United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2013 No. 19

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, February 8, 2013, at 11 a.m.

Senate

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2013

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal spirit, the fountain of life and truth, You make our plans succeed. Today, shine the light of Your presence upon our lawmakers, providing them with the wisdom You have promised to all who request it. May they primarily focus on pleasing You rather than on political consequences, trusting You to guide them during these challenging days. May what they declare with their lips be proven with their deeds. Lord, teach our lawmakers to love You as You have loved them.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable PATRICK J. LEAHY led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will resume consideration of the Violence Against Women Act. The time until noon will be divided and controlled equally between the two leaders or their designees. At noon, Senator-designee COWAN of Massachusetts will be sworn in to be a Member of the Senate.

We expect to complete action on the Violence Against Women Act. We hope to be able to do that today. If we cannot, we will do it tomorrow.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 209

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told S. 209 is at the desk and due for a second reading; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 209) to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve Bank by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would object to any further proceedings with respect to this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am optimistic that today the Senate will complete work on an important bipartisan measure that has been directed by the President pro tempore of the Senate; that is, the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

But Senate passage means little if our counterparts in the House fail to act on this crucial legislation. They failed once before. Let's hope this year they will get it past the finish line.

The Republican-controlled House, I repeat, failed to act last year, and the women of America do not want them to fail again. I was reassured to hear House Majority Leader CANTOR say yesterday that he ''cares very deeply about women.'' He went on to say the House would act to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act.

But Americans heard the some promise last year. Despite overwhelming evidence that this legislation saves lives, House Republican leaders used procedural gimmicks and stalling tactics to block its reauthorization. I would remind Leader CANTOR and his Republican colleagues of the seriousness of the delay.

Every minute House Republicans wait to act, another 24 Americans will become victims of domestic violence. Every day House Republicans stall, another three women will die at the hands of their abusers. Every year House Republicans put off action in order to please extremists within their own party, during that period of time more than 200,000 women will be sexually assaulted, more than 2 million will be stalked, and more than 1.3 million women will be abused by their partners.

It has been almost 300 days since the Senate passed a bipartisan bill to help law enforcement officials protect women and their families across this

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

country. But despite strong bipartisan support in the Senate, Republicans in the House refused to join the efforts to end domestic abuse.

Those partisan delays put women's lives at risk. Thousands have written letters and e-mailed and called to support this legislation. One Nevada woman shared her story of how her partner held a gun to her head and threatened to pull the trigger. She escaped with her life, but many women are not so fortunate. Every year more than 1,000 women are killed by domestic abusers. Since the Violence Against Women Act expired, more than 16 million women have been victimized.

The law is effective. In the two decades since it was enacted, the law has helped millions of women escape their attackers and seek justice. There is obviously much more work to do. I say to my friend Leader CANTOR: It is time for the Republican leaders to stop talking about how much they care about women and start acting to protect women. More than one-third of the women in this country have been the victim of violent sexual assault or stalking. Congress must do everything in its power to help law enforcement officials prevent these terrible crimes and prosecute the perpetrators. Reauthorizing this legislation would help law enforcement improve strategies to prosecute crimes against women. It would provide legal assistance to the victims of violence and funding for shelters to allow women to escape their abusers. It would safeguard youth who are experiencing dating violence and stalking.

Until we fully reauthorize this law, authorities will not have all the tools they need to fight domestic violence. Today—we hope it does not go over until tomorrow—we do not need another day's delay. For the second time in 2 years to protect American women and their children, we hope to take bipartisan action. I hope the House will act quickly to follow suit, as they did not do last year. I trust Leader CANTOR's words that this legislation is a priority. I will not be the only one holding him to his promise he made yesterday, to swiftly reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. In fact, there will be 160 million American women who are watching and waiting to see if he turns his words into action.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 47, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 47) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, first, I wish to applaud the distinguished leader Senator REID for his statement. He has helped us over and over again to get this bill to the floor. The reason it is here is because of the action of the distinguished majority leader in getting it up here. I was pleased to hear his comments about hopefully finishing this today or tomorrow. Anyway, it should be done soon. This is a landmark law.

The Senate has before it a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, a landmark law we enacted that has made a difference in women's lives. By providing new tools and resources to communities all around the country, we have helped bring the crimes of rape and domestic violence out of the shadows. The Federal Government stood with the women of this country and sent the message that we would no longer tolerate their treatment as second-class citizens. Our bill renews and reinforces that commitment.

Ending violence against women is not an easy problem to solve but there is a simple and significant step we can take, right now and without delay. I, again, thank Majority Leader REID for making this unfinished business from the last Congress a priority for the Senate early this year.

Senator CRAPO and I have worked hard to make this bill bipartisan and I am proud that it has more than 60 Senate cosponsors. It also has the support of more than 1,300 local, State and National organizations from around the country that work with victims every day and know just how critical this law has been. I included their most recent letter of support with my remarks on Monday. I, again, thank them for their tireless efforts.

On Monday the Senate voted to proceed to consideration of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. I was disappointed to see that 13 Republican Senators did not vote to proceed to the bill. I do not know why. They did not say.

I worry that there are Senators who do not appreciate the role of the Federal Government in helping improve the lives of Americans. That is what the Violence Against Women Act is intended to do and it is what this law has successfully accomplished for nearly 20 years. This is an example of how the Federal Government can help solve problems in cooperation with State and local communities. The fact is, women are safer today because of this law and there is no excuse not to improve upon it and reauthorize it without delay.

We are working to protect victims—all victims—of domestic and sexual violence. I hope that those who previously opposed our efforts to improve the Violence Against Women Act will join with us and help the Senate send our strong bill to the House of Representatives so that we can get it enacted. Let us not undercut the provisions to help protect Indian women from the serious problems they face.

If anyone needs a reminder of how important government help can be, just think about the way that Federal and local law enforcement worked together earlier this week to rescue Ethan, a 5-year-old kidnapped boy, from an underground bunker in Alabama, where he had been held hostage for almost a week. Ask the family and local law enforcement if they appreciated the help of the FBI, the Defense Department and so many who contributed to the safe return of that innocent victim.

I spent years in local law enforcement and have great respect for the men and women who protect us every day. When I hear Senators say that we should not provide Federal assistance, we should not help officers get the protection they need with bulletproof vests, or that we should not help the families of fallen public safety officers, I strongly disagree. In our Federal system, we can help and when we can, we should help. And that is exactly the opportunity that is before us today. We have the power to help improve the lives of millions of people in this country by renewing and expanding our commitment to end domestic and sexual violence. A recent study from the Centers for Disease Control, CDC, found that more than 24 people per minute are the victims of rape, domestic violence and stalking in this country. We can take action to change that and we must.

I am proud that our bill seeks to support all victims, regardless of their immigration status, their sexual orientation or their membership in an Indian tribe. As I have said countless times on the floor of this chamber, ''a victim is a victim is a victim.''

I appreciate the administration's support for this legislation and our goal in reaching all victims. In particular, I note the support of the administration in its Statement of Administration Policy for our bipartisan proposal, first developed by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, to ''bring justice to Native American victims.'' Three out of five Native women have been assaulted by their spouses or intimate partners. We can no longer idly stand by while this epidemic of abuse continues.

The language in the bill is that which the Senate adopted last April. The best legal views of which I am aware believe these provisions are both constructive and constitutional. We are building on the Tribal Law and Order Act and recognizing tribal authorities with respect to domestic violence in Indian country. No one should be able to get away with domestic violence and rape, not in any community, and not because the victim is a Native American victim in Indian country. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Statement of Administration Policy expressing the administration's strong support for this provision and the bill as a whole, be made

part of the RECORD at the end of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1).

Mr. LEAHY. The bottom line is this: While we have made great strides in reducing domestic and sexual violence, there is more to be done and it is incumbent upon us to act now. The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act has been carefully considered and debated for more than 2 years. It is time we vote and send this bill to the House of Representatives so that it can be enacted. Let us not undermine the provisions to help protect Indian women and other particularly vulnerable victims from the serious problems they face.

I hope the Senate will come together to reauthorize this needed legislation in a bipartisan manner that represents the finest traditions of the Senate. Domestic and sexual violence knows no political party. Its victims are Republican and Democrat, rich and poor, young and old, gay and straight, male and female. Let us come together now—today—to pass this strong reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. Let us show the American people what we can accomplish when we work together.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

S. 47—VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

(Sen. Leahy, D–VT, and 59 cosponsors, Feb. 4, 2013)

The Administration strongly supports Senate passage of S. 47 to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), a landmark piece of bipartisan legislation that first passed the Congress in 1994 and has twice been reauthorized. VAWA transformed the Nation's response to violence against women and brought critically needed resources to States and local communities to address these crimes.

The Administration is pleased that S. 47 continues that bipartisan progress and targets resources to address today's most pressing issues. Sexual assault remains one of the most underreported violent crimes in the country. The bill provides funding through State grants to improve the criminal justice response to sexual assault and to better connect victims with services. Further, the bill seeks to reduce domestic violence homicides and address the high rates of violence experienced by teens and young adults. Reaching young people through early intervention can break the cycle of violence.

The Administration strongly supports measures in S. 47 that will bring justice to Native American victims. Rates of domestic violence against Native American women are now among the highest in the United States. The bill builds on the Tribal Law and Order Act—which President Obama signed on July 29, 2010—to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of tribal justice systems and also recognize tribal authorities with respect to domestic violence in Indian country. The Administration is pleased that S. 47 recognizes the need to provide protection and services to all victims of abuse and includes proposals to strengthen existing policies that were supported by both Democrats and Republicans last year.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am going to proceed on my leader time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

FINDING ECONOMIC SOLUTIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, a report this week from Harvard's Institute of Politics reveals just how devastating the President's policies have been for Americans under 30. Despite the fact that most millennials have attended college, only about 60 percent of them have been able to find a job, and half of them are only working part time.

For many young Americans, this suggests the American dream is already drifting out of reach. It should not be this way.

Previous generations of Americans faced great challenges, but until now younger Americans could always expect they would eventually achieve greater prosperity than their parents, and that their children would do even better. Now the opposite appears to be the case. This should be shocking to all of us, especially considering that this generation of young people came into its own in an era of relative peace and prosperity. For many of us, just going to college was a pretty big deal. For today's younger generation, it was the obvious next step.

Many of us watched our parents save diligently for the simplest of luxuries. A lot of today's young people couldn't relate to those stories until now. They grew up in an age of dot-com booms and easy credit.

As college degrees no longer translate into fulfilling careers and as the Obama economy continues its yearlong stagnation, much has changed for a generation that once seemed to have everything going for it. Recent figures from the Congressional Budget Office help tell the story. According to CBO, in 2014 the United States will see a sixth consecutive year of 7.5 percent-plus unemployment. The last time the United States jobs picture was that bad, Americans were still huddling around the family radio.

For 2 years, the President has been saying that raising taxes on the rich would solve our problems. Yet CBO notes that while taxes are set to jump above their historic level, the added revenues from taxes that rose due to operation of law last month will mean almost nothing when it comes to dealing with America's long-term fiscal challenges. This is because CBO has also warned that spending, which already exceeds the historic average, will continue its unsustainable climb in the years ahead.

In fact, over the next decade, red ink will spike by trillions to levels unseen in peacetime America. If interest rates go up, as most expect, it will be even harder for young Americans to purchase a home. The CBO warns that if interest payments on our debt skyrocket, it will be even more difficult to guarantee the eventual availability of Social Security and Medicare for today's graduates. If wages fall as a result of the smaller economy that comes from the government's increased debt payments, then we can be quite certain that today's generation will know less prosperity than their parents do.

These are some of the negative consequences of failing to get spending under control. Things are set to get much worse unless we act quickly.

Has the White House reached out to Republicans to solve these pressing economic and fiscal challenges? I wish. Instead, it has turned once again to gimmicks and tax hikes that only serve to delay solutions. Earlier this week the President even proposed more tax hikes to offset a sequester that he himself proposed and he already signed into law. If he agrees with us there is a smarter way to make these cuts, he should propose it, not just call on others to act.

I will tell you this right now: My constituents in Kentucky and the American people will not accept another tax increase to put off a spending cut that the two parties have already agreed to. We have already agreed to cut this much spending. It is the definition of dysfunction that it might not happen.

This morning I am again calling on the President and his congressional allies to put politics aside at least for once. The election is over. The time to govern is right now, to make divided government work for the American people who chose it. We owe Americans action, not rhetoric. We owe it to the millions of college graduates out of work. We owe it to the strivers who find themselves still living in their parents' basement. They are all counting on us to enact real bipartisan solutions, solutions that can get our economy moving again today and can ensure greater prosperity tomorrow.

Is Washington up to the task? Republicans are, and we are still here ready to work for the President as soon as he is prepared to get down to business.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders and their designees.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about the legislation we are about to discuss here, the Violence Against Women Act.

Before I do, I want to respond to a comment I heard by the Republican leader on the floor right now talking about the impact of sequestration, which is to go into effect March 1 unless Congress acts to replace it with something that is more balanced. Sequestration was never written into law to go into effect. Sequestration was put into law in order for us, Congress, to come together in a bipartisan way to find a balanced solution. That is still the case. I feel very strongly that if Members of Congress, Republicans and

Democrats, can come together with a balanced package that takes into account sequestration causing severe impact to our national defense, to our nondefense programs such as Head Start and education at a time when our economy is very fragile—the impact of the job cuts on that would be very severe. Democrats believe, just as we did throughout this process, if we put forward a balanced replacement that includes revenue, making sure that those wealthy Americans who have done very well and have not had to sacrifice are part of a replacement package that we can move through this Congress, this will ensure, as we put forward a balanced budget approach for the future and work for a long-term deficit stabilization process, we can get past this hurdle.

There is no reason we need to manage crisis by crisis if we can come together on a balanced approach that does include revenue. This is what Americans expect—everybody participates in making sure that our economy gets back on track, we don't just protect the wealthiest, but we ask them to do their part.

I look forward to working with anybody in this body to do this so we don't face the impacts of sequestration that would happen if we don't have that balanced plan.

Speaking about the Violence Against Women Act, which is the order of business today, I come to the floor this morning to continue the efforts that we did start here 9 months ago, efforts that were, in fact, overwhelmingly bipartisan—68 Senators—to finally renew our national commitment to ending domestic violence and reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. It is a bill that has successfully helped provide life-saving assistance to hundreds of thousands of women and families, and it is a bill that consistently extends protections to new communities of vulnerable Americans each and every time it has been authorized.

I wish to thank Senator LEAHY and Senator CRAPO for making the Violence Against Women Act a priority for reintroduction in the 113th Congress, because there is no reason this critical bill, which has such broad support, should be put on the back burner and delayed further while there are millions of Americans across our country who are excluded from the current law. In fact, for Native, immigrant women, and LGBT individuals, every moment our inclusive legislation to reauthorize VAWA is delayed is another moment they are left without the resources and protection they deserve.

For women on tribal lands, the challenges are particularly immense. Often in our very rural areas, on tribal lands, these women live hours and hours away from the nearest Federal prosecutors.

For nontribal members on these lands who perpetrate these violent crimes against the women who are living there, it equates to nothing short of a safe haven for them. It is a place where they are free from tribal jurisdiction and repeatedly commit horrific acts without being afraid of being brought to justice.

This is an injustice that Deborah Parker, the vice chairwoman of the Tulalip tribes in my home State, spoke to just outside this Chamber last year in an effort to get House Republicans to listen. Through her tears she told a deeply personal story about how not only was she abused as a young girl, but how she then watched family members and friends suffer similar fates. She spoke about how time and again the abusers went unprosecuted, only to repeat the crime over and over. She called herself ''a Native American statistic.'' Even more sadly, she was right.

In fact, the numbers are staggering. One in three Native women will be raped in her lifetime. One in three. Two in five of them are victims of domestic violence, and they are killed at 10 times the rate of the national average. These shocking statistics aren't isolated to one group of women, as 25 to 35 percent of women in the LGBT community experience domestic violence in relationships. Three in four abused immigrant women never entered the process to obtain legal status, even though they were eligible, because their abuser husbands never filed the paperwork.

It does not need to be this way. I was very proud to be here serving the Senate back in 1994 when we first passed the Violence Against Women Act. Since we took that historic step, VAWA has been a great success in coordinating victims' advocates, social service providers, and law enforcement officials to meet the immediate challenges of combating domestic violence. Along with bipartisan support, this has received praise from law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, victim service providers, faith leaders, health care professionals, advocates, and survivors.

VAWA has attained such broad support because it worked. It provides shelter and justice to battered women who need both, and it is the cornerstone of our efforts to combat domestic violence. We can't pick winners and losers on who gets these critical protections, and we cannot afford any further delay, not on this bill.

Just like the last Congress, we all know what it would take to move this bill forward—leadership from Speaker BOEHNER and Leader CANTOR. The fate of the Violence Against Women Act lies squarely on their shoulders. To date they have refused to listen to countless law enforcement and women's groups, as well as moderate voices in their own party who have called on them to pass the Senate's bipartisan and inclusive bill.

In this new Congress, on this newly introduced bipartisan bill, the House Republican leadership faces the same choice and a second chance. They can either appease those on the far right of their caucus, who would turn battered women away from care, or they can stand with Democrats, moderate Republicans, and the many millions of Americans who believe that who a person loves, where they live, or their immigration status, should not determine whether they are protected from violence in this country.

In fact, in a recent editorial the Seattle Times echoed this same sentiment:

> House Republican leaders refused to bring the original Senate bill forward for a vote. They must not squander a second chance to save lives.

I couldn't agree more. Too many women have been left vulnerable while House Republican leaders have played politics. It is time for moderate Republican voices in the House to call upon them to pass this bipartisan Senate bill immediately, because women's lives across the country literally depend on it.

The Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, has led the charge on this bill. I wish to thank him publicly, as he is on the floor right now, for his work, for the first bill he has put forward for this body to consider. It is time to move on it, and I want him to know how much I truly appreciate all of his efforts in getting this done. This is for all women in this country, for Native American women, whom I have talked about, in particular, who have suffered at the hands of their abusers for so long, and for all of our women in this country, whoever they are, wherever they come from, to know that this Senate in a bipartisan way stands behind them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for her words. The Senator from Washington State has been a consistent and clear supporter of the Violence Against Women Act. I especially applaud what she said: It should apply to all victims. I have said so many times on this floor, and I sometimes wonder if people hear, but certainly in my experience in law enforcement the police never asked and said, well, we can't help this victim unless they fall into a particular category. They said a victim is a victim is a victim, and a crime is a crime is a crime.

We didn't have the Violence Against Women Act when I and my colleagues around the country were in law enforcement. I cannot help but think of all the deaths that would have been prevented had we had something like this, all the violence that would have been prevented if there had been organizations like some of the actual ones we have in Vermont and other States supported by the Violence Against Women Act that have prevented violence.

I cannot imagine any Member of this body would oppose this law if it affected them or their families. We, as Americans, are all family, so it affects every one of us.

I again thank the Senator from Washington State for her comments.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the letters from advocates and faith-based organizations in support of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Act, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ALLIANCE TO END SEXUAL VIOLENCE,
Washington, DC, January 28, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. MICHAEL CRAPO,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND SENATOR CRAPO: On behalf of 56 state and territorial sexual assault coalitions and 1300 rape crisis centers, I want to express our sincere gratitude for the introduction of S. 47. The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) with the SAFER Act included represents the essential and comprehensive legislative package that is necessary to advance this nation's response to the crime of rape and protect and support victims. S. 47 includes critical enhancements to address sexual assault including criminal justice improvements, housing protections, vital direct service and prevention programs, and SAFER's policies to address the rape kit backlog.

We are urging all Senators to stand with sexual assault survivors and support the swift passage of this far-reaching legislation.

Sincerely,

MONIKA JOHNSON HOSTLER,
Board President.

FEBRUARY 4, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Dirksen Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. MICHAEL CRAPO,
Dirksen Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY AND SENATOR CRAPO: We, the undersigned sentencing and criminal justice reform organizations, are writing to express our opposition to the inclusion of any mandatory minimum sentencing provisions in S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (VAWA).

We acknowledge that reducing the level of sexual, domestic, and dating violence and stalking directed at victims of violence is a worthwhile objective and an issue of national concern. We recognize and appreciate that many of the proposals contained in S. 47 enjoy broad bipartisan support, as well as the support of the American public. In its current form, S. 47 does not include any mandatory minimum sentences. We think it should remain that way through passage.

We do not believe that including mandatory minimum sentencing provisions for the domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking offenses in S. 47 would be necessary, appropriate, or cost-effective. In fact, such provisions could be counterproductive in combatting violence. According to the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, the threat of a lengthy, mandatory prison sentence for an intimate partner abuser could deter a victim from reporting a crime. Because the victim and offender are often related or in an intimate relationship, many of the crimes included in VAWA will involve complex facts and unique circumstances. Such complicated crimes demand that courts have flexibility to ensure that the sentence fits the crime and the offender, protects victims, and best meets the needs of the family or couple impacted.

Finally, more mandatory minimum sentences would only increase the burdens on and high costs of our already overcrowded federal prison system. A recent Congressional Research Service report shows that mandatory minimums are the primary driver of high prison populations and increasing prison costs. Mandatory minimum sentences are unfair, ineffective, and result in extraordinary costs to American taxpayers.

Accordingly, as the Senate considers S. 47, we strongly urge you to oppose the adoption of any mandatory minimums. Thank you for your leadership on this important issue and for considering our views. Please do not hesitate to contact any of us if you should have any questions.

Sincerely,

American Civil Liberties Union, Church of Scientology National Affairs Office, Drug Policy Alliance, Families Against Mandatory Minimums, Human Rights Watch, Justice Fellowship, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, National Legal Aid & Defender Association, The Sentencing Project, United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society.

LUTHERAN IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE SERVICE,
Baltimore, MD, February 1, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. MIKE CRAPO,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY AND SENATOR CRAPO: On behalf of Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS), the national organization established by Lutheran churches in the United States to welcome immigrants and refugees, thank you for reintroducing the bipartisan Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) (S. 47).

As you are aware, there are many cases in which immigration status is used as a tool for abuse, leading victims to remain in abusive relationships and contributing to the underreporting of serious crimes to local enforcement officials. The creation of the U visa in 2000 by Congress to encourage migrant victims to report criminal offenses to officials has been extremely helpful in advancing community safety. The need for U visas is significant. In 2012, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services ran out of available U visas over a month prior to the end of the fiscal year. Therefore, the lack of a vital increase in the number of available U visas in S. 47 is extremely disappointing. However, I am encouraged by your commitment to increase the cap on U visas as part of immigration reform legislation.

While I applaud efforts to swiftly move VAWA through both chambers of Congress, I caution against any use of VAWA as a means to expand immigration enforcement provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. These changes would be detrimental to the central purpose of VAWA—to address the critical issues of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and human trafficking—and should remain outside of the VAWA debate.

LIRS commends your leadership in advancing this bill and we are excited to continue to work with you to ensure the inclusion of provisions to protect vulnerable migrant victims in upcoming legislation. Please contact Brittney Nystrom, LIRS Director for Advocacy with any questions.

Yours in faith,

LINDA J. HARTKE,
President and CEO,
Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC WITNESS, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH (U.S.A.), COMPASSION, PEACE AND JUSTICE MINISTRY,
Washington, DC, February 1, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: In the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), we believe that ''domestic violence is always a violation of the power God intended for good.'' We believe that ''God the Creator is preeminently a covenant-maker, the One who creates, sustains, and transforms the people of God. Domestic violence and abuse destroys covenants in which people have promised to treat each other with respect and dignity.''

Because of these convictions, we strongly support a robust reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act and we thank you for your leadership in sponsoring S. 47. Further, we wish you to know that we have written to all of your Senate colleagues, asking them to support final passage of this bill, and urging them to oppose any amendments that you have not endorsed.

As you know, VAWA's programs support state, tribal, and local efforts to address the pervasive and insidious crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. These programs have made great progress towards reducing the violence, helping victims to be healthy and feel safe and holding perpetrators accountable. This critical legislation must be reauthorized to ensure a continued response to these crimes.

Again, we thank you for your leadership on this important issue and look forward to the bill's passage, so that we can build upon VAWA's successes and continue to enhance our nation's ability to promote an end to this violence, to hold perpetrators accountable, and to keep victims and their families safe from future harm. For our part, we commit to continued ministry with victims and survivors of violence and to do all we can, through our ministries and our advocacy, to end this desperate cycle of violence and brokenness.

We give thanks for your service to our nation and for your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

THE REVEREND J. HERBERT NELSON II,
Director for Public Witness.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from New

Hampshire would yield to me for a moment.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Always, Mr. President.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I know the senior Senator from New Hampshire is about to speak regarding the Violence Against Women Act. I would like to take a moment to thank her for all the work she has done in her State and in the Senate to help advance this legislation.

Senator SHAHEEN and I are from rural States. We border each other. The Connecticut River runs down the border between our two States. We have so much in common. We face some of the same difficulties of weather and rural nature, and, of course, in a rural State there is the question of access to transportation. Senator SHAHEEN was the one who brought up, based on her experience in New Hampshire, that women were having trouble getting to crisis centers and courts. Of course, we have a similar challenge in a rural State such as mine. But Senator SHAHEEN worked with the Department of Justice to address this problem. As a result, the Office on Violence Against Women is now allowing rural communities to obtain VAWA grant funding for transportation needs.

A number of the women who are going to be getting this transportation and desperately need it may not know how that came about, but I wish to congratulate Senator SHAHEEN on her successful efforts on behalf of not just women in New Hampshire or Vermont but throughout the country—again, another example of what we are doing with this bill and the necessity to finish this bill. I hope we can finish it today.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, both for his kind words and the tremendous leadership he has shown over the years in first passing this legislation and for getting it reauthorized time and again and now, after the bill died in the last Congress because of the unwillingness of the House to act, for his willingness to bring it forward so early in the session so that hopefully we can make sure all of those people who are victims of domestic violence and all of those advocates, the law enforcement community that is working so hard, can have the support they need as a result of this legislation. So I thank Senator LEAHY very much.

One of the reasons I am proud to support this bill is because it takes a truly comprehensive approach to the problem. It supports crisis centers for women and families to provide for immediate needs, such as shelter and counseling.

Last year the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence reported that they were able to provide shelter for 630 people who needed a place to sleep. Unfortunately, although they helped those 630, they had to turn away 721 because they didn't have room. So even with the help that is in the Violence Against Women Act, they had to turn away more people than they could help.

In the face of this need, sometimes it is easy to feel discouraged, to wonder whether we can really help at all. But when I speak to the brave women who are survivors who reached out for help to the advocates who have helped them rebuild their shattered lives, I know that we can and we must continue to make a difference.

The Violence Against Women Act helps us do this by providing funding for police officers and prosecutors so abusers are held responsible. Time and again, we have heard from law enforcement that the Violence Against Women Act helps them keep our communities safe and helps stop the cycle of abuse—law enforcement officers such as a detective sergeant in New Hampshire's largest city of Manchester, who is an investigator and a domestic violence advocate.

I brought with me today a chart that gives us a real picture of just how pervasive the problem of domestic violence is.

As we can see in the chart, one in four women in the United States is a victim of domestic violence. Three women are murdered every day by their partners. This has been a very big problem in New Hampshire where half of all murders are domestic violence related.

Maybe the worst statistic on this chart shows that 15 million children are exposed to domestic violence every year. I call this maybe the worst because, in fact, the cycle of domestic violence continues because so many children are exposed every year. They are not able to get out of this cycle. Let's recommit to shielding our children from senseless violence.

Another reason I am proud to support this bill is because it treats all victims equally, and it recognizes that members of the LGBT community are just as deserving of our support as any other survivor of domestic violence. A recent study by the Centers for Disease Control shows us that those in LGBT relationships actually experience higher rates of violence than heterosexual couples. Let's recommit to helping all Americans regardless of whom they love or who has abused them.

Finally, I want to end with a quote from a woman in New Hampshire who sought help at a crisis center that receives funds from VAWA, the Monadnock Center for Violence Prevention. Before she left that shelter—as she was putting her life back together—she told the case managers there:

> You all have really made my life worth holding onto and not giving up. Please don't ever give up doing what you do because you truly saved my life.

I think that represents what we hear from so many survivors of domestic violence. Just as we are not going to give up on those survivors, we must not give up until this legislation is on President Obama's desk and signed into law. There are too many victims who are counting on us.

I certainly urge all of my colleagues in the Senate—as we did in the last session of Congress—to join me in supporting the Violence Against Women Act. I also hope our colleagues in the House will recognize how significant this challenge is and be willing to take up this legislation and get it done so survivors across this country will get the help they need.

Thank you very much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, Indiana has a lot in common with Kansas, so I don't mind that label. I have been in the chair and made similar mistakes, so that doesn't bother me. We have a lot of similarities between Indiana and Kansas. We each hope to have a Final Four team in the basketball tournament coming up in the Final Four. We have some competitive teams, so it is a nice blend.

THE ECONOMY

I would like to speak about the sequestration issue that is facing us as a Congress in the next few weeks. But, first, let me just say, I returned from the National Prayer Breakfast. Several of our colleagues were there: Senator SESSIONS, a Republican, and Senator PRYOR, a Democrat, representing Alabama and Arkansas, but more importantly they are cochairs of the Senate Prayer Breakfast. They led the effort today. Both the House Prayer Breakfast group, which meets weekly, and the Senate Prayer Breakfast group, which meets weekly, supports and puts together the annual Prayer Breakfast. People from more than 160 countries and all 50 States attended. It is quite a remarkable event.

Beyond the socialization and bringing people together around the issue of faith and prayer, we find in our weekly Prayer Breakfast meetings in the Senate and the House that it is the one time when Republicans and Democrats, Liberals and Conservatives, people of no particular ideology, get together and talk about the common interest on the basis of their faith. It is always very refreshing to do that, and it was a pretty remarkable session this morning.

Senator SCHUMER from New York read from the Old Testament, and our former colleague, Senator Dole from North Carolina, read from the New Testament. Dr. Ben Carson, head of pediatric neurosurgery at Johns Hopkins University—recognized as one of the world's leading pediatric neurosurgeons—spoke to us. I heard him 16 years ago. What a remarkable life story. What a remarkable impact he had on the crowd that was there.

He talked about political correctness and how it is detrimental to the kind of honest, straightforward debate we

need in this country over any range of issues, from our religious beliefs to our political beliefs. He talked about how we need to be willing to be transparent and honest with the people we represent, to speak out about what we believe in and how healthy the debate is even if we come to different positions on separate issues.

That is one of the reasons I have been coming down here virtually every day since the Senate came back into session for the 113th Congress. I come here to talk about what I think is one of the challenges—if not the leading challenge—facing us in this 2-year term. Without question, our fiscal crisis and debt has an impact on our people and on the economy, but more importantly, on our people. This has an effect on the average family in America and the young people coming out of high school and college who are looking for a job. The impact of this more than 4-year economic malaise started with a deep recession. It is now getting to the point where our growth is far below what we need to get everybody back to work and get the economy moving again on a good upward path. We are looking for solutions to the root of our problem. This body, along with the House and the administration, has been dealing with this for well over 2 years. We have been trying to find a solution to get us on the right path to fiscal health. We have taken several steps in that regard, but each step has come up short. There have been several one-step-forward and half-a-step-back efforts, but most of it has simply been pushing it down the road and saving the big debate for another day.

In August 2011 we ended up passing the Budget Control Act, which addressed the debt ceiling at that time. Through that the administration first proposed—President Obama proposed—a measure known as sequestration, which was designed to force the Congress to step up to the plate and deal with the real problem. The real problem is continued deficit spending at a record level that has accumulated year after year.

We are now at the point where the clock is ticking. We have a $16.5 trillion debt which is up from nearly $5.5 trillion in just the last 4 years. The math proves and history clearly shows that this is unsustainable. This is the great challenge before this Congress. We need to do what is necessary to get on the right path to fiscal health before it all comes down.

We had a warning shot fired across our bow in 2009 as to the distortions in our economy, and the consequences were grave. We have warning shots being fired every day from virtually across the Atlantic as to what the European Union and the European nations are trying to deal with because they allowed their deficit spending, their debt, and overpromises by politicians to constituents to continue, which simply cannot be fulfilled. Now the bank is running out of money. We simply don't have the resources to continue to pay the debt, and the interest on the debt gets worse every day that goes by.

So we had this Budget Control Act in 2011 that included an enforcement mechanism called the sequester, which is simply an across-the-board cut. However, the sequester was not an across-the-board cut. It was heavily weighted in cuts to defense. There were exemptions to the major drivers of our debt and deficit, which are the mandatory spending programs.

Let me be straight and say the things we are not supposed to say because it is political suicide: If we don't reform Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, it doesn't matter what else we do, we cannot solve this problem. That is the conclusion of just about everyone in this body. More importantly, it is the conclusion of everyone who doesn't have a political stake in mind.

Analysts and economists who look at our fiscal plight and the history of economic performance and nonperformance all come to the same point: We need to address and reform mandatory spending programs. We don't want to impose sacrifice and pain on people; we want to save them from much greater pain down the road. We need to reform programs so they are viable and so that people who are contributing to Social Security and Medicare on every paycheck will be able to receive those benefits when they need them in retirement.

To save those programs and to keep from denying people their hard-earned benefits, we need to take steps and we need to take them sooner rather than later. The Medicare and Social Security trustees keep giving us additional warnings to do it now. It will be less painful than doing it later. It will help keep us from making Draconian cuts to benefits or Draconian increases in taxes that will break the back of the American taxpayer.

Unfortunately, the supercommittee that was formed—six Republicans and six Democrats from each body—was unable to come up with a solution. As a result of that, we have this sequester—across-the-board cuts with certain exceptions—that is to occur soon. It has been delayed once before and now. March 1 is the new date.

We need to step up and put together the big plan that will get us on the path to fiscal health. Republicans in the House of Representatives have been proposing and putting forth their plans, but we have had nothing come out of this body. Unless there is support from both Houses, nothing can be accomplished, and this will fail.

Frankly, we have had a lot of rhetoric coming out of the White House about what we need to do, but we have had no serious attempt to address the part of the equation that needs to be addressed, and that is the excessive spending over the years that we have put into law. As politicians, we have made promises to our constituents over the years which we know cannot be fulfilled.

It is time we stand up and be honest with the American people. We need to be transparent and basically say: Folks, we have a problem. It is simple math. We cannot continue to borrow $1 trillion or more a year and be in a sound fiscal position. We have to take some steps to address that problem and that challenge before us.

If we don't begin that process now, we are going to see devastating across-the-board cuts. It will have very detrimental effects on our national defense and national security because it is so heavily weighted to slash those areas.

The major three contributors and drivers of the debt are the entitlement programs: Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. If those are not addressed—no matter what else we do here—we cannot solve the problem. Yet the political tendency is to simply pass it along, push it down the road, and get past the next election. It apparently is too politically dangerous to stand up and say these things and be honest with the American people. Well, I think the American people know better and are telling: We are ahead of you. We understand the problem, and we want results. We want you to work together, find a solution to this problem, and put it before us. It is our responsibility to go out and present the plan. But without the President's support, despite his rhetoric—all we hear from the White House is that more taxes will solve the problem. They just got $630 billion worth of taxes from the fiscal cliff deal. The President's commitment and obsession with taxing the rich and the job creators was fulfilled, and the top percent—the people he described in his campaign and afterward in the negotiations—are now paying higher taxes, but that does not begin to even come close to solving the problem. So what we need to do is be straightforward with what it is we must do and not be afraid of being honest with the American people.

There is now talk about delaying, once again, the sequester. So whether it is the debt limit, whether it is the spending bills, or whether it is the budget, we keep hearing: Push it down the road. Do it some other time. It is too painful to do now. I would suggest the time to do it is now. Even though the sequester is imperfect, even though it imposes more pain and more detriment to one of the essential functions of government; that is, providing for our national security, which is part of the reason I opposed the Budget Control Act, these cuts are going to take place and need to take place if we don't come up with a better solution because it now is the law.

I am pleading with my colleagues: Let's not do this in a way that is not the soundest way to reduce spending and achieve what we need to achieve. By the way, while the sequester, once again, will be an important step forward, it doesn't begin to deal with the

real problem. The real problem is finding the political will and courage to be honest with the American people and pass a fiscal package that will reassure investors, consumers and the world that the United States of America has finally taken the steps necessary to address the cause of our debt and put us on a path to return to fiscal soundness.

I think, given our position in relation to where we are with other nations, this type of package would result in an amazing increase in our economy, get people back to work, and send the message that America can return to its place of leadership in the world because it has gotten their economic house in order. Without that, we will continue to decline, which will have consequences not only for our generation but for generations to come. This also would have potentially dangerous consequences for security around the world because of our inability to lead. It would have serious consequences for young people and for middle-aged people and others who simply want to get back to work. They simply want to get back to a place where they get a paycheck at the end of the week so they can cover the mortgage and save money to send the kids to school and so they can make those necessary payment commitments to lead the kind of life they are aspiring to lead. Without Congress taking action, they are going to continue to live under this cloud of uncertainty about our future and people are going to continue to struggle to find meaningful work.

It all comes down to the individual and to families. It doesn't come down to some accountant's balance sheet. It comes down to the pain and suffering so many people have gone through over the past 4 years and are continuing to encounter because of our lack of responsibility to take the necessary steps to go act.

I am going to keep talking about this. I am going to come to the floor and talk about how we can potentially achieve a much leaner, more effective, and efficient government. I am going to use as a model not just my State but many States with Governors who have had the courage to step forward and do what is necessary to put their State in fiscal balance, in contrast to other States that are doing what we are doing; that is, pushing the tough decisions down the road and trying to deal with it at another time.

As we go through the Federal budget, there are literally hundreds of billions of dollars simply being spent in the wrong place, simply going to programs that are no longer effective and efficient if they ever were in the first place. We are not making priorities in terms of how we spend our money. Senator COBURN and others have been down to this floor talking about egregious examples of overspending, of bloated bureaucracy, talking about programs that perhaps had a value at one point in time but are simply not doing the job anymore and are not necessary. We have been talking about the kinds of things that ought to be done at the State and local level rather than the Federal level. We have been talking about how Congress needs to stop making promises to people that everything we spend is for a vital, national purpose if that isn't the case.

We need to do some serious triage and take a serious look at how we spend taxpayer dollars. We can come up with money to offset necessary programs. We can come up with money to lower the demands so we don't have to continue to go to the American people and say we have to raise your taxes one more time. We have said that too much.

The burden is not tax revenues; the burden is dealing with our spending issue, and part of that has to be dealing with the mandatory spending that is ever driving this deficit and debt.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I request the time to make my statement as required.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak on the Violence Against Women Act, but before I do that, I wish to say I appreciate the comments of my friend from Indiana. We all want to get this budget under control. We all recognize we have to get it under control not only for today's generation but for multiple generations to come.

During the last few years we have been able to cut almost $2 trillion of our budgetary costs over the next 10 years, cuts we have been able to accomplish in a bipartisan way but led a lot by this side. Let me remind folks where we are. Four years ago this economy was flat on its back—an economy that didn't have any air in it. It was in a grave situation. But where are we today? We have a 5-year housing start, incredible activity within the automobile industry, with record-high sales going on there. The stock market has doubled in the last 4½ years. Most recently, the CBO—the Congressional Budget Office, a bipartisan office which doesn't show any favoritism to any side—verifies that in 4 years we have cut the annual deficit by 40 percent. I know that is not where it should be yet because we want to balance it, but a 40-percent reduction in the annual deficit is significant.

So we are on the road. Is it a slower road than we would like? Sure, but it is on the road to recovery. It is having a positive impact. As a matter of fact, now the deficit, as the amount compared to our GDP, is cut in half. So we are making some inroads.

Democrats are not afraid at all to cut the budget where it is necessary, but we need to solve this problem with three types of moves. We have to cut the budget, deal with revenues, and invest in this economy for education, energy, and infrastructure. It is a three-pronged approach. Even if we think we can do one of these and somehow, magically, a $16 trillion debt will just vanish overnight is in another world that doesn't exist on this planet.

I appreciate the debate that goes on, but we need to be honest, realistic, and practical in dealing with these budgetary issues, and they will be tough. People will not like all of it. I can see it now at my townhall meetings when I go to them. They will say cut the budget, which we will do—don't get me wrong, we will do that—but then when I go back to my hometown they will say, I didn't actually mean that program. That will be the story.

The fact is we have serious issues with which to deal. So this is not a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. When people come to the floor, we should think about this as an American issue and that we have to resolve this for the right reasons. We have done some exceptional work over the last 4 years, despite the hurdles, the political slogans, and all the other stuff that goes along with it in getting results. A 40-percent reduction in the annual deficit in 4 years is significant. Is it zero? Is it balanced? No; because there have been 40-plus years of not paying attention to the budget.

A lot of us are new around here. As a matter of fact, 60 percent of the Senate is made up of people who haven't been here more than 6 years. I am looking at three Senators on the floor right now. We are here to solve this problem. However, do not be mistaken. We have made progress. The American people should be proud of what we have done. But is it perfect? No. Do we have more work to do? Yes. That is why we are here and that is why we are going to do this with a bipartisan approach.

So I digress from the issue I came to discuss. I like the debates that happen on the floor, and I wish more would happen, but when a Member speaks, I want to make sure all the information is on the table.

I came to speak on an important piece of legislation, the Violence Against Women Act. We debate issues that are important around here, but not too often can we stand on the floor of this Chamber and say our votes are a matter of life and death. In this case, it is absolutely true. This bill saves lives. It is our job to pass it now—today.

The Senate, as we did last year, needs to send a simple and important message that America will not tolerate violence against its women, children, and families. We must do our part to reduce domestic violence and sexual assault. Even though the House has refused to act for over 300 days since we sent the bill over there, we are now in a new session and there is bipartisan support in this Chamber. The VAWA bill passed the Senate with 60 votes last spring and there are at least 60 of us already signed up and cosponsoring this legislation.

We know the reality. The fight to protect women and families from violence is far from over. VAWA was first

passed just 20 years ago and it has not been reauthorized since 2006. The law has made a difference. We know a great deal more about domestic violence than when VAWA was first written. Services for victims have improved. Communities offer safer shelter. Local, State, and Federal laws are stronger. Yet there are still too many awful stories and inexcusable numbers, especially in my home State.

Alaska continues to have some of the worst statistics in the country. Three out of every four Alaskans have experienced domestic or sexual violence or known someone who has. The rate of rape in Alaska is nearly 2½ times the national average, even worse for Alaskan Native women. Child sexual assault in Alaska is almost six times the national average. Out of every 100 adult women in Alaska, nearly 60 have experienced physical or sexual violence or both.

So my colleagues can see why I am standing here today. We need to do something about this not someday, not next year but today.

In one typical day in my State, victim services agencies throughout Alaska serve an average of 464 victims, 114 hotline calls are answered, and 308 people across Alaska attend training sessions offered by local domestic violence and sexual assault programs. Yet people are still turned away because of a lack of funding, a lack of service. On an average day in Alaska, 52 requests for services are not met—basic needs such as transportation, childcare, language translation, counseling and legal representation. The bill before us is critical in ensuring all victims receive the services they need.

I wish to spend just a few more minutes discussing the safety of women and children in Alaska Native and American Indian families. For the sake of our Nation's first peoples, the tribal provisions in this bill need to become law. Yet some of my colleagues on the other side of this Chamber are trying to strip out our expanded authority over domestic violence in Indian Country. Why are we debating this? One out of every three Native American women has suffered rape, physical violence or stalking. Yet some Members want to debate the rights of their abusers. I fully support the tribal provisions in this bill. Yet I must point out that none of the expanded criminal jurisdiction applies to Alaska Native tribes except for one true reservation at the very southern tip of Alaska. Today is not the day to fight that fight, but I will take it up again soon from my seat on the Indian Affairs Committee in the Senate.

Study after study has concluded that the lack of effective local law enforcement in Alaska Native villages contributes to so many problems: increased crime, alcohol and drug abuse, domestic violence, and poor educational achievement. When it comes to protecting those most at risk, Congress must recognize the need for local control, local responsibility, and local accountability. This bill will take a big step forward today on Indian reservations in the lower 48.

At a later time, we will get to my bill, which I have introduced in the past as the Alaska Safe Families and Villages Act.

My bill would establish small demonstration projects so a handful of federally recognized tribes in Alaska's villages can take action. They would be allowed to address domestic violence and alcohol-related cases within their villages and village boundaries.

Our Native villages are vibrant, resilient communities, and we must answer their calls for help. That includes an ''all of the above'' approach to combating domestic violence and abuse. The one thing we know for sure is the status quo is not working. It is not just about slogans or feel-good statements. We need to act.

But for now—for today—let's vote on VAWA and get this bill passed. Let's protect women and children and families all over this country. And let's send a strong message to our colleagues in the House, that this time there is no hiding. It is time to get the job done. It is time to put politics aside. Pass this bill and truly save lives.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, is he in the queue to speak?

Mr. GRASSLEY. For 7 or 8 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Excuse me?

Mr. GRASSLEY. If I could have 7 or 8 minutes now.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Yes. The Senator is in the queue because Senator BEGICH just spoke. That would be great. I thank the Senator very much. I appreciate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, there has long been bipartisan support for the Violence Against Women Act. Too many women are victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence. Federal support for services to these women, and sometimes even men, has been beneficial to our country.

I support many of the provisions in the majority bill. There are consolidations of grants, cyber stalking, rural programs, assistance for individuals with disabilities, older victims, housing protections, and numerous other provisions I wholeheartedly support. There is overwhelming bipartisan support for 98 percent of what is contained in S. 47.

The process on the Violence Against Women Act in the 112th Congress was very disappointing, and I expressed that last year during debate on this issue.

Previously, the Violence Against Women Act was reauthorized unanimously—I mean prior to the debate last year and this year.

When new provisions were added in the past, prior to last year, they were consensus items. The law then was reauthorized by consensus. Something similar could have happened again last year, but it did not. New provisions were forced into the bill. Some of these provisions were controversial. Some raised serious constitutional concerns. But those on the other side of the aisle insisted on these provisions without change and refused any sort of middle ground. It appeared that the debate was more about blame and politics than it was about providing help to women in need.

Last Congress, both the Republican leader and this Senator offered that the Senate consent to striking a provision that violated the Constitution's Origination clause and then we would proceed to conference. Everybody knows that the Constitution's Origination clause says that issues involving raising revenue must start in the other body. Well, this bill raised revenue and, consequently, violated that constitutional provision.

Yet today, S. 47 has removed that provision that raised this blue slip problem in the other body. It does this only a few months after the majority refused to drop it and proceed to conference. What I just said tells you, if it had been done as they are doing it right now, we could have gotten this bill to conference and had something to the President in the last Congress. The willingness of the majority today to eliminate that unconstitutional provision demonstrates that we could have had a bill last year, and that is what I want to express to my colleagues as a terribly disappointing proposition for this Senator.

It is not true that unless S. 47 is passed exactly as is, various groups will be excluded from protection under the law. Current law protects all victims. Vice President BIDEN wrote the current law. Every Member of the Senate who was a Member of this body when the Violence Against Women Act last was reauthorized voted for that bill, which backs up what I have been saying several times during my remarks, that this could have passed last year as a consensus piece of legislation and has passed in other reauthorizations as a consensus piece of legislation.

Neither Vice President BIDEN nor any other Senator passed a discriminatory bill in the past. It is not the case that unless the controversial provisions are accepted exactly as the majority insists, without any compromise whatsoever, that any groups will be excluded.

The key stumbling block to enacting a bill at this time is the provision concerning Indian tribal courts. That provision raises serious constitutional

questions concerning both the sovereignty of tribal courts and the constitutional rights of defendants who would be tried in those tribal courts.

We should focus on providing needed services for Native American women. But S. 47 makes political statements and expounds needlessly on Native American sovereignty. It raises such significant constitutional problems that its passage might actually not accomplish anything at all for Native American women, while at the same time failing to protect the constitutional rights of other American citizens.

Even the respected organization, the Congressional Research Service, has raised constitutional questions about the tribal provisions in this bill. I hope that whatever the Senate might do today, negotiations on these questions will continue. I am confident that if we can reach agreement on these questions, compromises on the other few remaining issues can also be secured, allowing the bill to pass with overwhelming bipartisan support.

So following up on some of the concerns I have raised this morning, I will yet today, if possible, offer a substitute that is much more likely to be accepted by the other body and then get to the President for signature.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. It is important that we are doing this early in the 113th Congress and unfortunate that we have to have this debate again. The Senate passed a nearly identical bill last April—a bill with strong bipartisan support—but the House failed to bring it up for a vote, allowing the law to expire at the end of last year.

Many House Republicans opposed the Senate bill because it expanded VAWA protections to three groups: gays and lesbians, Native Americans, and undocumented immigrants. I support all three of these expansions.

Today I want to again stress how crucial this measure is to Native American women. For the past 19 years, the Violence Against Women Act helped protect Native women from domestic violence, from sexual assault, and from stalking. This historic legislation has strengthened the prosecution of these crimes, and it has provided critical support to the victims.

VAWA has long been bipartisan, with broad support. Democrats, Republicans, law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, health professionals, all have supported this legislation. Why? Because it has worked. Since VAWA's passage in 1994, domestic violence has decreased by over 50 percent, and the victims of these crimes have been more willing to come forward, knowing they are not alone, knowing they will get the support they need, knowing that crimes against women will not be tolerated.

Unfortunately, not all women have received the full benefits of the Violence Against Women Act. That is why the tribal provisions now are so important. Native American Women are 2½ times more likely than other U.S. women to be victims of rape. One in three will be sexually assaulted in their lifetimes. And it is estimated that three out of every five Native women will experience domestic violence.

Those numbers are tragic. Those numbers tell a story of great human suffering, of women in desperate situations, desperate for support, and too often we have failed to provide that support. The frequency of violence against Native women is only part of the tragedy. Too often these crimes go unprosecuted and unpunished. Not only is violence inflicted but justice is denied.

Here is the problem: Tribal governments are unable to prosecute non-Indians for domestic violence crimes. They have no authority over these crimes against Native American spouses or partners within their own tribal lands.

Instead, under existing law, these crimes fall exclusively under Federal jurisdiction. But Federal prosecutors have limited resources. They may be located hours away from tribal communities. Non-Indian perpetrators often go unpunished. Yet over 50 percent of Native women are married to non-Indians, and 76 percent of the overall population living on tribal lands is non-Indian.

The result is an escalating cycle of violence. On some tribal lands, the homicide rate for Native women is up to 10 times the national average—10 times the national average. But this starts with small crimes, small acts of violence that may not rise to the attention of a Federal prosecutor.

In 2006 and 2007, U.S. attorneys prosecuted only 45 misdemeanor crimes on tribal lands. For perspective, the Salt River Reservation in Arizona—which is relatively small—reported more than 450 domestic violence cases in 2006 alone. Those numbers are appalling.

Native women should not be abandoned to a jurisdictional loophole. In effect, these women are living in a prosecution-free zone. The tribal provisions in VAWA will provide a remedy.

The bill allows tribal courts to prosecute non-Indians in a narrow set of cases that meet the following specific conditions: The crime must have occurred in Indian country; the crime must be either a domestic violence or dating violence offense or a violation of a protective order; and the non-Indian defendant must reside in Indian country, be employed in Indian country, or be the spouse or intimate partner of a member of the prosecuting tribe.

This bill does not extend tribal jurisdiction to general crimes of violence by non-Indians. It does not apply to crimes between two non-Indians, crimes between persons with no ties to the tribe. If they do not have any ties to the tribe, it does not apply. Nothing in this provision diminishes or alters the jurisdiction of any Federal or State court.

I know some of my colleagues question whether a tribal court can provide the same protections to defendants that are guaranteed in a Federal or State court. The bill addresses this concern. It provides comprehensive protections to all criminal defendants who are prosecuted in tribal courts, whether or not the defendant is a Native American. Defendants would essentially have the same rights in tribal court as they do in State court. These include, among many others, the right to counsel, the right to a speedy trial, the right to due process, the rights against unreasonable search and seizure, double jeopardy, and self-incrimination. A tribe that does not provide these protections cannot prosecute non-Indians under this provision.

Some have also questioned whether Congress has the authority to expand tribal criminal jurisdiction to cover non-Indians. This issue was carefully considered in drafting the tribal jurisdiction provisions. The Indian Affairs and Judiciary Committees worked closely with the Department of Justice to ensure that the legislation is constitutional.

As a former Federal prosecutor and attorney general of a State with a large Native American population, I know how difficult the legal maze can be for tribal communities. One result of this maze is unchecked crime. In situations where personnel and funding run thin and distances are long, violence often goes unpunished. This legislation will create a local solution for a local problem. Tribes have proven their effectiveness in combating domestic violence committed by Native Americans.

But let me reiterate this very important point: Without an act of Congress, tribes cannot prosecute a non-Indian, even if he lives on the reservation, even if he is married to a tribal member. Without this act of Congress, tribes will continue to lack authority.

This legislation will create a local solution for a local problem. Tribes have proven their effectiveness in combating domestic violence committed by Native Americans. But let me reiterate this very important point—without an act of Congress, tribes cannot prosecute a non-Indian. Even if he lives on the reservation. Even if he is married to a tribal member. Without this act of Congress, tribes will continue to lack authority.

This bill will also promote other important efforts to protect Native women from an epidemic of domestic violence, with increasing grants for tribal programs to address violence, with support for research on violence against Native women, and also by allowing Federal prosecutors to seek tougher sentences for perpetrators who

strangle or suffocate their spouses or partners.

All of these provisions are about justice. Right now, Native women do not get the justice they deserve. But these are strong women. They, rightly, demand to be heard. They have identified a desperate need and logical solutions. That is why Native women and tribal leaders across the Nation support the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act and the proposed tribal provisions.

There are many—far too many—stories of violence against Native women, and of the failure to protect them. Stories that should outrage us all. And that could end through local intervention. Local authority that will only be made possible through an act of Congress. We have the opportunity to support such an act in the tribal provisions of VAWA. With this bill we can close a dark and desperate loophole in criminal jurisdiction. Native women have waited too long already for justice. They should not have to wait any longer.

Senator LEAHY had asked that I put tribal statements in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these letters from tribal and other organizations in support of the tribal provision in S. 47, the Violence Against Women Act.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
PUEBLO OF TESUQUE,
Santa Fe, NM, February 5, 2012.

Re Support for S. 47, VAWA Reauthorization

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY: I write on behalf of the Pueblo of Tesuque to voice our strong support for S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2013. This bill will provide local tribal governments with the long-needed control to combat acts of domestic violence against Native women and children on Indian lands regardless of the status of the offender.

The current justice system in place on Indian lands handcuffs the local tribal justice system. Non-Native men who abuse Native women hide behind these federal laws and court decisions, walking the streets of Indian country free of consequences, while denying justice to Native women and their families.

Nationally, Native women are raped and assaulted at 2.5 times the national average. More than 1 in 3 Native women will be raped in their lifetimes, and more than 3 in 5 will suffer domestic assault. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has found that the current system of justice, ''inadequate to stop the pattern of escalating violence against Native women.'' Tribal leaders, police officers, and prosecutors have testified to the fact that when misdemeanor acts of domestic and dating violence go unaddressed, offenders become emboldened and feel untouchable, and the beatings escalate, often leading to death or severe physical injury. A National Institute of Justice-funded analysis of death certificates found that, on some reservations, Native women are murdered at a rate more than ten times the national average. S. 47 will crack down on reservation based domestic violence by all offenders at the early stages before violence escalates.

While the problem of violence against Native women is longstanding and broad, the jurisdictional provisions proposed in S. 47, Section 904, are well-reasoned and limited in scope. They extend only to misdemeanor level crimes of domestic and dating violence. They are limited to enforcement of reservation-based crimes involving individuals that work or live on an Indian reservation and who are in a serious relationship with a tribal citizen from that reservation. S. 47 also provides the full range of constitutional protections to abuse suspects who would be subject to the authority of tribal courts.

In June of 2010, the United States Senate, by unanimous consent, passed the Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA). On July 27, 2010, the House of Representatives passed the measure under suspension of the rules. The tribal provisions in S. 47 are subject to a more narrow set of crimes, are limited to misdemeanor level punishments, and would provide a broader range of protections to suspects of abuse than those required under TLOA. With such broad support for TLOA, it is troubling that some Members of Congress now claim that the narrowly tailored proposal in S. 47 raises constitutional concerns. Such concerns are unfounded.

In 2004, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed a similar restoration of tribal government authority through an amendment to the Indian Civil Rights Act. Congress has this authority, and Native women throughout the United States desperately need us to act so that they can be afforded similar access to justice that many others take for granted.

In 1978, the U.S. Supreme Court, in deciding to divest Indian tribes of authority over local reservation-based crimes, made the following statement:

''We recognize that some Indian tribal court systems have become increasingly sophisticated and resemble in many respects their state counterparts. . . . *We are not unaware of the prevalence of non-Indian crime on today's reservations which the tribes forcefully argue requires the ability to try non-Indians.* But these are considerations for Congress to weigh.'' *Oliphant* v. *Suquamish Indian Tribe*, 435 U.S. 191, 211 (1978) (emphasis added).

This statement and resulting gaps in criminal jurisdiction on Indian lands have haunted Native women and tribal communities nationwide for more than 35 years. Time has come for Congress to act. S. 47 takes reasonable well-tailored measures to fill the gap in local authority, and will go far in helping to prevent future acts of violence against Native women nationwide. Thank you for again including these vital provisions in your VAWA Reauthorization.

Sincerely,

MARK MITCHELL,
Governor.

SAMISH INDIAN NATION,
Anacortes, WA, February 4, 2012.

Re Support for S. 47, VAWA Reauthorization

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY: I write on behalf of the Samish Indian Nation to voice our strong support for S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2013. This bill will provide local tribal governments with the long-needed control to combat acts of domestic violence against Native women and children on Indian lands regardless of the status of the offender.

The current justice system in place on Indian lands handcuffs the local tribal justice system. Non-Native men who abuse Native women hide behind these federal laws and court decisions, walking the streets of Indian country free of consequences, while denying justice to Native women and their families.

Nationally, Native women are raped and assaulted at 2.5 times the national average. More than 1 in 3 Native women will be raped in their lifetimes, and more than 3 in 5 will suffer domestic assault. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has found that the current system of justice, ''inadequate to stop the pattern of escalating violence against Native women.'' Tribal leaders, police officers, and prosecutors have testified to the fact that when misdemeanor acts of domestic and dating violence go unaddressed, offenders become emboldened and feel untouchable, and the beatings escalate, often leading to death or severe physical injury. A National Institute of Justice-funded analysis of death certificates found that, on some reservations, Native women are murdered at a rate more than ten times the national average. S. 47 will crack down on reservation based domestic violence by all offenders at the early stages before violence escalates.

While the problem of violence against Native women is longstanding and broad, the jurisdictional provisions proposed in S. 47, Section 904, are well-reasoned and limited in scope. They extend only to misdemeanor level crimes of domestic and dating violence. They are limited to enforcement of reservation-based crimes involving individuals that work or live on an Indian reservation and who are in a serious relationship with a tribal citizen from that reservation. S. 47 also provides the full range of constitutional protections to abuse suspects who would he subject to the authority of tribal courts.

In June of 2010, the United States Senate, by unanimous consent, passed the Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA). On July 27, 2010, the House of Representatives passed the measure under suspension of the rules. The tribal provisions in S. 47 are subject to a more narrow set of crimes, are limited to misdemeanor level punishments, and would provide a broader range of protections to suspects of abuse than those required under TLOA. With such broad support for TLOA, it is troubling that some Members of Congress now claim that the narrowly tailored proposal in S. 47 raises constitutional concerns. Such concerns are unfounded.

In 2004, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed a similar restoration of tribal government authority through an amendment to the Indian Civil Rights Act. Congress has this authority, and Native women throughout the United States desperately need us to act so that they can be afforded similar access to justice that many others take for granted.

In 1978, the U.S. Supreme Court, in deciding to divest Indian tribes of authority over local reservation-based crimes, made the following statement:

''We recognize that some Indian tribal court systems have become increasingly sophisticated and resemble in many respects their state counterparts. . . . *We are not unaware of the prevalence of non-Indian crime on today's reservations which the tribes forcefully argue requires the ability to try non-Indians.* But these are considerations for Congress to weigh.'' *Oliphant* v. *Suquamish Indian Tribe*, 435 U.S. 191, 211 (1978) (emphasis added).

This statement and resulting gaps in criminal jurisdiction on Indian lands have haunted Native women and tribal communities nationwide for more than 35 years. Time has come for Congress to act. S. 47 takes reasonable well-tailored measures to fill the gap in local authority, and will go far in helping to prevent future acts of violence against Native women nationwide. Thank

you for again including these vital provisions in your VAWA Reauthorization.

Sincerely,

TOM WOOTEN.

GREAT PLAINS TRIBAL CHAIRMAN'S ASSOCIATION,
Rapid City, SD, February 4, 2013.

Re Support for S. 47, VAWA Reauthorization

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY: I write on behalf of the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association to voice our strong support for S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2013. This bill will provide local tribal governments with the long-needed control to combat acts of domestic violence against Native women and children on Indian lands regardless of the status of the offender.

The current justice system in place on Indian lands handcuffs the local tribal justice system. Non-Native men who abuse Native women hide behind these federal laws and court decisions, walking the streets of Indian country free of consequences, while denying justice to Native women and their families.

Nationally, Native women are raped and assaulted at 2.5 times the national average. More than 1 in 3 Native women will be raped in their lifetimes, and more than 3 in 5 will suffer domestic assault. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has found that the current system of justice, ''inadequate to stop the pattern of escalating violence against Native women.'' Tribal leaders, police officers, and prosecutors have testified to the fact that when misdemeanor acts of domestic and dating violence go unaddressed, offenders become emboldened and feel untouchable, and the beatings escalate, often leading to death or severe physical injury. A National Institute of Justice-funded analysis of death certificates found that, on some reservations, Native women are murdered at a rate more than ten times the national average. S. 47 will crack down on reservation based domestic violence by all offenders at the early stages before violence escalates.

While the problem of violence against Native women is longstanding and broad, the jurisdictional provisions proposed in S. 47, Section 904, are well-reasoned and limited in scope. They extend only to misdemeanor level crimes of domestic and dating violence. They are limited to enforcement of reservation-based crimes involving individuals that work or live on an Indian reservation and who are in a serious relationship with a tribal citizen from that reservation. S. 47 also provides the full range of constitutional protections to abuse suspects who would be subject to the authority of tribal courts.

In June of 2010, the United States Senate, by unanimous consent, passed the Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA). On July 27, 2010, the House of Representatives passed the measure under suspension of the rules. The tribal provisions in S. 47 are subject to a more narrow set of crimes, are limited to misdemeanor level punishments, and would provide a broader range of protections to suspects of abuse than those required under TLOA. With such broad support for TLOA, it is troubling that some Members of Congress now claim that the narrowly tailored proposal in S. 47 raises constitutional concerns. Such concerns are unfounded.

In 2004, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed a similar restoration of tribal government authority through an amendment to the Indian Civil Rights Act. Congress has this authority, and Native women throughout the United States desperately need us to act so that they can be afforded similar access to justice that many others take for granted.

In 1978, the U.S. Supreme Court, in deciding to divest Indian tribes of authority over local reservation-based crimes, made the following statement:

''We recognize that some Indian tribal court systems have become increasingly sophisticated and resemble in many respects their state counterparts. . . . *We are not unaware of the prevalence of non-Indian crime on today's reservations which the tribes forcefully argue requires the ability to try non-Indians.* But these are considerations for Congress to weigh.'' *Oliphant* v. *Suquamish Indian Tribe*, 435 U.S. 191, 211 (1978) (emphasis added).

This statement and resulting gaps in criminal jurisdiction on Indian lands have haunted Native women and tribal communities nationwide for more than 35 years. Time has come for Congress to act. S. 47 takes reasonable well-tailored measures to fill the gap in local authority, and will go far in ensuring domestic safety for Native women nationwide. We urge you to support and vote for S. 47 when the measure moves to the Senate floor. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

TEX ''RED TIPPED ARROW'' HALL,
Chairman, Mandan, Hidatsa, Arikara Nation, Three Affiliated Tribes, Chairman, Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES,
Reno, NV, February 4, 2013.

Sen. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. SENATE: On behalf of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) and its 2,000 members who represent the nation's 30,000 state family and juvenile court judges, I am writing in support of Title IX of S. 47, the bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. In particular, I am writing to apprise you of the NCJFCJ's strong support for the recognition of tribes' need for and sovereign authority to establish tribal courts to address the epidemic of domestic violence on tribal lands.

On January 21, 2011, the NCJFCJ adopted an organizational policy that states that we recognize tribal courts as equal and parallel systems of justice to the state court systems. We did so because our state court judge members have a strong history of working with tribal courts and are aware of their capacity to adjudicate local cases of domestic violence. Our organization has long supported the efforts of tribal courts to address these crimes, whether these crimes are committed by Indian or non-Indian persons, in order to protect the safety of the victims of these crimes, their family members, and the local community.

In our role as state court judges working alongside tribal lands, we are in a unique position to see the shortcomings of the current system of justice afforded to the tribes through the federal district courts. Currently, only the U.S. Attorneys can prosecute these cases—but they seldom do, because there are not enough U.S. Attorneys to handle these cases and because in many cases the nearest office of the U.S. Attorney is several hundred miles away. The remote locations of many tribal communities create serious obstacles to access for victims of these crimes. They have no way to get to federal court and the federal court has no capacity to reach out to these geographically distant communities. Yet we know how dangerous domestic violence cases can be, and cannot stand by and let these crimes go unaddressed. Too many lives are at risk; too many victims and children are left to suffer because the only system of justice afforded to them is utterly out of reach.

We believe that the provisions contained in S. 47 create an excellent path for supporting a system of tribal courts that can quickly, appropriately, and fairly respond to the epidemic of domestic violence on tribal lands. We base this belief on the long history NCJFCJ has had in providing training and technical assistance to tribal courts. There is a dedication and willingness on the part of both tribal and state courts to build the best possible system of justice for Native victims of domestic violence. We ask the Senate to recognize the appropriateness of tribal courts' providing protection to their most vulnerable community members. In the interests of justice for all, we ask you to vote for S. 47 so that its tribal provisions can become law.

If you have any questions, we stand ready to answer with whatever information you may need.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL NASH,
President, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

SUSANVILLE INDIAN RANCHERIA,
Susanville, CA, February 4, 2013.

Re Support for S. 47, VAWA Reauthorization

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY: I write on behalf of the Susanville Indian Rancheria to voice our strong support for S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2013. This bill will provide local tribal governments with the long-needed control to combat acts of domestic violence against Native women and children on Indian lands regardless of the status of the offender.

The current justice system in place on Indian lands handcuffs the local tribal justice system. Non-Native men who abuse Native women hide behind these federal laws and court decisions, walking the streets of Indian country free of consequences, while denying justice to Native women and their families.

Nationally, Native women are raped and assaulted at 2.5 times the national average. More than 1 in 3 Native women will be raped in their lifetimes, and more than 3 in 5 will suffer domestic assault. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has found that the current system of justice, ''inadequate to stop the pattern of escalating violence against Native women.'' Tribal leaders, police officers, and prosecutors have testified to the fact that when misdemeanor acts of domestic and dating violence go unaddressed, offenders become emboldened and feel untouchable, and the beatings escalate, often leading to death or severe physical injury. A National Institute of Justice-funded analysis of death certificates found that, on some reservations, Native women are murdered at a rate more than ten times the national average. S. 47 will crack down on reservation based domestic violence by all offenders at the early stages before violence escalates.

While the problem of violence against Native women is longstanding and broad, the jurisdictional provisions proposed in S. 47, Section 904, are well-reasoned and limited in scope. They extend only to misdemeanor level crimes of domestic and dating violence. They are limited to enforcement of reservation-based crimes involving individuals that

work or live on an Indian reservation and who are in a serious relationship with a tribal citizen from that reservation. S. 47 also provides the full range of constitutional protections to abuse suspects who would be subject to the authority of tribal courts.

In June of 2010, the United States Senate, by unanimous consent, passed the Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA). On July 27, 2010, the House of Representatives passed the measure under suspension of the rules. The tribal provisions in S. 47 are subject to a more narrow set of crimes, are limited to misdemeanor level punishments, and would provide a broader range of protections to suspects of abuse than those required under TLOA. With such broad support for TLOA, it is troubling that some Members of Congress now claim that the narrowly tailored proposal in S. 47 raises constitutional concerns. Such concerns are unfounded.

In 2004, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed a similar restoration of tribal government authority through an amendment to the Indian Civil Rights Act. Congress has this authority, and Native women throughout the United States desperately need us to act so that they can be afforded similar access to justice that many others take for granted.

In 1978, the U.S. Supreme Court, in deciding to divest Indian tribes of authority over local reservation-based crimes, made the following statement:

''We recognize that some Indian tribal court systems have become increasingly sophisticated and resemble in many respects their state counterparts. . . . *We are not unaware of the prevalence of non-Indian crime on today's reservations which the tribes forcefully argue requires the ability to try non-Indians.* But these are considerations for Congress to weigh.'' *Oliphant* v. *Suquamish Indian Tribe*, 435 U.S. 191, 211 (1978) (emphasis added).

This statement and resulting gaps in criminal jurisdiction on Indian lands have haunted Native women and tribal communities nationwide for more than 35 years. Time has come for Congress to act. S. 47 takes reasonable well-tailored measures to fill the gap in local authority, and will go far in helping to prevent future acts of violence against Native women nationwide. Thank you for again including these vital provisions in your VAWA Reauthorization.

Sincerely,

STACY DIXON,
Tribal Chairman.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I know my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, is here today—another prosecutor, another Senator who knows the importance of this law. I very much appreciate her hard work in terms of bringing justice to tribal communities and bringing justice to women across this Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I wish to first thank the Senator from New Mexico for his great leadership on this issue. This is a national issue. It is a bipartisan issue. It crosses geographic lines. Those of us who have significant tribal communities know how important these provisions are to this bill.

We tried very hard on the Judiciary Committee to make sure this bill is consistent with the bipartisan work we have done in the past, but we also saw it as an opportunity to consolidate some of the programs to save money and then to look at areas where we needed to be more sophisticated, where we needed to respond to changing issues in the law. Certainly, the tribal jurisdiction issue was one of those major issues.

I rise today to talk about the importance of this bill. It is a law that has changed the way we think about violence against women in the United States of America. The Violence Against Women Act is one of the great legislative success stories in the criminal area in the last few decades. Since it was first passed in 1994, annual domestic violence rates have fallen by 50 percent. Now, you usually cannot say that about criminal prosecution efforts. I usually do not have that kind of number. But that is what we have—since 1994, a 50-percent difference in domestic violence rates.

People have stopped looking at the issue of domestic violence as a family issue, and they have started treating domestic violence and sexual assault as the serious crimes they are. Last year Minnesota recorded the lowest number of domestic-related deaths since 1991—down from 34 in 2011 to 18. This is in no small part due to the Violence Against Women Act. Women have more access to intervention programs, and they feel more empowered to come forward.

I know in my own county, where I was chief prosecutor for 8 years, thanks to the good work of Paul and Sheila Wellstone, and my predecessor Mike Freeman, we set up one of the most unique domestic violence service centers in the country. It has been a model for the rest of the country. Under my leadership, we also made changes to it to advance it to even higher levels. But the point is that it is a one-stop shop for the victims of domestic violence, so they can come in, see a prosecutor, see a cop, have a place for their kids to play, be able to find a shelter and a place to live, all under one roof instead of walking through the maze of the bureaucracy in the Government Center.

Both prevention and prosecution of domestic violence work were among my top priorities as a prosecutor. I know we have done good work, but there is still a lot of work that needs to be done.

According to a recent survey conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 24 people per minute are victims of rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner in this country. Approximately one in four women has experienced severe physical violence by an intimate partner at some point in her lifetime, and 45 percent of the women killed in the United States are killed by their partner. Every year close to 17,000 people still lose their lives to domestic violence. These statistics mean that sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking are still problems in America. That is why it is so important that we move quickly to take up this bill.

Just like the two prior authorizations in 2000 and 2006, this bill strengthens current law and provides solutions to problems that we have learned more about since VAWA first passed in 1994.

The Senate bill continues a tradition of bipartisan sponsorship, with 60 cosponsors, including 7 Republicans. As we know, last April the Senate approved this bill by a 68-to-31 vote. All 17 women Senators—I see my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI here from Alaska. We thank her for her support and vote for that bill. This truly brought the women of the Senate together to stand up against domestic violence.

What does this bill do that is different from the last bill? Well, it consolidates duplicative programs and streamlines others. It provides greater flexibility for the use of grant money. It has new training requirements for people providing legal assistance to victims. As I mentioned, it takes important steps to address the disproportionately high domestic violence rates in Native American communities.

I am disappointed that we were unable to include the modest increase in U visas for immigrant victims of domestic violence. There were technical objections to including that provision. It was removed in order to improve our chances of getting this bill done once and for all. U visas are an important tool for encouraging victims to come forward. I will press to increase the number of U visas available to victims when we work on the comprehensive immigration reform bill in the spring.

One thing I wish to note about this bill is that it closes many gaps in the current system, ways to improve the current system. There was a bill I introduced with Senator Hutchison to address high-tech stalking, cases where stalkers use technology such as the Internet, video surveillance, and bugging to stalk victims. This is not something we probably would be talking about if I were standing here in 1994, but here in 2013, we know it is an issue. We have seen cases across the Nation of this kind of video surveillance and Internet bugging. In fact, we had a very high profile case involving a high profile newscaster who was willing to come forward and work with House and Senate authors on this bill. We are very pleased to have had the support from the Fraternal Order of Police, Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, National Sheriffs' Association, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police. They have all endorsed this bill.

This provision, the high-tech stalking provision, is included in the Violence Against Women Act, so we are very happy about that. Again, I believe our laws have to be as sophisticated as those who are breaking them. If they are using the Internet, if they are spying with video cameras through peepholes, we have to be able to respond to that.

I wanted to end by telling a story I told when we first started to consider this bill over a year ago. A year ago,

over the holidays, I went to one of the saddest funerals I ever attended. It was the funeral for Shawn Schneider. He was a Lake City police officer in Minneapolis. I have since gotten to know his widow. He died responding to a domestic violence case. He went up to the door. He had received a call from the 17-year-old victim—the department had. He went up there to that door, and he got shot in the head. His bulletproof vest did not protect him. Nothing protected him. When I was sitting in that church and saw his three little children, including that little girl in her little blue dress covered in stars, I thought to myself at that moment, the victims of domestic abuse are not just one victim. It is an entire family. It is an entire community. So in their honor today, in the honor of those children, I would like us to have strong bipartisan support for the Violence Against Women Act. I believe we can do it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these letters from law enforcement and criminal justice organizations in support of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Act.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AEQUITAS, THE PROSECUTORS' RESOURCE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN,
Washington, DC, February 4, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Judiciary, Washington, DC.
Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, House Committee on Judiciary, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Judiciary, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN CONYERS,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY, CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE, RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY AND RANKING MEMBER CONYERS: On behalf of AEquitas: The Prosecutors' Resource on Violence Against Women, in support for the Violence Against Women Act's (VAWA) reauthorization. AEquitas' mission is to improve the quality of justice in sexual violence, intimate partner violence, stalking, and human trafficking cases by developing, evaluating and refining prosecution practices that increase victim safety and offender accountability.

VAWA has unquestionably improved the nation's justice system response to the devastating crimes of sexual violence, intimate partner violence, and stalking. This critical legislation must be reauthorized to ensure a continued response to these crimes.

Since its original passage in 1994, VAWA has improved the criminal justice system's ability to keep victims safe and hold perpetrators accountable. As a result of this historic legislation, every state has enacted laws making stalking a crime and strengthened criminal rape and sexual assault statutes.

VAWA has undoubtedly had a positive impact on the efforts of prosecutors to hold offenders accountable while supporting victim safety. We urge Congress to reauthorize VAWA to build upon its successes and to expand its ability to improve our response to these crimes, hold perpetrators accountable, and keep victims and their children safe from future harm.

Thank you for your leadership and steadfast commitment to supporting victims of sexual violence, intimate partner violence, and stalking. We look forward to hearing of VAWA's swift reauthorization. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.
Sincerely,

JENNIFER G. LONG, J.D.,
Director.

AMERICAN PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION,
Lexington, KY, February 1, 2013.

Senator PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.
Senator MIKE CRAPO,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS LEAHY AND CRAPO: The American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) represents over 35,000 pretrial, probation, parole and community corrections professionals working in the criminal and juvenile justice systems nationally and come from federal, state, local and tribal jurisdictions. On behalf of our membership and constituents we whole-heartedly support your efforts to have the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) reauthorized.

The VAWA initiatives have supported state, local and tribal efforts to effectively address the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking. These efforts have shown great progress and promise towards keeping victims safe and holding perpetrators accountable. The reauthorization of VAWA is critical to maintaining the progress of current initiatives and ensuring comprehensive and effective responses to these crimes in the future for the protection of all victims without consideration of race, ethnicity or sexual orientation.

Domestic violence perpetrators represent a significant proportion of the total population on community supervision. In 200 8 there were nearly 86,000 adults on probation for a domestic violence offense in United States, and data from the California Department of Justice indicates that in 2000 approximately 90 % of adults convicted of felony domestic violence offenses in that state were sentenced to a period of probation, either alone or coupled with incarceration. Domestic violence offenders are among the most dangerous offenders on community supervision caseloads, and in order to supervise domestic violence offenders effectively, community corrections professionals must receive adequate training.

Since its original passage in 1994, VAWA has been instrumental in increasing our constituents' attention to and understanding of these crimes as well as provided significant assistance in humanizing their responsiveness to victims and improving their practices related to accountability and intervention with perpetrators of these crimes. VAWA has without question been instrumental in developing community supervision practices that keep victims and their families safe from future harm and improved compliance and behavioral change for perpetrators.

We stand ready to assist you throughout the reauthorization process. If you have any questions or require further information or assistance, please feel free to contact me.
Sincerely,

CARL WICKLUND,
Executive Director.

ASSOCIATION OF PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS,
Washington, DC, February 4, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY: On behalf of the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, which represents and supports all prosecutors, I am writing today regarding the Violence Against Women Act's (VAWA) reauthorization. VAWA has improved the criminal justice system's response to the devastating crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking. The reauthorization of this critical legislation ensures a continued response to these crimes.

Since its original passage in 1994, VAWA has dramatically enhanced our nation's response to violence against women. More victims report domestic violence to the police, the rate of non-fatal intimate partner violence against women has decreased by 63%, and VAWA saved nearly $14.8 billion in net averted social costs in *just* the first six years.

The reauthorization of VAWA builds upon existing efforts to more effectively combat violence against all victims. The reauthorization of VAWA renews a range of important programs and initiatives for law enforcement to address the various causes and far-reaching consequences of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. VAWA Reauthorization will further build upon the successes of these programs by including measures to ensure an increased focus on sexual assault prevention, enforcement, and services; and providing assistance to law enforcement to take key steps to reduce backlogs of rape kits under their control.

VAWA has undoubtedly had a positive impact on the efforts of law enforcement agencies nationwide to keep victims and their children safe and hold perpetrators accountable. Thank you for your leadership and steadfast commitment to supporting victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. We look forward to hearing of VAWA's swift reauthorization. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me.
Sincerely,

STEVEN JANSEN,
Vice President/COO.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA,
Santa Barbara, CA, January 31, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing on behalf of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors to urge you to take action on legislation to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

Thank you for introducing S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. Programs authorized by VAWA have saved lives as well as providing resources and training needed in communities like Santa Barbara County to address these reprehensible crimes, and the Board recognizes the importance of reauthorizing and enhancing the resources provided by this important public safety program.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act would expand the law's focus on sexual assault and help ensure access to services for all victims of domestic and sexual violence. It also responds to these difficult economic times by consolidating programs, focusing on the most effective approaches, and adding accountability measures to ensure that Federal funds are used efficiently and effectively.

The Violence Against Women Act has been successful because it has consistently had

strong bipartisan support for nearly two decades. Please work with the members of your committee to expedite action on S. 47 or similar legislation to reauthorize VAWA.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS P. WALTERS,
Washington Representative.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, IL, January 30, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MICHAEL D. CRAPO,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS LEAHY AND CRAPO: On behalf of the American Bar Association (ABA), with nearly 400,000 members across the country, I write to commend your continued bipartisan leadership in the cause of justice and equal rights with the introduction of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. The ABA strongly supports your effort to renew proven and effective programs that support victims of domestic, sexual, stalking and dating violence and their families.

The ABA has long supported efforts to address domestic, sexual and stalking violence, and we recognize that the legal profession fulfills an important role in addressing these crimes. Since 1994, the ABA's Commission on Domestic & Sexual Violence has also worked to increase access to justice for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking by mobilizing the legal profession.

In recent years, the ABA has adopted policies that specifically address VAWA reauthorization, including some of the more challenging issues that ultimately proved to be barriers to reauthorization during the last Congress:

February 2010: urging reauthorization and highlighting the need for legislation that ''provides services, protection, and justice for underserved and vulnerable victims of violence, including children and youth who are victims or are witnesses to family violence, and victims who are disabled, elderly, immigrant, trafficked, LGBT and/or Indian.''

August 2012: urging Congress ''to strengthen tribal jurisdiction to address crimes of gender-based violence on tribal lands that are committed by non-Indian perpetrators.''

VAWA reauthorization was a legislative priority for the association during the 112th Congress and a focus of our annual grassroots lobbying event, ABA Day 2012, when ABA, state, local, and specialty bar leaders from al l 50 states met with members of Congress of both parties on this issue.

VAWA reauthorization remains a priority for the American Bar Association during the 113th Congress. We appreciate your leadership and look forward to working with you to ensure passage of this legislation.

Sincerely,

LAUREL G. BELLOWS.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MISSOURI,
Jefferson City, MO, February 6, 2013.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: In 1994, this nation's leaders enacted the Violence Against Women Act (''VAWA''). This landmark piece of legislation put in place a legal framework that better enabled states like Missouri to effectively investigate violent crimes against women, prosecute and punish offenders, and protect victims from further harm. In the decades since VAWA's enactment, Congress has twice voted to reauthorize the law. With each reauthorization, Congress not only strengthened the provisions of the law, it also reaffirmed this country's commitment to support survivors of personal violence and sexual assault. It is time to do so again.

Missouri women and their families rely on the programs and services that VAWA makes possible. For example, non-profit, community, and faith-based organizations use federal funds directed through VAWA's Sexual Assault Services Program to provide vital support to victims of sexual assault. And Missouri prosecutors, police officers, and court personnel participate in training funded through the STOP (Services Training Officers Prosecutors) program, equipping them to better address violent crime against women.

But the work is just beginning. In 2011, over 40,000 incidents of domestic violence were reported in Missouri. Thirty women were killed by their husbands or boyfriends. Missouri women reported more than 1,400 forcible rapes or attempted forcible rapes. And although over 10,000 women in need were able to find a place at a shelter, nearly 20,000 more were turned away.

By reauthorizing VAWA, this Congress will continue the effort undertaken nearly twenty years ago—the effort to eliminate violent crime perpetrated against our mothers, our sisters, our daughters, our neighbors, and our friends. I urge each of you to support this important legislation.

Respectfully,

CHRIS KOSTER,
Attorney General, State of Missouri.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, first I would like to follow my colleague from Minnesota in voicing my support for passage of the Violence Against Women Act. As she noted, I have been a cosponsor of this very important legislation not only this Congress but last. I have urged on multiple occasions that we move forward with reauthorization of this very significant legislation, have urged the House to do the same last year. They failed to do that.

You do not give up when the cause is right. This is far too important to too many around the country. My colleague has cited some of the statistics and the issues and the initiatives she worked on when she was back home in her home State of Minnesota. It is something I think we all share—a concern for the levels of domestic violence within our respective States. In a State such as Alaska where we have so much to be proud of, unfortunately our statistics as they relate to domestic violence are appalling. Appalling.

So anything that we can do, whether it is here in Washington, DC, at the local level, the State level, we must do. We need to act here. So I join not only my colleague from Minnesota but so many who have led the charge here to do right as we work to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. I will have an opportunity to speak more on the VAWA reauthorization later.

DECISION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

I wanted to take some time this morning to come to the floor to speak about an issue that has absolutely inflamed me this week. This week I learned that the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior has made a decision to deny the construction of a single-lane gravel emergency access road through a very, very tiny portion of a national wildlife refuge located on the Alaska Peninsula in southwest Alaska.

You might think, well, why is this such a big deal? You have heard me here on the floor or others here in this body have certainly heard me many times advocate on behalf of Alaska and the development of our resources to benefit the people of Alaska, to benefit the country as a whole. This is not a development project I am talking about here today. What I am addressing today is the health and the safety—the safety of the residents of a small Aleut community located in the Aleutian Islands. These are 748 people who really do not have the audiences so many constituents in Alaska or in other parts of the country enjoy.

They are kind of out of sight, out of mind, if you will. They are not out of sight, out of mind, out of my heart.

One of the most important responsibilities we have as U.S. Senators, as Members of Congress, is to protect the safety of those people we represent.

I wish to tell the story of King Cove, AK, and what is going on. You have seen the picture of the map of Alaska, the big beautiful State. I don't have it superimposed over the rest of the lower 48, because my point today is not to talk about how big we are in comparison to the rest of the Nation as a whole but to put in context what we are talking about here when we talk about the community of King Cove, AK.

You have the Aleutian peninsula here that stretches out approximately 1,000 miles. You might not appreciate the length and scope we are talking about here, but the Aleutian chain is just exactly that.

King Cove is right on the end of this peninsula area in this diagram. It is kind of out there. When I say ''kind of out there,'' there is nothing else around there. There are no roads that connect you to get anywhere when you want to go to ''town.'' Town is Anchorage, AK, probably about 600 miles away, maybe even a little bit longer. It is most likely a $1,000 airplane ticket to get there. That puts it in context here. This is King Cove, AK.

To put it in a little better context as to what we are speaking about, this is the community of King Cove right on the end of this lagoon, this bay. All the way around the other side of the bay is an area called Cold Bay. Cold Bay was designated during World War II as an air base this country relied on. During the war, they constructed a 10,000-foot runway. It is the second longest runway in the State of Alaska right now, and it is in pretty good shape. It is used as a divert runway. NASA uses it as one of its divert places. It is a pretty good solid airport.

Keep in mind, Cold Bay has about 100, maybe 110 people on a good day who live there. Around here, King Cove is an Aleut community. It has been

around for maybe 1,000 years, maybe a couple of thousand years. It has been around a long time. The Aleut people have lived in this part of the country for thousands of years. This community now is host to about 748 people, give or take. During the fishing season you might get it up as high as possibly 1,000 people. It is not a booming metropolis by any stretch of the imagination.

King Cove, as you can see, is kind of isolated. There is water all around it. That is fair, that is good. This is a situation where this community is ringed by mountains.

I have a picture here of King Cove. When you look at the location of the water, you see where the mountains are. These are pretty fjord-like. These are not timid and tame mountains. These are the types of mountains that get your attention when you are flying in.

The air strip here for King Cove sits right back up in this area. You need to come through these high mountains on all sides. When the cloud layer is low, as it usually is in this area, there are some issues as to whether you have a safe fly-out range.

There are clouds, not only cross currents that hit as you are coming into the airport, but you also have the downdraft coming off these very strong, very prominent mountains. This type of downdraft causes turbulence that particularly impacts helicopters which might be coming into this community for a rescue.

Again, as you look at the options of getting in and out of King Cove, your airport sits about here. You are rimmed with mountains. You may either fly in up this way or you may fly in and out that way. Either way you cut it, you are moving through very high mountainous terrain with winds on all sides coming from above, clouds coming from below. It is as tricky and as difficult a navigational issue as about anywhere in the State.

Going back to where King Cove sits in the ocean here, weather comes in off the Bering Sea up here and there is weather that comes up from the Gulf of Alaska here. It all kind of comes together right around the Aleutians. The Aleutians are known to be one of the areas, at least in this country, of—excuse the expression, but we call it snotty weather. It is foul weather too many times of the year, not just in the winter.

We saw last month the incident with Shell's vessel trying to move from Unalaska across the Gulf of Alaska during January and encountering seas of up to 40 feet. This is the weather we deal with in Alaska. There are difficult seas, and there are difficult flying situations. Yet there are people who call King Cove home and have for thousands of years.

You might ask why I am spending so much time talking about the weather. It sets the stage for this action the Department of Interior has taken and why I feel this decision is so wrongheaded, so shortsighted, and so wrong to the people who call this area home.

Talking again about the weather and what it means, when you are in a small community that doesn't have a hospital—you don't have a hospital if there are 748 people. We have an IHS clinic, an Indian Health Service clinic. To provide for health needs is a community health aid, and we might have a PA every now and again, but not always reliably. We actually did have a doctor out in King Cove some years ago. He was there in 2006, and he left after 6 months. We don't have the medical assistance we need. When somebody suffers a heart attack, when a woman has a complication with a pregnancy, it is not as if you can stay there in King Cove and seek medical help.

What happens? They have to get out. Well, how do they get out? They can get out by boat. They can move around by boat from King Cove over to Cold Bay, where we have the second largest runway in the State of Alaska. It seems like a pretty simple situation. The problem is that a boat is about as dangerous oftentimes as flying. What happens is if you have weather this stinky, it raises the waves, making getting a fishing vessel across with a sick person, trying to get them to the dock on Cold Bay side and out of that vessel, a harrowing event.

This is a picture we took from a video which had been taken by the residents of King Cove. It might be difficult to see this, but what you are looking at here is a steel ladder, a ladder going up the side of the dock. It is about a 20-foot area there. Way down at the bottom here you see the base of a fishing vessel. What they are trying to do is to haul a sick, elderly gentleman up this metal ladder in the rain, sleet, and snow that is coming. You have a boat that is pitching and heaving here, with somebody up at the top of the dock ready to pick up this individual underneath their arms and haul them up onto the dock. This is not a condition you want if you are feeling at all poorly. The fishing vessel isn't helping, so maybe we could do something else. Congress back in 2005 said maybe we could put a hovercraft there so it can fly the waters between this point here and Cold Bay over here, because there is a road that can take you right along here and take you across to the water.

The problem was not only the seas wouldn't accommodate, but also the operational costs were through the roof. It made no sense, and the people in King Cove and Cold Bay had acknowledged it was not going to make any sense. They tried it, they were game, but it hasn't worked.

What happened was action needed to be taken because we were seeing too many people whose lives were at risk. We were seeing too many people who were killed trying to get out in an effort to seek the medical help they needed.

At some point in time you say this doesn't work. When you have a way out, and it could be a simple road, why wouldn't we do that to address the life safety of the people who live here?

Back in 1979 and 1980, there were a number of airplane crashes that happened as they were trying to take off and land in King Cove. In 1981 we had a medevac plane go down. We lost a nurse, her helper, the patient, and the medevac's pilot—all killed. They were trying to airlift an individual who had suffered a heart attack. Everybody was killed.

In 2010, there was an airplane crash that occurred well on landing into King Cove. Della Trumble, who has long been an advocate for a solution to help the people of King Cove, was watching that plane land because her daughter was coming home. To be sitting there at the air strip, watching the plane come in to deliver your daughter, knowing the weather is foul, knowing the conditions are sketchy, and then seeing that airplane crash in front of your eyes—fortunately for Della and her daughter, she walked away. Think about that trauma.

In February of 2011, the Coast Guard was forced to dispatch a helicopter out of Kodiak, moving a helicopter from Kodiak over to King Cove. They were trying to transfer a 73-year-old woman who was suffering from chest pains. A few days later the Coast Guard tried and failed to reach King Cove with a helicopter to airlift an 80-year-old woman who was also suffering chest pains. Fortunately, she survived. Two days later, there was another medical airlift that was delayed 6 hours from leaving.

I just received the statistics from the Coast Guard for last year. How many rescue missions did the Coast Guard take on to go into King Cove to help those who needed help—not because the medevacs didn't want to go help or because it was going to be too costly—because the medevacs refused to go in because they will not take those risks.

What do we do? We call on our fabulous Coast Guard to come in and do the job. It was five times last year. It is scary work. The Coast Guard does it, and fortunately nobody was killed last year. How many people need to be killed when you have an option for a road to get you to the second longest runway in the State of Alaska?

Let me share with others what it is we actually did to address this problem. We said this is not acceptable. Five years ago this Congress approved a land exchange. In that exchange the Aleut people and the State of Alaska agreed to give up 56,400 acres of prized waterfowl habitat. They said, okay, we are going to give up 56,000 acres here to add to the Alaska peninsula and Izembek National Wildlife Refuge. We are going to trade this and, in return, the government will give back about 1,800 acres.

Do the quick math on this. This is a 300-to-1 exchange the people agreed to,

and it is even less when we isolate it. We are talking about 206 acres that are at issue—206 acres to allow for construction of a one-lane gravel road that will have no commercial use. This is to be used for emergency access. If someone needs to get out of King Cove because they have some kind of a condition, all they would need to do is drive 20 miles—20 miles. Think about that. We drive 20 miles to get from here to wherever. We drive all the time and we don't think about it. We are talking about 20 miles to save people's lives.

But it is even better than that. Because when we are talking about what we are putting through a refuge, it is about a 10-mile road. I hate to even describe it as a road. It is a one-lane gravel area through this lagoon we are talking about and not for commercial use. We have agreed to this. In exchange for this 10-mile road, we said: We are going to give the Federal Government 56,400 acres to add to a wilderness area. What a deal—what a deal.

I hope you can see this, Mr. President, because it is important to understand what we are talking about. This area in the black is what would be subject to the exchange. This is what is going into the wilderness area. All this, plus other acreage that is not shown on this map, in exchange for these red corridors here—about 206 acres.

So back in 2009 we figured in the Senate and over in the House it was important to address the safety needs of the people of King Cove, and if we could do that by allowing for 10 miles, 11 miles of new road through the Izembek Refuge, we could solve a lot of problems. Again, I reiterate, this road is specifically not allowed to be used for economic development. In the omnibus bill we passed the language is specific: ''Primarily for health and safety purposes and only for noncommercial purposes.''

There were some who were so concerned we were going to see a volume of traffic going back and forth between this community of 748 people and the 110 people over here and that somehow there was going to be this wild traffic going back and forth that was going to disturb the migratory waterfowl, the birds that come through here, the animals in this refuge area. I think it is important to recognize this is not an area that has never been tracked by man; that has never seen a presence. Again, I will remind my colleagues, this was an Air Force base in World War II. This is the second largest runway in the State. This is an area that has seen traffic through vehicles, ATVs, over the years because of the war.

In this chart, we can see the red tracks here. These are all the areas where all-terrain vehicle use is currently in play, and this has been in play since 2005 to 2008. Then the areas that are kind of red dotted are the predicted ATV vehicle travel corridor. We can see this is all within the Izembek Refuge area, the wilderness area. So it is not as if this is without any kind of access that is in place.

If we look at this next picture, this is an example of what we are talking about with this proposed road. It is out in the middle of some pretty amazing, sweeping landscape, as we can see. But the road is pretty much a one-lane gravel road. There is not going to be any stuff such as street lights. There are not going to be any dividers, meridians, sidewalks. There will not be any overpasses. This is pretty much what we are talking about here.

This next chart shows the existing trails that are currently within the refuge area. Again, it is pretty much a small, narrow, one-track road. It is not like we are going to be able to pass one another moving through the area.

The last picture I wish to show is a view of what the area looks like. It is amazingly flat. It is surrounded by a lagoon area. It is beautiful, absolutely. But these are roads that are currently in existence in the area now. So what we are talking about doing is adding—adding—about a 10-mile strip that would allow us to connect the roads that exist in Cold Bay to connect to a community that needs to have an emergency way out that is safe. They need to be able to connect to those who are on the other side of this lagoon, and the way to do it is this simple road.

I have mentioned the concern about the waterfowl, and this is why the Secretary of the Interior called me and he said: I listened to the biologists, and the biologists tell me the best way to respect this refuge is to not allow any road, to not allow any road so we can respect the refuge. He listened to the biologists, but the Secretary of the Interior did not listen to the people of Alaska. He did not listen to the people of King Cove. He did not even accept a meeting with them the numerous times they have asked to meet with him. They have flown across country to make their case. But he listened to the biologists because he wants to respect the refuge, and, instead, the lives of these people are not being respected.

If this is the attitude of this Department of Interior—that we are going to respect the animals and we are going to respect the birds, but we are not going to respect the people who live there—then this is the wrong way to be going. This is the wrong way to be going, and I will not stand for it.

I want to make sure we have refuge areas. I want to make sure we have wilderness areas. In this exchange we adopted 5 years ago, we allowed for that. We are putting in place wilderness area—the first new wilderness area designated by Congress in a generation, with 45,456 acres of prime waterfowl habitat added to wilderness in Alaska. But you know what, that is gone. Those lands will not remain in wilderness designation unless this road is permitted because the exchange is then going to be nullified if that road is not going to be built.

We have offered a pretty sweet deal—a 300-to-1 exchange—in exchange for the safety of the people who live there. Anyone who thinks we can't build a one-lane gravel road that will allow for a coexistence between the waterfowl that migrate through there and the people who live there, they have another thing to be thinking about. We will not have a practical impact on the waterfowl in the refuge. While the land exchange involves 206 acres, far less is actually going to be impacted by the construction. It is far less than 1 percent of the refuge. Again, the Federal Government is getting 300 times more land.

It is just inconceivable to me we would not be able to have a resolution that works for both sides. For the Secretary to move forward with a designation that says no road—no road—it is just stunning to me. Some might say it is because it is going to cost us money. There is no cost to the Federal Government. The State of Alaska is going to be building this.

Too many people have died for there to be any legitimate excuse for further delay, and I challenge those officials within the Department of the Interior to come and visit King Cove and don't necessarily come during the good weather—although the people of King Cove would tell us they are not entirely sure when the good weather is—but come and see them. Come and see what we are talking about. I have been there. To Deputy Secretary Hayes' credit, he, too, has been there, and I appreciate that. I appreciate that others have tried and perhaps have not met with success because the weather didn't allow them in because we weren't about to take a risk with them. But at a minimum, the Secretary of the Interior needs to be there. He needs to meet with people—real people, such as Carl Smith, a King Cove elder, an Aleut warrior. He was recognized as one of the amazing veterans. He is an Eskimo Scout with the Territorial Guard. Look these people in the eye and tell them their lives are not worth as much as the lives of the birds, the black brants, that inhabit the area.

It is not too late. While this decision of the Department of the Interior has been made, the Secretary—or if Secretary Salazar is no longer there, his designee—has a legal obligation under this 2009 act to base a decision on the road on what is deemed the ''public interest.'' Right now it seems to me the Department of the Interior has deemed the public is made up solely of birds and sea otters. My public—my public—is the real human beings who live in King Cove.

So we need to make sure a decision is not based on an incomplete and misleading EIS that concludes, with lives at stake, no action is somehow acceptable. I repeat: No action is absolutely not acceptable.

I am going to end my comments by letting you know what has happened in

some other refuges. It was just a few years ago, we will all remember, when we were transfixed by what was called ''the miracle on the Hudson.'' There was a commercial jetliner that hit a flock of Canadian geese, lost power, and landed in the Hudson River. Through the amazing skills of that pilot, nobody was harmed. But what was the result of that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. What actually happened a couple years after that incident was that USDA's Wildlife Service agents went into the Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge, rounded up and killed 751 Canadian geese. The plan was to kill 1,0000, but they couldn't catch them fast enough.

Essentially, we see it is OK to kill birds in New York refuges, but we can't inconvenience the birds in Alaska. Maybe geese are less exotic than black brants or maybe it is because Members of this body and their families and friends fly through La Guardia and they worry about that. Well, I worry about the lives of Alaskans. I worry about the people of King Cove, and I am not going to rest on this. The decision that came out of the Department of the Interior was a travesty. It will not be allowed to stand, and I will do everything I can to ensure it does not.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner that also opposes the decision of the Department of the Interior, as well as the press accounts I have referred to of the New York geese story.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner]

PREFERRED PATHS: AGENCY RECOMMENDS AGAINST KING COVE ROAD

Almost four years ago, the federal administration signed off on a national wilderness act with a provision offering a small, wind-plagued village on the Alaska Peninsula the possibility of future road access to a safer airport. This week, the Obama administration appears poised to snatch that provision back. It should not do so.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service said Tuesday that the federal government should not proceed with a land swap that would allow construction of a road through the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge. That road would allow the community of King Cove access to a 10,000-foot airfield and cross-wind strip at Cold Bay.

The environmental impact statement was required by the legislation authorizing the land swap, the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009. That legislation proposed that about 56,000 acres now owned by the state and the King Cove Native corporation would become official federal wilderness in exchange for rights to build a one-lane road through an isthmus separating Cold Bay from Izembek Lagoon. Total road acreage: 206.

It was a generous offer from the state and corporation. Yet the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service could not accept the road.

Roads and trails have provided decades of access from Cold Bay to other parts of lagoon area for hunters and birdwatchers. However, the agency believes a new road connected to the much larger community of King Cove would greatly increase traffic by off-road vehicles. The agency admits this is just an educated guess, though. ''It is impossible to quantify the amount of human use (i.e., hunting, fishing, etc.) or illegal off-road vehicle use that would occur adjacent to the road if it is built,'' it said in response to public comments that raised the issue. ''The analysis presented in the EIS was based on previous experience of the authors and reviewed by staff familiar with the area and other areas in rural Alaska.''

Other educated guessers could point to areas set aside in Alaska, near far larger communities, where wildlife thrives and off-road trespassers are kept to a minimum.

The agency discounted the value of the state and Native corporation land it would receive in the exchange. It said those lands weren't such critical wildlife habitat as the isthmus, which is a fair statement. It also said no one was likely to do any development soon on the state and Native lands, which also is fair.

Nevertheless, the mere size of the offer, the potential benefits to King Cove and the uncertainty about the real impacts of off-road vehicles should tip the balance in favor of the exchange.

Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar, who must issue a record of decision on the swap within 30 days, appears already to have accepted the service's assessment of the swap. ''After extensive dialogue and exhaustive scientific evaluation,'' he said in a news release, ''the agency has identified a preferred path forward that will ensure this extraordinary refuge and its wilderness are conserved and protected for future generations.''

Unfortunately, that preferred path excludes King Cove's preferred path.

FEDERAL AGENTS KILL 750 GEESE FROM JAMAICA BAY WILDLIFE REFUGE NEAR JFK AIRPORT

(By Carly Baldwin and Daniela Bernal)

NEW YORK.—They're back.

Agents with the U.S. Department of Agriculture removed more than 700 Canada geese from Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge Monday morning, at the prodding of U.S. Senator Kirsten Gillibrand.

In the hours between 7 a.m. and noon, 711 of the birds, including possibly goslings, were rounded up and put into crates, said Carol Bannerman, with the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, a division within the USDA.

They were then drive to a meat processing plant in upstate New York, where the geese will be killed and their meat will be given to food banks upstate, Bannerman told Metro. In the past carbon dioxide has been used to gas the geese to death.

The more than 700 geese rounded up today comes after USDA agents removed 40 geese from a landfill near John F. Kennedy airport two weeks ago, said Bannerman. In total, 751 geese have been removed from area around JFK in the past two weeks.

That leaves only about 750 Canada geese remaining in the federally protected preserve. Before the round-up, there were 1,500 geese in the park, said Gateway National Recreation area spokesman John Warren.

According to Warren, the feds originally called for killing up to 1,000 geese in the park. But molting season ended before that many could be taken, he said.

Bannerman told Metro there will be no more further cullings planned for this summer.

But today's surprise killing shocked and outraged many New Yorkers.

''I was sick to my stomach,'' said Brooklynite David Karopkin when he heard of the killings yesterday. Karopkin, 27, runs GooseWatch NYC, which seeks to monitor and record the controversial cullings of geese in the metro area. ''New Yorkers have been kept in the dark about what's going on. These operations are done with no transparency, no public approval—for the most part we're told after the fact.''

''It's really a disgrace and a shock that New York City's only wildlife and bird sanctuary has been opened up to a wildlife slaughter for no good reason,'' Edita Birnkrant, the New York director of Friends of Animals, said. ''I'm in utter disbelief at the stupidity of some of the people in office.''

Gillibrand has been pushing for more than three years to allow agents into the Jamaica Preserve, a 9,000-acre estuary and bird sanctuary that surrounds JFK's runways. The birds are a hazard to planes taking off from JFK and LaGuardia airports, she and others argue.

Just this past April, a Delta jet hit geese when it took off from JFK. The cabin filled with smoke, but the plane made a safe emergency landing.

Gillibrand specifically wanted the geese culled before the end of their June and July molting phase, when the adult birds and goslings cannot fly and can be easily rounded up.

GEESE-PLANE STRIKES

The USDA first started removing geese from the NYC area in July of 2004. In the five years before that, there were nine bird strikes on planes at LaGuardia, said Carol Bannerman.

In the five years after 2004, to July of 2009, there have been three bird strikes.

The most famous of which is when geese brought down the ''Miracle on the Hudson'' flight in January of 2009.

But according to Karopkin, the geese that brought down that flight were migrating from Canada, and did not nest in the metro area.

''So even if you killed every animal in New York City you would not have prevented that crash,'' he said.

A HISTORY OF CULLINGS

Number of geese removed from around the city:

2009 1,276 geese removed and killed
2010 1,676 geese removed and killed
2011 575 geese removed and killed
2012 751 killed so far this year
Source: USDA.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. With that, I yield the floor.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 2 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that following the swearing in of our new Senator I be recognized; and that following my remarks Senator FRANKEN be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the 12:03 Senate a Certificate of Appointment to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Senator John Kerry of Massachusetts. The certificate, the Chair is advised, is in the form suggested by the Senate. If there is no objection, the reading of the Certificate will be waived and it will be printed in full in the RECORD.

(Applause)

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I, Deval L. Patrick, the Governor of said Commonwealth, do hereby appoint William ''Mo'' Cowan a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the resignation of John F. Kerry, is filled by election as provided by law.

Witness: His excellency our governor Deval L. Patrick, and our seal hereto affixed at Boston, Massachusetts this First day of February, in the year of our Lord 2013.

By the governor.

DEVAL L. PATRICK,
Governor.

WILLIAM FRANCIS GALVIN,
Secretary of Commonwealth.

(State Seal Affixed.)

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designee will now present himself at the desk, the Chair will administer the oath of office.

The Senator-designee, escorted by Mr. Kerry and Ms. WARREN, advanced to the desk of the Vice President, the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President, and he subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations, Senator, and welcome.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

Mrs. HAGAN. I do wish to congratulate the North Carolina native on his new role as a U.S. Senator from Massachusetts.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013—Continued

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I am proud to join my colleagues today in support of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. I do so not just as a Senator but also as the mother of two daughters.

This critical legislation has been held up for far too long, and it is past time for reauthorization. We have a serious responsibility to ensure that women and families are protected.

The rates of violence and abuse in our country are astounding and totally unacceptable. According to a 2010 CDC study, domestic violence affects more than 12 million people each year. Across the United States 15½ million children live in homes in which domestic violence has occurred. In my home State of North Carolina alone, 73 women and children are killed on average every year because of domestic violence.

Let me say that number one more time. Seventy-three women and children are killed every year due to domestic violence. These are alarming statistics, and we must act now to address them.

Since 1994, VAWA programs, and in particular the STOP Program that provides grants for services, training, officers, and prosecutors, have made tremendous progress in helping victims of domestic violence and sexual assault and have transformed our criminal justice system and victim support services.

These grants have assisted law enforcement and prosecutors in tracking down perpetrators and bringing them to justice. They have also saved countless lives and provided needed services to victims of these violent acts.

In one instance in my State a man was on pretrial release after being charged with stalking his wife. Thanks to this STOP grant funding, he was being monitored electronically, and he was caught violating the conditions of his release when he went to his estranged wife's home. The supervising officer was immediately notified of this violation, and police officers found the man with the help of a GPS and arrested him in his estranged wife's driveway. Because of this VAWA program, we had one less victim in my State. This is just one example of how VAWA is protecting women and saving lives.

Title V of this bill includes legislation that I sponsored in the last Congress, the Violence Against Women Health Initiative Act, which updates and improves the health care system's response to domestic violence and sexual assault. My provision is simple: It provides training and education to help the health care professionals respond to violence and abuse. By equipping doctors and nurses to recognize the signs of domestic abuse and make sure they have the training to respond, we can better care for our survivors and prevent future crimes. It also consolidates existing programs to streamline and strengthen the health care system's response to violent crimes.

Since my time in the North Carolina State Senate, I have been dedicated to reducing the backlog of unanalyzed rape kits. This bill includes the bipartisan SAFER Act, which helps fund audits of untested DNA evidence and reduces this backlog of rape kits.

Before my efforts in the State senate, what used to happen in North Carolina, and continues to happen today in many States, is that a woman would be raped, she would go to the hospital, DNA would be collected and then placed in a box. Then that box would go and sit on a shelf in a police department or in a sheriff's department totally unanalyzed unless the woman could identify who attacked her.

I ask you: What other victims in America have to identify the attacker before authorities will take action? None.

When I first brought this issue to the forefront, I was told there was not enough money for all of these rape kits to be tested. We found that funding in North Carolina. Now with the help of the SAFER Act, our law enforcement agencies will have the ability to track and prioritize their untested DNA evidence to ensure that victims can find their perpetrators and hold them accountable, and we can remove violent criminals from the streets.

Unfortunately, until Congress acts to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, the well-being of women across the country hangs in the balance. This bill has never been a partisan football, and there is no reason it should be today. I hope we will pass this bill swiftly and without further disputes. We must ensure this bill's passage for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking not only in North Carolina but around the country.

Finally, I do want to thank the North Carolina Coalition Against Sexual Assault, the North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence, and North Carolina's State and local law enforcement agencies that have truly been leaders in combating this problem. I applaud them for all the work they have done to reduce and address the incidents of domestic violence and sexual assault, and I am grateful for the work they do every day on the front lines of this issue.

So I am asking my colleagues to join me in moving the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act through the Senate swiftly and without further delay. Millions of victims across the country are waiting for us to enact this lifesaving legislation, and we simply cannot wait any longer.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, last spring, just before the Senate passed the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, I came to the floor to share some words from my late dear friend Sheila Wellstone whose commitment to ending domestic violence is an everlasting source of inspiration to my wife Franni and to me.

I shared with my colleagues something Sheila said, which was this:

I have chosen to focus on domestic violence because I find it appalling that a woman's home can be the most dangerous, the most violent, and, in fact, the most deadly place for her. And if she is a mother, it is dangerous for her children. . . . It's time that we tell the secret; it's time that we all come together to work toward ending the violence.

Sheila's words rang true in her time, but they have perhaps never rung more true than they do today. It is time that we all come together to work toward ending the violence.

We passed the VAWA Reauthorization Act in the Senate last April, but the House did not let it go to the President for signature and enactment, so we are back here today voting on the bill again because those of us who believe in VAWA will continue to fight for the bill's passage until it is signed into law. I encourage my colleagues, both in the Senate and in the House, to come together to work toward ending the violence, to support this bill.

The bill's managers, Judiciary Committee chairman PAT LEAHY and Senator MIKE CRAPO, have demonstrated remarkable resolve and leadership. We all are grateful for that. I also thank them for inviting me to author two parts of the VAWA reauthorization bill, which I would like to describe briefly.

First, the VAWA Reauthorization Act includes provisions from the Justice for Survivors of Sexual Assault Act. We just heard Senator HAGAN talk about an aspect of that. This is one of the first bills I introduced after being sworn in to the Senate. When this bill becomes law, never again will survivors of sexual assault suffer the indignity of paying for the forensic medical exam, the rape kit. VAWA provides State and local governments with funding to administer these exams, which are used to collect evidence in sexual assault cases. The problem is that under current law, grant recipients can charge the survivor—the victim—for the upfront cost of administering the exam, leaving her to seek reimbursement later. Too often survivors get lost in a maze of paperwork and they are not reimbursed. Under my bill, grant recipients will be able to charge insurance companies or victims' assistance funds or other sources, but they cannot charge the survivor. I believe survivors of sexual violence have endured enough already. They should not have to pay for rape kits, and they will not have to once this bill is passed and signed by the President and becomes law.

Second, the VAWA reauthorization bill includes the Housing Rights for Victims of Domestic and Sexual Violence Act, legislation I introduced with Senator COLLINS and Senator MIKULSKI in the fall of 2011. This bill will help women stay in their homes when they are the most vulnerable, when they need a roof over their heads the most. The link between violence and homelessness is undeniable. By one account, nearly 40 percent of women who experience domestic violence will become homeless at some point in their lives. Once a woman becomes homeless, she becomes even more vulnerable to physical or sexual abuse. In my State, nearly one in three homeless women is fleeing domestic violence, and half of those women have children with them. That is unacceptable.

Franni and I have visited battered women's shelters, and I have to tell you it is heartbreaking. They are crowded. They are full. And a lot of mothers are there with their kids. On a bitter-cold Minnesota night, these women often have nowhere to go. Transitional housing is really important. If a woman has a choice between going out in the cold winter night in Minnesota or maybe going back to her abuser and exposing children to that, that is wrong. This can be heartbreaking.

But there is something heartwarming too about seeing people come to each other's aid in their time of need. That is what the people who run the shelters do every day—the staff of Advocates for Family Peace in Itasca County, the Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women, the Casa de Esperanza, and the many other advocacy groups across my State. Talk to these folks about VAWA, and they will tell you what it means for women in Minnesota. It means nights spent under a roof instead of in a tent or in a car or on a street or, even worse, having to go back to live with their abuser and exposing their children to that danger, to witnessing that violence. We need these shelters and transitional housing programs for women who are fleeing danger. The VAWA reauthorization bill provides continued support for these programs.

My housing rights legislation provides additional support. It is a preventive measure that is intended to keep women from becoming homeless in the first place. My bill will make it unlawful to evict a woman from federally subsidized housing just because she is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking. A woman may be living away from her abuser in Federal housing and the abuser comes and knocks down the door and the landlord will say: Let's evict her. Under my bill, that cannot happen in Federally subsidized housing. This bill is for every woman who has hesitated to call the police to enforce a protective order because she is afraid she will be evicted from her home if she does so.

The VAWA Reauthorization Act is a crucial bill. It is a good bill. It is an important bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these letters from professional medical organizations in support of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Act.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, IL, February 5, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. MIKE CRAPO,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS LEAHY AND CRAPO: On behalf of the physician and medical student members of the American Medical Association (AMA), I am writing to express our support for S. 47, the ''Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. '' This bill, which reauthorizes the landmark Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), would strengthen and improve existing programs that assist victims and survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

While violence against adult women has decreased 60 percent since VAWA was first passed in 1994, it remains a critical problem in our country and much more work remains to be done. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey released in December 2011, one in five women in the United States has been raped in her lifetime and one in four women has been the victim of severe physical violence by a partner. Domestic and sexual violence is a health care problem and one of the most significant social determinants of health for women and girls.

We are pleased that S. 47 would address some of the critical gaps in delivery of health care to victims by strengthening the health care system's identification and assessment of, and response to, victims. We also appreciate and support language in Title V of the bill on the development and testing of quality improvement measures for identifying, intervening, and documenting victims of domestic violence that recognizes and aligns with the important work underway by the AMA, the National Quality Forum, and other stakeholders in the quality improvement arena.

We commend you for your long-standing support for victims of violence and abuse and for your leadership in introducing the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. We urge swift passage of your bill in the Senate and look forward to working with you to ensure enactment of this important legislation this year.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. MADARA, MD.

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, February 4, 2013.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MIKE CRAPO,
Senator,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND SENATOR CRAPO: On behalf of the 137,000 members and affiliates of the American Psychological Association (APA), I am writing to thank you for your invaluable leadership in introducing the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (S. 47). As the legislative process advances, APA offers its full support of your efforts to ensure a comprehensive and inclusive reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

As you know, nearly one in four women in the United States reports experiencing domestic violence at some point in her life, and 15 million children live in families in which intimate partner violence has occurred within the past year. Domestic violence can result in significant mental and behavioral health consequences including depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder, relationship problems, diminished self-esteem,

social isolation, substance use disorders, and suicidal behavior. VAWA programs can help to mitigate these negative outcomes by providing a vital link to services and supports for survivors and their families.

APA applauds your commitment to protect survivors of intimate partner violence with a comprehensive VAWA reauthorization. In particular, we appreciate the inclusion of essential public health provisions to reauthorize and strengthen the health care system's identification, assessment, and response to violence, as well as provisions to protect vulnerable populations, including Native women, immigrants, and LGBT individuals.

We welcome the opportunity to work with you to address these important issues. For further information, please contact Nida Corry, Ph.D., in our Public Interest Government Relations Office at (202) 336–5931 or ncorry@apa.org.

Sincerely,

GWENDOLYN PURYEAR KEITA, Ph.D.,
Executive Director, Public Interest Directorate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, in my previous life, I was attorney general of the State of Texas. In that capacity, I had the opportunity to work with numerous victim rights groups, primarily because part of my responsibility—the office's responsibility—was to administer the Crime Victims Compensation Fund, which took a small portion of the fees paid by criminal defendants who are convicted of crimes or pled guilty to crimes and put it into a fund that could be used then to help victims. As attorney general of Texas, I became a supporter of the crime victims rights community and their interests as well as the VAWA.

This is really an important point. Since it was first enacted in 1994, the VAWA has been reauthorized on two separate occasions, each time by unanimous vote of the Senate. Let me say that again. On the two previous occasions the Senate has voted to reauthorize the VAWA, it has been unanimous. There were no differences between Democrats and Republicans—we were all together in supporting this legislation. For that reason, I hope Members of both parties will think long and hard before turning this critical law into just another vehicle for scoring political points or bowing to special interests instead of the public interest.

I am enormously proud and grateful that this bill contains a version of the SAFER Act, which I first introduced last year with strong bipartisan support. I had the privilege of meeting several extraordinary Texas women, including Carol Bart, Lennah Frost, and Lavinia Masters, all of whom decided to go public with their story in hopes of helping other victims of sexual assault. It has been a moving experience.

I am delighted that our bill and our effort via the SAFER Act to address the untested rape kit scandal in this country is so close to the finish line. Why is this legislation so important? Right now there are as many as 400,000 untested rape kits sitting in police evidence lockers or labs across the Nation. Each one of those rape kits—which is a sample of DNA that could then be used to match up against an FBI database to make an identification of a sexual assailant—right now 400,000 of them, it is estimated; we really don't know the exact number—are sitting in evidence lockers and police storage facilities all across the Nation. Each one of these kits has the potential to solve a crime, to identify a rapist and deliver justice for a victim.

The SAFER Act would help law enforcement officials reduce that backlog of untested rape kits and improve public safety. Indeed, it would help us address what can only be considered a national scandal. It would help bring peace of mind to rape victims. And it would help get dangerous criminals off the street before they commit another crime. That is why the SAFER Act has been endorsed by a wide range of victim advocacy groups, such as the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network; the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence; the Fraternal Order of Police; and the National Organization for Women. That is why we are so eager to see this legislation become law.

But beyond the SAFER Act, the VAWA provides funding for shelters, counseling programs, and legal services that help ensure that our justice system leaves no victim behind.

For all these reasons, we can and we must reauthorize the VAWA. As we have done on previous occasions, we should do so with overwhelming bipartisan support. We could easily do that.

Unfortunately, the underlying bill also contains a separate provision that is blatantly unconstitutional. It would deny U.S. citizens their full constitutional protections under the Bill of Rights in tribal courts. Needless to say, this is a big problem, but it is also a solvable problem. I have drafted an amendment that would allow Native American tribes to prosecute U.S. citizens for domestic violence as long as those tribes followed the Constitution and allowed all convictions to be appealed in the Federal court system.

This amendment is a sensible compromise, and I have discussed it with all of the various organizations that are interested in passage of a reauthorization of VAWA. We have negotiated in good faith, but unfortunately that good-faith effort to try to find a solution has run into a brick wall of opposition, and the chairman has decided to not change the controversial language that would deny certain Americans full protection of the Bill of Rights. What I cannot understand is why anyone would want to pick a political fight and not find a solution if a solution is at hand and it makes so much sense.

Once again, I passionately support the SAFER Act. I am grateful that provision at long last is included in this law, which will allow us to address that national scandal of hundreds of thousands of untested rape kits. This is a bill which could do so much good in the battle for victims' rights, but unfortunately it is being held hostage by a single provision that would take away fundamental constitutional rights for certain American citizens.

And for what? For what? In order to satisfy the unconstitutional demands of special interests.

I remain hopeful that we can eventually come to a compromise that upholds the Constitution, if not here in the Senate then in a conference committee between the House of Representatives and the Senate, so we reconcile the differences between the two bills passed by each House.

For now I cannot, in good conscience, vote for a bill that violates the U.S. Constitution. I cannot, in good conscience and in fidelity to my oath of office, vote for a provision that I know is unconstitutional. I will, however, vote for the alternative bill that is offered by Senator GRASSLEY which eliminates this unconstitutional provision. It reauthorizes the Violence Against Women Act and contains the SAFER Act which addresses this backlog of untested rape kits.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you, Mr. President. By the way, what a pleasure it is to see the new Senator presiding.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, I rise every week on this Senate floor to talk about the dangers of carbon pollution to our atmosphere and to our oceans. This week I want to preface my remarks by talking about America and her role in the world.

I can use some very well-known words to make my point. From John Winthrop to Ronald Reagan, we have described our great American experiment as ''a city on a hill.'' Indeed, our hymn ''America the Beautiful'' sings about our ''alabaster cities' gleam.'' President Kennedy's inaugural address said that ''the glow from [our] fire can truly light the world,'' and a generation later, President Obama's first inaugural noted that our ''ideals still light the world.'' We Americans have described ourselves as a beacon of hope, a light in the darkness, our lamp lifted up in welcome and in example.

Daniel Webster years ago said that our Founders ''set the world an example.'' That was what the founding of America meant—our Founders ''set the world an example.'' President Clinton has pointed out that the power of our example, the power of that example in

the world, has always been greater than any example of our power. That was the way Bill Clinton described it. And when Daniel Webster said that our Founding Fathers had set before the world an example, he went on to say this:

> The last hopes of mankind, therefore, rest with us; and if it should be proclaimed, that our example had become an argument against the experiment, the knell of popular liberty would be sounded throughout the earth.

I have spoken before about this small globe of ours, the light of dawn sweeping each morning across its face, lighting cities and cottages, barrios and villages, and across the globe's face people coming forth from homes and hovels into that morning Sun, each knowing, from our American example, that life does not have to be the way it is for them, knowing that an example of liberty and self-government stands free before them, that America stands as an alternative and a rebuke to the tyranny, to the corruption, or to the injustice in which they may be enmired.

So like many of my colleagues, I believe America has a special destiny in the world. America's special destiny does not come easy, and it does not come alone. America's special destiny confers upon us a special duty. What is that duty? That duty is to live up to our own example, to see to it that our lamp gleams brightly, to be the promise that each dawn America offers this small globe.

So let's look at climate change in that light. What if our carbon pollution is, in fact, changing the planet? What if, in fact, we know this, we know this to any reasonable degree of responsible certainty? And what if, knowing this, we do nothing? And what if the reason we do nothing is the influence of special interests who profit from that very pollution or the groundless ideology of a fringe? What sort of example is that for America to set? How does that meet our special duty? How does that advance our special destiny?

Look at what other continents and nations will experience, particularly those that have not enjoyed the economic development we achieved through our carbon economy.

I will start in Africa, where temperatures are expected to increase faster than the rest of the world. Rainfall patterns are also expected to change, decreasing in some areas, increasing in others. Floods, droughts, and new crop diseases linked to changes in temperature and rainfall will hurt African farmers in a continent where subsistence farming is still so important to so many individuals' way of life. Research shows that production of crops, such as maize—a core staple in Africa—will decrease by 30 percent over the next 20 years due to climate change. More frequent and severe extreme weather will have dire consequences there. We saw, just a few weeks ago, the worst flood in a decade, killing at least 38 people in Mozambique and leaving 150,000 homeless.

Parts of Russia have warmed between 3.5 and 5.5 degrees Fahrenheit just in the last century, leading to the loss of permafrost. Russians, like Alaskans—whom I spoke about before—build homes and roads and infrastructure on the permafrost. When it disappears, communities lose the very foundations on which they are built. NOAA says that the Russian heat wave of 2010, which killed tens of thousands of people, was the most severe since records were first kept back in 1880. And this type of heat wave is now more and more likely.

Go to the Land Down Under, where warmer and more acidic oceans have fueled a widespread coral bleaching in the Great Barrier Reef. The Great Barrier Reef is a natural wonder. It is one of the great wonders of the world. Economically, it is the basis of a $4 billion tourism industry in Australia, and it is dying before our eyes. Scientists say that climate change heightens the devastation from other natural disasters in Australia, such as the 2009 bushfires that claimed 173 lives, the 2011 flooding that killed dozens, and the wildfires that have already damaged hundreds of homes and displaced thousands of Australians this year.

Europe is getting hotter, with increased risk of summertime droughts in Central Europe and in the Mediterranean. Tree lines creep higher in European mountain ranges. Glaciers in Central Europe shrink. Alpine ski areas have been forced to adapt to higher temperatures and less snow.

South America has been warming, and glaciers in the Andes are retreating at an increasing rate. I have a symbol of that retreat in my office. Lonnie Thompson of Ohio State University and Clark Weaver of NASA loaned me this artifact. It is a piece of a plant that has been preserved under the Quelccaya Ice Cap in Peru for at least 5,200 years—more than 3,000 years before Jesus Christ walked the Earth. This plant was overcovered by glacier and has stayed that way ever since. Now, thanks to glacial retreat, that piece of plant, which was preserved by the weight and cold of the glacier, is in my office.

Closer to home, in Canada, a tropical fungus that causes lung disease and meningitis has been discovered. Scientists think the deadly yeast likely came to Vancouver Island in ballast water from ships, but now—now—it can survive there because of higher temperatures.

In the Arctic, we are losing sea ice, permafrost, glaciers, and ice sheets. Arctic sea ice is shrinking at about 5 percent per decade. With that shrinkage, there is less ice to reflect sunlight back into space. More heat is captured, and the warming accelerates. At this rate, Arctic summers will be ice free within decades. For the United States, that means new Arctic waterways to defend, an expanded theater of operations in the Arctic, and increased competition for Arctic resources.

Wherever you look around the globe, climate change changes habitats, changes where plants can grow, and loads the dice for more frequent and more severe extreme weather. Heat waves, droughts, floods, and storms create victims and refugees who require humanitarian relief. The poorest nations, those least prepared to weather natural disasters, will suffer the most. Those nations will look to us and to the rest of the developed world for help. They will not look to us for help without reason. The United States is responsible for one-quarter of all industrial-age carbon pollution in the world. Today we no longer emit the most carbon dioxide; China has passed us.

But we have emitted the most over time. Nations all over the world have implemented carbon reduction plans. Some have implemented carbon pricing. Many invest far more than we do in renewable energy. The United States is falling behind rather than leading. Even China, today's biggest polluter, recently committed to reduce the amount of carbon it emits relative to its economic output.

In 2009, China passed the United States of America in renewable energy investment. Looking at all that, it is hard to imagine that those who will suffer, those who will be displaced, those who will lose their ancient livelihoods all around the world will look benevolently upon our Nation.

It is hard to believe they will not resent that they are forced to bear those burdens at the price of our carbon economy. One can readily imagine extremists who wish to rally disenchanted people against us, even to violence against us, finding fertile opportunity where that resentment festers.

Will it not be, as Daniel Webster said, ''an argument against [our] experiment?'' Will it not be an argument against our experiment that our democracy, our great American democracy, seized in the grip of polluting special interests or fringe political ideology, was unable to respond to the facts around us to protect ourselves and our world?

Will there not be ready ears easy to fill with that argument against our experiment, among those who have been uprooted from traditional homes and livelihoods or among those whose homes and livelihoods have been disturbed by climate refugees?

Destiny means duty. Destiny means duty, and we are failing in that duty. It is time for us to awake in this moment to that duty. We can expect in the long and blessed future of this country to have to face unpleasant facts, facts more unpleasant than the facts of carbon pollution and climate change and ocean acidification.

We have done this before. With God's help, we will do it again. But if we cannot bring ourselves to our senses now, in this moment, in our day and hour to wake and face these facts, what a terrible admission that is by this generation of Americans.

Stand we a chance of being looked back at as a greatest generation if we fail to address this greatest issue facing our planet? Lord Acton noted ''the undying penalty which history has the power to inflict on wrong.'' Truly, that penalty will be inflicted on us, on our generation, if we do not awaken to these plain facts and to our plain duty.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee is nearby and may well seek the floor with respect to the Violence Against Women Act.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank Senators MURRAY, SHAHEEN, BEGICH, UDALL of New Mexico, KLOBUCHAR, MURKOWSKI, HAGAN and FRANKEN for their statements today in support of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

I also note that the ranking Republican member on the Judiciary Committee made a statement today from which I take some hope. The Senator from Iowa indicated that this measure could have been enacted last year. I wish it had been enacted last year after the Senate voted with a strong majority to do so and did everything I could, including reaching out to the Republican Speaker of the House, to try to make that happen.

I will not respond to all that my friend from Iowa said but I do want to correct any notion that I have abandoned my efforts to increase U visas to help law enforcement and immigrant women. As I have said repeatedly, I remain committed to these provisions that I originally introduced and will pursue them in the context of comprehensive immigration reform. I hope that the Senator from Iowa will join me and support them. We will need them later this year.

I am encouraged that our bipartisan bill has 62 cosponsors. I am disappointed that Senators who say it should have passed last year are still opposing it. I hope that after a vote on the Republican substitute, remaining opponents will join us and support Violence Against Women Act reauthorization. That is what Senator HUTCHISON did last year when the Senate rejected her alternative; she joined with us. I praised her for it. Let us join together and pass the strong Senate bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I spoke earlier today about the importance of passing the Violence Against Women Act, how this has been a longtime bipartisan bill back to 1994 when the late Senator Paul Wellstone was involved in this bill, as well as Vice President BIDEN. People came together and said we have to do something about domestic violence. This is no longer a hidden crime behind closed doors.

Do you know what we have seen since then? We have seen a 50-percent reduction—a 50-percent reduction—in domestic violence in this country. This is a victory. We do not want to go backward. Unfortunately, the bill that has been submitted by Senator GRASSLEY, the substitute amendment, I believe would take us backward. Let me explain why.

First of all, we know the VAWA reauthorization bill was months of negotiation between the two lead authors, Senator LEAHY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and Senator CRAPO. It has bipartisan consensus and was drafted after months of input from numerous stakeholders.

Unfortunately, the Grassley substitute doesn't do a lot of the things that are so important to us in this Violence Against Women bill. This is not an acceptable substitute.

While much of this bill is consistent with past policy in the Violence Against Women Act, there were some changes that we felt necessary to match the times. One of them is a growing problem of tribal domestic violence. Domestic violence in tribal communities, unfortunately, is an epidemic. Four out of five perpetrators of domestic or sexual violence on tribal lands are non-Indian and currently cannot be prosecuted by tribal governments. The only way is to have the U.S. Attorney's Office come in. They do a lot of good work. My United States Attorney's office has done great work historically through several administrations with our tribal communities, but these cases should be able to be prosecuted not only by U.S. attorneys but also by tribal governments. The Leahy-Crapo VAWA reauthorization bill builds on the protections for Indian women by recognizing tribes' authority to prosecute non-Indians who commit domestic violence against their Indian spouses or dating partners. Let me say this was narrowly tailored for these acts of domestic violence with specific requirements.

The Grassley proposal, unfortunately, does not provide the tribes the authority to enforce laws against domestic violence on their own lands. It also takes money away from other Justice Department grant programs to install Federal magistrate judges and prosecutors on tribal lands. Bringing in large numbers of Federal officials goes against the locally based solutions to domestic violence that VAWA has so successfully promoted.

Federal judges and prosecutors already, as I pointed out, have authority to handle cases on tribal lands. This has not stemmed the plague of violence against Indian women. That is what you do with the reauthorizations. That is why you don't have bills go on forever and forever into eternity. You have reauthorizations to try to address some issues which can make things better.

Here we have addressed one. While the Violence Against Women Act has helped so much with so many victims of domestic violence in this country, we still see incredibly tragic numbers when it comes to domestic violence against American Indian women. That is why we have made these changes. It allowed us the reauthorization to adjust.

While the Grassley proposal allows a tribe to petition a Federal court for a protective order to exclude individuals from tribal land, this does not begin to address the problem of non-Indian perpetrators who are not arrested, prosecuted, or convicted for those heinous crimes. This is a false alternative that does almost nothing to solve the epidemic of violence against Native women.

Another issue. There was a very careful negotiation that went on with where the funding went. We had to make cuts to funding this year in many areas, including this one. We negotiated how much of the funds would go to sexual assault and how much would go to domestic violence. The Leahy-Crapo VAWA reauthorization bill includes a 20-percent set-aside for sexual assault programming in the STOP program, a balance that was achieved after months of discussions with domestic violence and sexual assault service providers. The bill increases the focus on sexual assault without endangering domestic violence victims. It was a big deal that we were able to get it done. Unfortunately, the Grassley proposal makes a change to that and goes against the negotiation we already had in place.

Finally, there is the issue with the Grassley proposal on U visas. As you most likely heard, we actually made changes to the original bill on U visas already in this negotiated bill. We were going to be able to use U visas that had been issued in prior years but not actually used, and be able to use those numbers in the coming years. We ended up taking that out. I didn't agree with that, and I hope it is something we can address and fix in immigration reform. Unfortunately, the Grassley proposal goes even farther. It adds more restrictions on U visas.

Let me stop for a moment to explain what these U visas are. This is when you have an immigrant victim of domestic violence. When I was a prosecutor for 8 years, we would have a number of cases where an immigrant was a victim. What do you think her perpetrator did to get her to be scared to come forward? They said, We are going to deport you if you come forward to law enforcement. You will never be able to stay in this country.

What the U visas do is give that victim a status to remain in the country to make sure this person gets prosecuted and then work on some kind of a permanent immigration status. That is what the U visas are. I think they are a necessary component. There have been agreed-upon numbers for years when this bill has been reauthorized.

Unfortunately, as I said, the Grassley proposal adds restrictions on U visas which are a law enforcement tool to encourage immigrants to report and help prosecute crime. The restrictions are put in there—I am sure Senator GRASSLEY, who is so good at fighting fraud, put them in there for good reason—to deter fraud, but no study or report has been cited to indicate that there is an issue here. U visas already have fraud protections because law enforcement officers must personally certify that the victim is cooperating with the criminal investigation. I tend to believe the personal certification from a law enforcement officer, and that is the proof that we have to issue the U visas.

No program is perfect. I am sure we can work with Senator GRASSLEY in the future if there are some fraud issues here. At this point, after a year of negotiation in trying to get the bill through here, we have significant bipartisan support. It is not the time to put a substitute in.

I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity. I urge my colleagues to reject the substitute Grassley amendment, embrace this bill, and vote for it. It is a good bill.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, pending before the Senate is the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. We considered it over a year ago. The bipartisan reauthorization passed the Senate with 68 votes more than 9 months ago. To someone who has suffered domestic violence abuse and is in need of help, it is amazing to think that what used to be an easy bipartisan issue has been tied up in the obstruction between the House and the Senate since then. There is absolutely no excuse for failing to enact this legislation. Now is the time to do it. We have a strong sensible bill before us.

Senator LEAHY, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, is guiding it on the Senate floor. This is an interesting issue. It is an emotional issue. If you haven't had domestic violence in your family, you can be grateful. Many people have seen it firsthand, and I don't think it is something they will easily forget.

I was invited a few years back to go to Champaign, IL, to a domestic violence shelter to meet with one of the victims. It was an important meeting for me. Sitting across the table from a woman with two black eyes, her eyes red from crying, she could barely choke out a few words about what life had been like as a victim of domestic violence. She was humiliated by the scars her face and body showed and ashamed she had reached that point in her life. She had nowhere to turn. She didn't trust anybody. She was afraid of her spouse and so she came to this domestic violence shelter with her child. She didn't know where to turn. The shelter was trying to protect her, No. 1, and give her a chance for a better life.

That is what this bill is about. It is also about a group of people I have come to know personally and really respect in Chicago. There is a group called Mujeres Latinas En Accion. What a dynamic group. I met them 14 or 15 years ago. They were operating out of an old house in Pilsen, one of the Hispanic neighborhoods in Chicago. It was one of these beat-up, old places that a lot of charities take on and hope to call home and use for their purposes—in this case a domestic violence shelter primarily for the Hispanic neighborhood. The rooms were all packed. There were cots and diapers and food and all the things you beg for from friends to sustain a family in need of help.

I remember going there with Amalia Rioja Castro, and she explained to me what they were doing in receiving people from the community. These were women most often with children who came in and had been victimized. It was tougher for them than for most. Many of them struggled with English. Many of them struggled with a culture that many times is too patriarchal in these circumstances, and many of them struggled with the same embarrassment as the woman I met in Champaign, IL. But they finally realized they had no choice; they had to ask for help. So they came to that shelter. And, thank goodness, those volunteers and people were there offering them a safe place and willing to take on the issues of protecting this mother and her children from further abuse. They saved a lot of lives in the process.

That is what this bill is about, and it is one of the reasons this bill hasn't passed. You see, the difference between the Senate approach and the approach in the House of Representatives comes down to two or three things, but they are all three important things. One of them relates to the undocumented.

If an undocumented woman—mother—walks into a domestic violence shelter in this country, beaten up, running from an abusive husband, holding her baby, will we help her? That is the question. Ordinarily, one would say: Of course. But some say: No, she is undocumented. We don't help those people.

Really? We don't? Is that who we are in America? It isn't. Of course, we help her. Of course, we help her child. Our bill said we did; the House disagreed.

Native American communities are much more complicated. In Illinois I don't live with these tribal communities and know all of the issues associated with them, but it turns out that many times in cases of domestic violence, the tribal courts are unable, unwilling to deal with the prosecutions in a timely and effective way. We tried, in the Senate version of the bill, to make sure when it came to Native American populations, tribal populations, the same protections would be there. The House disagreed.

Then, of course, came the question about sexual orientation. What if the abuse is not man to woman, heterosexual abuse, but something else. Will that type of abuse also be protected? The answer is yes. In the Senate version of the bill, it was clearly yes. The House disagreed.

Because of those three basic disagreements, nothing is happening. I shouldn't say nothing is happening. Thank goodness, BARBARA MIKULSKI, now chairman of the Appropriations Committee, chaired the subcommittee that kept funding the bill. So we kept our commitment to these violence shelters around America, but we didn't reauthorize them. We didn't put in new language. We didn't do our job. We just stopped for a year on a bill that shouldn't even be debated, to a great extent. It certainly shouldn't be partisan.

According to a recent survey, in the United States, 24 people every minute become victims of rape, physical violence, or stalking. That means in the time it takes me to finish this statement dozens will have been victimized. Since its passage, the Violence Against Women Act, known as VAWA, has provided valuable and even lifesaving assistance to hundreds of thousands of people in America. The impact is profound.

The Bureau of Justice statistics tell us the rate of domestic violence against women has dropped by more than 50 percent since we first enacted this bill. There aren't many pieces of legislation we can point to with that track record, but there are so many more who need help. That is evident from the statistics.

The Centers for Disease Control tells us approximately one in four women has experienced severe physical violence by an intimate partner, and nearly one in five women has been raped. One in five? In a study of undergraduate women, 19 percent have experienced an attempted or actual sexual assault while in college. All together more than one in three women have experienced rape, stalking, or physical violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime. That is a fact.

The consequences are ongoing. For example, 81 percent of women who have experienced this report significant short- or long-term impacts, and the consequences can be severe. By one report, in 2007, 45 percent of the women killed in the United States died at the hands of an intimate partner.

This reauthorization ensures that funding will continue to go to the organizations and individuals who need help the most. It places increased emphasis on responding to sexual assault, in addition to domestic violence. It does things such as encourage jurisdictions to evaluate rape kit inventories and reduce backlogs. It incorporates important accountability mechanisms, consolidates programs, and actually reduces spending.

It also includes vital provisions to help Native American women and protect immigrant communities. A provision helping to ensure the availability of U visas for victims of crime was taken out. I am sorry it was. It is a budget item; a constitutional item. But we want to make sure other critical provisions in the bill remain—provisions that protect immigrant communities that are strongly supported by those who work with them.

The reauthorization also ensures that lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender communities are not discriminated against when it comes to these services. I say this to my colleagues on both sides of the Chamber. Now is the time to pass the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. Our country has to come together to make sure all of the victims are protected.

Take the Native American communities, for example. According to a survey by the Centers for Disease Control, 4 out of every 10 American Indian or Alaska Native women—4 out of 10—have been victims of rape, physical violence, or stalking in their lifetime. That is unacceptable in America, a country that prides itself on its commitment to human rights.

This bipartisan bill is supported by victims, experts, and advocates. It is supported by service providers, faith leaders, and health care professionals, prosecutors, judges, law enforcement officials, and it ought to be supported by both Chambers of Congress.

The last two VAWA reauthorization bills have carefully expanded the scope of the law and improved it. This reauthorization is no exception. It implies lessons learned from those working in the field and renews our commitment to reducing domestic and sexual violence. We ought to listen to the people on the front lines protecting those vulnerable populations. We should be able to pass a strong reauthorization that addresses the needs of all women.

I thank Senator LEAHY and many others in this Chamber for their leadership. I want to take a moment to discuss a provision which I mentioned earlier in the bill.

A troubling episode of ''Frontline,'' the PBS program many of us watch and respect, detailed one woman's story in great detail, but that wasn't an isolated incident. The National Prison Rape Elimination Commission, created by Congress, said:

> As a group, immigration detainees are especially vulnerable to sexual abuse and its effects while detained.

The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, known as PREA, was designed to eliminate sexual abuse of those in custody. It was bipartisan and championed by the late Senator Ted Kennedy and Senator SESSIONS of Alabama, and I cosponsored it. PREA required the promulgation of national standards to prevent, detect, and respond to prison rape in America. There had been questions raised about whether those standards would apply to immigration detainees, and as I have said before, when we drafted and passed PREA it was our intent it would apply to all in Federal detention, including immigration detainees.

I was pleased when President Obama issued a memo clarifying that PREA applies to all Federal confinement facilities and directing agencies to act accordingly. I was also pleased with the Department of Homeland Security drafting standards to comport with PREA. Secretary Napolitano and I have discussed this problem of sexual assault in detention, and I applaud the Secretary for her strong commitment to this issue.

It was critical to me to have a provision in this VAWA reauthorization that clarifies that standards to prevent custodial rape must apply to immigration detainees—all immigration detainees—a provision that codifies the good work DHS is now doing and ensures strong regulations pertaining to immigration will remain in place in the future.

Mr. President, I have visited some of these immigration detainee facilities. They are not quite prisons but almost. Those who are being detained before being deported have little access to the outside. In my case, I went down to deep southern Illinois, 300-plus miles from Chicago—more than 300 miles from Chicago. It was hard for them to get a telephone they could use for access to family or attorneys. It was a pretty isolated situation. They are clearly in a remote place. Many are treated well but many are not.

Custodial sexual assault is just one of the many issues addressed by this VAWA bill. I urge my colleagues to work together and reauthorize this bill. If this is truly a new day after this last election, if we are truly determined to do things on a bipartisan basis, why isn't this the first thing we do? It used to be bipartisan. It didn't even take that much time to pass it because we were all together on it.

Everybody understands domestic violence—if not from their family, certainly from their life experience and watching what happens in these domestic violence shelters. We have had broad bipartisan support for this in the past. This last year, despite Chairman LEAHY's extraordinary efforts, it fell apart in the House of Representatives. We want to give them another chance—a chance to get it right, a chance to join us in passing a bipartisan bill that we are likely to pass from this Chamber.

The dozens of individuals who have been victimized since I stood up to begin this speech need help now. This is our opportunity. Let's show them that when it comes to protecting America's most vulnerable populations, we will be there.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I take this time because I think it is important people recognize that what we do has such an important impact on local law enforcement and on local agencies.

Last year I hosted a roundtable discussion in Prince George's County, MD, to discuss the importance of reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act, known as VAWA. This roundtable brought together victims, social service agencies, law enforcement, clergy, and others on the frontline of providing support and protection to victims of domestic violence.

VAWA has a proven track record of protecting women from domestic violence, and it is hard to understand opposition to legislation with the goal of curbing domestic violence. Saving women's lives should not be a partisan issue. The statistics of domestic violence are alarming. Yet domestic violence remains one of the most underreported crimes in the country. These victims need to know they have our support, including access to justice, help with housing, medical care, and economic opportunity.

In 2010, there were 10,574 protective orders in my State, and peace order filings in Prince George's County was one-fifth of the total 50,363 filings in the State of Maryland—so 10,000 in Prince George's County, 50,000 in Maryland.

At the roundtable I held in Prince George's County, I heard a number of examples of the importance of VAWA from those on the frontline of combating domestic violence.

Prince George's County sheriff Melvin High told me the oath he took obligates him to protect all people without political consideration. He strongly stated that VAWA should be reauthorized; that it is an extremely important tool that he uses to help protect the people of Prince George's County.

State attorney Angela Alsobrooks told me that for more than a decade, her office has received funding from VAWA that has allowed her domestic violence unit to provide greater services to the victims of abuse. Without this funding, she told me she would lose a domestic violence advocate and a prosecutor who is assigned specifically to domestic violence cases, reducing their ability to help victims. She

urged the House at that time—because we had passed the bill in the Senate—to pass the Senate version of VAWA in order to ensure they continue to receive this critical funding.

Malinda Miles is the executive director of the Family Crisis Center in Prince George's County, which is the premier domestic violence program in the county, serving women and children for more than 30 years. She stated she believes the House bill, if passed, would set back women 50 years—the bill they were considering last year—and would be a travesty for the women and children of this Nation now and for years to come, urging at that time that the bill we passed last year—the bill we are considering on the floor now—needs to pass as quickly as possible.

Prince George's County police chief Mark Magaw told me that combating domestic violence remains a primary focus of his department, and he is thankful for support provided by the VAWA grant program.

The Violence Against Women Act was passed by Congress and signed into law in 1994 by President Clinton. This law has a proud and bipartisan history. Congress passed this legislation in 1994 after growing awareness of crimes associated with domestic violence, including sexual assault and stalking cases. Congress needed to address the prevailing attitude at the time that domestic violence was a private so-called family matter, which in many cases police were hesitant to arrest abusers and prosecutors were reluctant to send abusers to jail. We have changed that, and VAWA helped us change that. The passage of VAWA will help our local agencies protect women and hold those abusers accountable for their actions.

VAWA enhanced investigators and prosecutors of sex offenses and created a number of new grant programs that included law enforcement, public and private entities, services providers, and victims of crime. Congress approved reauthorizations of VAWA that expanded its protections by bipartisan votes in 2000 and 2005. In 2000, Congress enhanced Federal domestic violence and stalking penalties, added protections for battered immigrants, and added new programs for elderly and disabled women. In 2005, Congress enhanced penalties for repeat stalking offenders, added protection for battered and trafficked immigrants, and added programs for sexual assault victims and American Indian victims, as well as programs designed to improve the public health response to domestic violence.

Now, in 2013, the Senate is trying to approve VAWA once again, since its original passage nearly 20 years ago. The Senate-passed version of the law includes measures to ensure that victims are not denied services because they are gay or transgender. It protects Native American women from domestic violence and sexual assault and includes nondiscrimination provisions for all victims, regardless of their race, color, religion or gender.

VAWA encourages collaboration among law enforcement, judicial personnel, and public and private service providers to victims of domestic and sexual violence. It also works to increase public awareness.

One in four women will experience domestic violence in their lifetime. An estimated 1.3 million women are victims of physical assault by an intimate partner every year. In Maryland, in 2009, there were more than 18,000 reported cases of domestic abuse and 38 fatalities. That period of time has been the lowest number of domestic violence-related deaths on record for the State, but these numbers are still very much unacceptable.

I am disappointed that last year the House refused to take up this legislation we approved and also refused to allow us to go to conference to work out the differences between the two bills. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to pass this legislation, and I urge my colleagues in the House to quickly take up the Senate bill and enact it into law.

● Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I am in support of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. I am a cosponsor of this bill and look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this important piece of legislation.

The grants created by this act have helped ensure services to domestic violence victims since 1994. VAWA has helped raise public awareness on an issue that too often went unreported and ignored under the guise of politeness and privacy by family, friends, and neighbors.

Yet, while VAWA has raised awareness, increased reporting, and provided victims of domestic violence and similar crimes with better services and protection against perpetrators, there is still much work to be done to eliminate these crimes. Specifically, I am concerned about the high instances of domestic violence in Indian Country. I am pleased that S. 47 includes language to provide tribal governments the force they need to prosecute non-Indian perpetrators who commit these crimes on tribal land. There is no reason a non-Indian perpetrator should go unpunished because a tribe lacked jurisdiction over him or her, and it is especially egregious that in such cases, the perpetrator may go unpunished for crimes committed on tribal land. Every citizen of this Nation deserves the safety and security that comes with a peaceful home and safe relationship.

Indeed, I believe noncitizen immigrants who have moved to this country and found themselves trapped in an unsafe relationship or family setting also deserve the protections provided by VAWA. S. 47 provides the types of protections necessary to assist law enforcement in prosecuting crimes that might otherwise have gone unreported by immigrants fearful of losing their status.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting S. 47 and will work to make the bill and the services and protections it provides as strong as possible.●

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today to express support for the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA.

For the last 18 years, VAWA has been the centerpiece of the Federal Government's efforts to combat domestic violence, dating violence, stalking and sexual assault, and it has transformed the response to these crimes at the local, State, and Federal levels.

VAWA was first signed into law in 1994. This body reauthorized it in 2000 and again in 2005 on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis.

Unfortunately, final approval of the VAWA reauthorization bill came to an abrupt halt in Congress last year, when some Republicans insisted on removing provisions that would provide expanded protections for gay and lesbian individuals and undocumented immigrants who are the victims of domestic abuse.

In my view, these expanded protections are improvements. Domestic violence is domestic violence, regardless of the victim's immigration status or sexual orientation.

Domestic violence and crimes against American women have never been partisan issues in the past. This is why, candidly, I'm surprised that I find myself on this floor urging a vote a vote on a historically bipartisan bill.

Today, as a result of VAWA, more victims report incidents of domestic violence to the police, and the rate of non-fatal partner violence against women has decreased by 53 percent since 1994, according to the Department of Justice.

Because of VAWA, States have the funding to implement ''evidence-based'' anti-domestic violence programs, including lethality screens, which help law enforcement predict when a person is at risk of becoming the victim of deadly abuse.

In my home State of California, with the help of VAWA funds, we reduced the number of domestic violence homicides committed annually by 30% between 1994—the year of VAWA's enactment—and 2010.

In my days as the mayor of San Francisco, many of the most difficult calls for the city's law enforcement officers were those of domestic abuse. It was a big problem then, and it remains a big problem today.

In California in 2010, there were 166,361 domestic violence calls, including more than 65,000 that involved a weapon.

Fortunately, over 5,000 victims receive assistance each day from local domestic violence service providers in the State. These providers offer services that are essential to ending the cycle of abuse that is faced by so many domestic violence victims.

Let me share a success story about a woman from Lake County, CA who received vital assistance from a local domestic violence center that receives Federal VAWA funding.

Mary—her name has been changed to protect her confidentiality—contacted the Lake Family Resource Center after leaving her abusive husband. Mary was assigned to a domestic violence family advocate who offered her one-on-one counseling and legal assistance.

The family advocate helped Mary file and obtain a temporary restraining order against her husband. This order kept him away from Mary and gave her temporary custody of their children.

The family advocate also accompanied Mary to several court hearings and was able to connect her with other local service providers. This support allowed Mary to remain independent and keep her children safe.

After several months of counseling and assistance, Mary obtained full custody of her children and their lives have improved significantly. For the first time ever, the children are now able to invite friends to their home and participate in normal social activities. In addition, their grades have improved dramatically, with one child receiving the Student of the Month Award from his school.

The positive impact of VAWA funding is undeniable. Yet many California service providers report a critical shortage of funds and staff to assist victims in need.

Reauthorizing VAWA would address these shortages through grant programs administered by the Department of Justice that provide funding for emergency shelters, counseling, and legal services for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

The bill would also continue support for State agencies, rape crisis centers, and other organizations that provide services to vulnerable women.

The bill we are considering today gives increased attention to victims of sexual violence. This form of violence is particularly destructive because, for many years, our society viewed sexual violence as the fault of the victim, not the perpetrator.

Although VAWA has always addressed the crime of sexual assault, a smaller percentage of grant funding has been allocated to sexual assault victims than is proportional to their rates of victimization. This reauthorization bill does three things to address this imbalance:

1. It provides an increased focus on training for law enforcement and prosecutors to address the ongoing needs of sexual assault victims.

2. The bill extends VAWA's housing protections to these victims.

3. And the bill ensures that those who are living with, but not married to, an abuser qualify for housing assistance available under VAWA.

The bill also updates the Federal criminal code to clarify that cyberstalking is a crime. With increasing frequency, victims are being stalked over the Internet through e-mail, blogs, and Facebook. When stalking is done online, the message sent by the perpetrator is memorialized forever, making it more difficult for victims to put the painful experience in the past and move forward in their lives.

Simply put, VAWA saves lives. It protects American women. And it is a lifeline for women and children who are in distress. To me, this bill is a no-brainer. We must continue our ongoing commitment to ending domestic and sexual violence. This commitment has always been bipartisan, and it should be again. Let's not further victimize at-risk American women because of partisan politics.

Let's do our job and reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act with strong bipartisan support, as we always have.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, today the Senate should have been able overwhelmingly to support reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act, but the majority made that impossible. In fact, S. 47 is not really a reauthorization bill but a bill to use the Violence Against Women Act to venture into new ideological territory. For that reason, I cannot support S. 47 but am a cosponsor of the true VAWA reauthorization bill introduced by my colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY.

Two decades ago during the 103rd Congress, as ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, I worked with Chairman JOE BIDEN to develop legislation to combat domestic violence and sexual assault against women. That first passage of the Violence Against Women Act had bipartisan support, although it was by no means without controversy. I took more than my share of criticism from the right, but it was the right thing to do, and I worked to promote a genuine bipartisan consensus behind this legislation.

In 2000, I again cosponsored the Violence Against Women Act which was included in the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act, and the Senate voted 95-to-0 for the conference report. I cosponsored the VAWA reauthorization bill again in 2005, and this time the Senate passed it by unanimous consent without even a roll call vote. Clearly, the trend has been toward broader support.

Unfortunately, the majority today has deliberately stopped that trend. The majority has insisted on injecting into this legislation highly controversial and divisive provisions that were guaranteed to fracture the growing support that VAWA has enjoyed in the past. Many of us asked them not to do it this way but to address these issues separately so that there could be hearings and proper debate. Instead, the majority chose to use VAWA as cover for sidestepping the legislative process on these issues.

Let me give just one example. One of those divisive issues concerns the jurisdiction of courts on Native American reservations. Section 904 of S. 47 would give tribal courts jurisdiction over nontribal individuals in domestic violence cases. This presents numerous constitutional problems. Native American reservations are sovereign nations, and key provisions of the U.S. Constitution's Bill of Rights have been interpreted not to apply there. This legislation lists certain rights to be afforded nontribal defendants but not only stops short of guaranteeing all constitutional rights but also does not provide for direct review of convictions in U.S. courts. I simply cannot support depriving American citizens of constitutional rights and judicial protection.

I want to applaud my colleague from Texas, Senator CORNYN, who has been trying mightily to correct this grave constitutional defect in S. 47. He has negotiated in good faith in a principled and fair way. Like me, he wants to support reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. But like him, I will do so only on the appropriate constitutional and policy grounds.

I have cosponsored the Violence Against Women Act three times. I voted last year to reauthorize it and will do so again today. But while I support reauthorizing VAWA, I cannot support using VAWA as a vehicle to enact divisive and controversial new measures that have not been properly evaluated on their own terms. Had the majority taken the same approach as we did in 2000 and 2005, this legislation would have been passed and signed into law months ago. Instead, the majority has destroyed the bipartisan consensus in favor of unconstitutional and divisive efforts to favor special interests.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I thank the leader, Senator LEAHY, for his leadership in trying to get the Violence Against Women Act passed and for being down here and working on an agreement with the other side of the aisle so we can vote either today or in the near future. Hopefully, we will bring this issue to an end and get along with protecting the rights of women throughout the United States of America.

I am very anxious to help and further that debate. I come to the floor as the chair of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee and as somebody who has spent a lot of time dealing with tribal leadership in the State of Washington and throughout the Pacific Northwest. I know the Presiding Officer has a very large tribal population within her State too. I am sure she has had had many experiences with those tribes. Like me, she wants to make sure all victims of domestic violence are protected in America.

In Washington State, we receive over 30,000 domestic violence calls a year. That is more than 500 incidents per week. Our domestic violence programs serve about 1,800 people each day, and that is why we need to move past this debate, get this legislation reauthorized, so we make sure we help protect victims.

A woman named Carissa Daniels came to one of our events recently. She fled from a very abusive domestic violence situation with her 3-year-old daughter. She said she is alive because of the Violence Against Women Act. Those safeguards and protections protected her and her daughter.

I come to the floor, and I am a little frustrated this debate has been bogged down over a few issues, particularly this issue as it relates to Native Americans and the rights of Native Americans.

I think we had the Department of Justice come to the Congress with a very good solution because their point was we have an epidemic of violence against women in Indian country, and we don't have a ready solution as it relates to the necessary law enforcement there to protect them.

I don't mean to be elementary, but going back through our country's history and our relationship with tribal governments, it is a Federal relationship. To secure that Federal relationship, we have basically said these are rights for the Federal Government and not the States. In many ways, we have eliminated what States can do as it relates to tribal land. The challenge we have is that on these tribal reservations we need to make sure the law is enforced—a Federal law—and that there are individuals to carry out that Federal law.

By voting for the underlying amendment, maybe my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have an appropriations authorization that says this is how we are going to deal with it: We are going to give you a Federal prosecutor and a Federal agent on every tribal reservation or in every jurisdiction. I don't know how many that would be in my State. We have vast and huge amounts of land. I guess, if they thought that was going to be effective, there would have to be a prosecutor and a Federal agent in probably 39 different parts of my State. If we multiply that in the West—or even just in the Presiding Officer's State—we are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars the Federal Government would have to dole out to properly police and enforce Federal law as it relates to crimes against these women.

Why isn't anybody recommending that? Because I think the Department of Justice has adequately seen that the best way to do this is to build a partnership with those tribal jurisdictions to get that done.

In looking over the history of this, I am always amazed at what previous administrations—Republican administrations—said about this tribal relationship. Even George H.W. Bush's Solicitor General Kenneth Starr stated in a filing in the Supreme Court that ''it remains true today that the State has no jurisdiction over on-reservation offenses involving Indians. . . . ''

George W. Bush's Solicitor General said that ''the policy of leaving Indians free from State jurisdiction and control'' is one that ''is deeply rooted in the Nation's history.''

So here are Republican administrations that have basically said the way to deal with this is a Federal relationship. I am saying to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that unless they are willing to put a Federal prosecutor and a Federal agent on all tribal reservations, who do they think is going to prosecute these crimes? Who? Who is going to prosecute them? That is why the Department of Justice came to us and said: We have an idea on how we might do it. Let's try to get a partnership with tribal jurisdictions to make sure justice is being brought on tribal land but do so by protecting the civil liberties of American citizens as we go through this process.

That is the legislation that is before us. It passed out of the Judiciary Committee and is now on the Senate floor. My colleagues across the aisle are trying to strip those very rights that Native American women would have.

The way this would work is obviously tribal jurisdictions would prosecute these individuals. If there is anyone who doesn't think this is a problem—it is amazing to me to think this concept that one of our other colleagues might be proposing, that somehow we would say: OK. A solution would be to say it is a lesser crime if an Indian woman is assaulted on a tribal reservation, and it would be a misdemeanor. Somehow aggressive abuse and violent attacks against women would be a misdemeanor. I am not going to treat Native American women as second-class citizens in the United States of America.

I get that might have been the cultural norm of the 1700s and 1800s, but it has no place in our history in 2013. This is about legislation that will protect tribal women on Indian reservations and make sure these cases of abuse—whether they are done by a Native American or non-Native American—are protected.

Consider the case of Diane Millich. Her ex-husband was never arrested any of the more than 100 times he had beaten her or attacked her. Finally, he showed up at her workplace with a gun to kill her. She is alive because an individual from her workplace pushed her out of the way. Her husband is being treated as a first-time offender because all those other times he beat her or domestically assaulted her, he was never prosecuted because it took place on a reservation.

This epidemic is so great that now these people who are involved in sex and drug trafficking are targeting reservations and Indian women because they know they will not get prosecuted. They know this.

We are allowing an intolerable situation to grow in great extremes simply because we are missing a vital tool. I get that many of my colleagues may not understand the history of tribal law and the history of our country and securing a relationship with tribes and the treaties we signed.

Again, as I said before, this is a relationship we have preserved for the Federal Government, and the Federal Government is saying this is how we can best solve these crimes by getting the help and support of tribal jurisdictions.

I wish to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, because I have heard some of them say that somehow this violates the civil liberties of non-Native Americans if these crimes happen in Indian Country, that nothing could be further from the truth.

First of all, all tribal courts also adhere to the Indian Civil Rights Act, which is basically our 14th amendment. So the security of the 14th amendment is right there in the law and will protect any non-Native American who is charged with this crime on a reservation.

Secondly, this law has specifically broad language, making sure the defendant would be protected with all rights required by the United States in order for this jurisdiction to have oversight. It is almost like a double protection—saying it twice—that the habeas corpus rights of individuals will be protected under this statute.

The notion that this is somehow abrogating individual rights just because the crime takes place on a tribal reservation is incorrect. So I ask my colleagues: Do we want to continue to have this unbelievable growth and petri dish of crime evolving—when criminals know there is a porous border, that is where they are going to go—or do we want to partner with a recommendation that has been determined by the Department of Justice, which has the authority to carry out this Federal law on tribal reservations and is asking for this partnership but with due protection so we can root out this evil in our communities.

I would say to my colleagues, it is time to pass this legislation and protect these rights for all individuals. We cannot vote for an amendment on the other side of the aisle that basically strips the rights of Native American women and treats them like second-class citizens, nor can we just go silent on what is an epidemic problem in our country. What we have to do is stand and realize that the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian Country is a very mature relationship with a lot of Federal case law behind it. A lot of Republican administrations recognize it is a Federal relationship and that we can—asking Indian Country to help us—solve this problem and prosecute these individuals under the rights we have as constitutional citizens of the United States.

I am confident we can get to an answer and resolve this issue. I say to my colleagues: We need to do so with urgency. We cannot allow another 1,800 calls to go unanswered or not supported because we have not authorized this legislation. Let's get our job done and protect all women throughout the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I would like to speak on the amendment, if I could.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. PORTMAN. Earlier this week, my colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL spoke about an amendment we are offering to the Violence Against Women Act, and it is an amendment that has to do with child sex trafficking. I am pleased to join him in offering this important amendment and talking about it today.

This is really a technical correction to the underlying legislation to enhance the safety of our youth and our children in the area of sex trafficking.

Last November, Senator BLUMENTHAL and I started the Senate Caucus to End Human Trafficking. We have been working with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and have been making bipartisan progress on this issue. In general, we are working to raise awareness of human trafficking, and with regard to the underlying bill, the issue of child sex trafficking.

This issue cuts across all party and philosophical lines. It is something that is more fundamental. It is about who we are as a people, and how we respect and protect basic human dignity. It is important to acknowledge that human trafficking is not something we hear about that happens overseas; it happens right here in America. Unfortunately, human trafficking is an issue present in communities in Ohio and Connecticut—where Senator BLUMENTHAL is from—and in all of our States.

Children and youth are among the most vulnerable individuals and are at the greatest risk. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, there are now nearly 300,000 young Americans who are at risk of commercial sexual exploitation and trafficking.

The Department of Justice reports that between 2008 and 2010, 83 percent of sex trafficking victims found within the United States were U.S. citizens. By the way, 40 percent of those cases involve sexual exploitation of children. Human trafficking has a devastating impact on so many Americans across this country.

One of the reasons we lack data on the definitive number of victims is that there are limited programs and resources available to serve these children nationwide, and this problem is not limited to large cities or metropolitan areas.

In Ohio, the 2012 Human Trafficking Commission Report surveyed more than 300 Ohio youth victims of sex trafficking. The report found that 40 percent were also victims of sexual abuse; 47 percent of the victims surveyed confirmed they had been raped 1 year before being trafficked.

Dr. Celia Williamson, from Toledo, OH, is one of the key individuals responsible for this report and continues to work to strengthen the response to sex trafficking in Ohio. Dr. Williamson developed the program, RESCUE CHILD, which educates first responders and everyday citizens on how to recognize the signs of child sex trafficking.

This is an important issue for Ohio. Toledo, OH, is among the highest in the country in terms of prosecution and investigations of sex trafficking. Dr. Williamson has helped to educate folks to identify signs of sex trafficking and high vulnerability. Some of the key signs of high vulnerability to sex trafficking are youth who have run away from home and children who are victims of sexual assault, emotional abuse, child abuse, or neglect. In order to fight human trafficking, we have to prioritize services to these vulnerable youth and connect victims of sex trafficking with appropriate resources.

So this amendment is really just a technical amendment to ensure that we protect these child victims of sex trafficking and provide them with what is necessary to fully recover from this devastating trauma.

Section 302 of the reauthorization of VAWA is appropriating titled ''Creating Hope Through Outreach, Options, Services, and Education for Children and Youth.'' The intent of this section is to ''develop, expand, and strengthen victim-centered interventions and services that target victim-centered youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.''

Section 302 omits the term ''sex trafficking'' except in the context of a ''co-occurrence'' with one of these other factors I mentioned. So in order to be covered under this section, victims would have to be victims of sexual assault or another violation as well as victims of sex trafficking.

The omission of ''sex trafficking'' seems to be inadvertent because it is inconsistent with the similar sections of the reauthorization. One example of this is found in Section 902, which provides grants to Indian tribunal governments for the safety of women and youth. This section provides for ''services to address the needs of youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sex trafficking, and stalking.'' So sex trafficking is in one section but not in another. We want to clarify that being a victim of sex trafficking alone should be sufficient to be covered under this act.

I thank Senator BLUMENTHAL for his commitment to this issue, and I thank my colleagues, including the ranking member and the chairman who are here on the floor today. I hope to offer this amendment at the appropriate point in the process, but I wanted to speak a little bit about it and explain why Senator BLUMENTHAL and I would like to offer this. Again, we hope it will be a noncontroversial, technical correction to ensure that sex trafficking is included among those provisions that are listed in Section 302.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I hope to offer an amendment that would be a Republican substitute, so whenever that happens—I don't know exactly when, but I wish to discuss my amendment at this point.

My amendment does more to protect the rights of victims of domestic violence and sex crimes than does the underlying piece of legislation. There are many ways in which this is so. Under the substitute amendment I will offer, more money goes to the victims and less to bureaucrats. It requires that 10 percent of the grantees be audited every year to ensure that taxpayer funds are actually used to combat domestic violence. It seems to me that when dollars are short, that is a very important point that people ought to take cognizance of.

The Justice Department inspector general conducted a review of 22 VAWA grantees between the years 1998 and 2010. Of these 22, 21 were found to have some form of violation of grant requirements, ranging from unauthorized and unallowable expenditures to sloppy record keeping and failure to report in a timely manner. In 2010 one grantee was found by the inspector general to have questionable costs for 93 percent of the nearly $900,000 they received from the Department of Justice. A 2009 audit found that nearly $500,000 of a $680,000 grant was questionable.

These fiscal irregularities continue. An inspector general audit from last year found that the Violence Against Women Act grant recipient in the Virgin Islands engaged in almost $850,000 of questionable spending. Also, a grant to an Indian tribe in Idaho had about $250,000 in improperly spent funds, including $171,000 in salary for an unapproved position. In Michigan last year, a woman at a VAWA grant recipient used some of those funds to purchase goods and services for her personal use.

After all of those examples, the point is this: We should make sure Violence Against Women Act money goes to victims. That hasn't been the case under the current situation, and the substitute works toward improving that situation.

The substitute also prevents grantees from using taxpayer funds to lobby for more taxpayer funds. That seems to be pretty common sense.

My amendment will ensure that more money is available for victim services. That is where the money is supposed to go. Money that goes to grantees and is squandered helps no woman or other victims.

In addition, the Republican alternative limits the amount of VAWA funds that can go to administrative fees and salaries to just 7.5 percent. The present underlying bill, S. 47, contains no such limit. If we want the money to go to victims and not to bureaucrats, then those overhead expenses should be capped.

The Republican substitute amendment requires that 30 percent of the STOP grants and grants for arrest policies and protection orders are targeted on sexual assault. The underlying bill sets aside only 20 percent for sexual assault.

The substitute requires that training materials be approved by an outside accredited organization to ensure that those who address domestic violence help victims based on knowledge and not on ideology. That will result in more effective assistance to the victims. The underlying bill contains no such requirement.

The substitute protects due process rights the majority bill threatens. Now, I am sure the majority writers don't feel their bill threatens due process rights, so let me explain. The majority bill says that college campuses must provide for ''prompt and equitable investigation and resolution'' of charges of violence or stalking. This essentially does nothing but codify a proposed rule of the Department of Education that would have required the imposition of a civil standard or preponderance of the evidence for what is essentially a criminal charge—one that, if proved, rightfully should harm reputation. But if established on a barely-more-probable-than-not standard, reputations can then be ruined unfairly. The substitute eliminates this provision as well as another provision that allowed the victim who could not prove such a charge even under this reduced standard to appeal if she lost, creating a kind of double jeopardy.

The majority bill also would give Indian tribal courts the ability to issue protective orders and full civil jurisdiction over non-Indians based on actions allegedly taken in Indian Country. Noting that the due process clause requires that courts exercise jurisdiction over only those persons who have ''minimum contacts'' with the forum, the Congressional Research Service has raised constitutional concerns with this provision. The substitute contains provisions that would benefit tribal women and would not run afoul of the Constitution.

Tribes could seek protective orders in Federal court. The substitute establishes up to $25 million for Federal prosecutors and magistrates to be placed near tribes for criminal domestic violence and sexual assault cases as well as to hear tribal motions for protective orders.

The grant funds are paid for by reducing the overhead of other Justice Department grant funds. However, there will be no reduction in available grants for law enforcement or victims. These programs are not currently funded to their authorized levels, so the reductions will not reduce services provided.

Combating violence against women also means tougher penalties for those who commit these terrible crimes. The substitute I am referring to creates a 10-year mandatory minimum sentence for Federal convictions for forcible rape. The majority bill even eliminates the 5-year mandatory minimum sentence for this crime that was in the bill last year and supported last year by the Judiciary Committee.

Child pornography is an actual record of a crime scene of violence against women. Our alternative amendment establishes a 1-year mandatory minimum sentence for possession of child pornography where the victim depicted is under 12 years of age. I believe the mandatory minimum for this crime should be higher and that in light of the systematically lenient sentences that too many Federal judges hand out, there should be a mandatory minimum sentence for all child pornography possession convictions. But the substitute at least is a start. This is especially true because the majority bill takes no action against child pornography.

Our alternative also imposes a 5-year mandatory minimum sentence for the crime of aggravated sexual assault. This crime involves sexual assault through the use of drugs and by otherwise rendering the victim unconscious. The underlying bill does nothing about aggravated sexual assault. The status quo appears to be fine for the other side.

The Republican substitute establishes a 10-year mandatory minimum sentence for the crime of interstate domestic violence that results in the death of a victim. It increases from 20 to 25 years the statutory maximum sentence for the crime where it results in life-threatening bodily injury to or the permanent disfigurement of the victim. It increases from 10 to 15 years the mandatory maximum sentence for this crime when serious bodily injury to the victim is the result. The underlying bill contains none of these important protections for domestic violence victims.

Also included in my substitute are commonsense immigration reforms that put integrity back into the Violence Against Women Act self-petitioning process and the U visa program.

This last Congress, the Judiciary Committee heard the powerful testimony of Julie Poner. She described her personal experience as a victim of immigration marriage fraud and with the fraudulent use of Violence Against Women Act self-petitions. Ms. Poner told us she married her husband in the Czech Republic and moved her husband and kids back to the United States. Within days of receiving notice of an interview with the immigration service to finalize her husband's immigration status, he told her he was divorcing her. He instructed her to file for the divorce and continue to sponsor him for his green card. He then became abusive toward her children. Her husband was a hockey player—6 feet 2 inches tall. However, he knew he risked deportation if the truth came out, so he turned the tables on his wife and claimed he was the one abused—actually being abused by Ms. Poner. Ms. Poner never was allowed to share her side of the story. The immigration service believed his claims and allowed him to remain in the United States.

Our committee also received written statements from more than 20 individuals who maintained they were victims of marriage fraud or were falsely accused as part of the Violence Against Women Act self-petitions. These witnesses told of their firsthand experiences and how foreign nationals prey on U.S. citizens simply to get a green card. The U.S. citizens thought it was all for love, but after saying ''I do,'' the foreign national lodged false allegations, sometimes of physical abuse, in order to get out of the marriage, collect alimony, and secure a green card.

Witnesses have said their side of the story was never—never—heard because under the process used by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, the citizen's side of the story is not considered. The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services handles all of these green card applications in one service center that relies exclusively on paper, without interviewing either the alleged abused foreign national or the accused citizen.

To this day, I am disappointed that antifraud measures have not been included in the Violence Against Women Act. We cannot allow a law intended to prevent abuse to be manipulated as a pathway to U.S. citizenship for foreign con artists and criminals. If we are truly concerned about helping and protecting the victims of domestic violence, then we should include a provision that allows our immigration agents to hear both sides of the story when a foreign national applies for a green card after alleging domestic violence by a U.S. citizen.

So my amendment, obviously, addresses this fraud. It would require an interview of the applicant and allow the government to gather other evidence and interview other witnesses, including the accused U.S. citizen or legal permanent resident.

Before adjudicating the self-petition, the government would have to determine whether other investigations or prosecutions are underway for the petitioning alien. If there are other allegations or investigations pending, the immigration adjudication would have to consider all facts.

The second immigration-related section of my amendment would strengthen the requirements of a U visa. Under current law, the requirements for receiving a U visa are generous. My

amendment implements some commonsense requirements to guide law enforcement who help sponsor these individuals.

In addition to confirming that the alien has been helpful, each law enforcement certification will also have to confirm that, one, the alien reported the criminal activity to a law enforcement agency within 120 days of its occurrence; two, the statute of limitations for prosecuting an offense based on the criminal activity has not lapsed; three, the criminal activity is actively under investigation or a prosecution has been commenced; and, four, and last, the alien has information that will assist in identifying the perpetrator of the criminal activity and/or the perpetrator's identity is known.

With these changes, U visas will become a true law enforcement tool. The additional requirements will ensure that the help given is real and significantly advances an actual investigation and prosecution.

Another immigration-related section of my amendment includes a Government Accountability Office report to assess the efficiency and reliability of the process for reviewing applications for U visas and self-petitions under the Violence Against Women Act, including whether the process includes adequate safeguards against fraud and abuse.

It will also identify possible improvements in order to reduce fraud and abuse.

The final immigration provision I want to highlight in my substitute would allow the U.S. Government to deport repeat drunk drivers. Section 1005 would add habitual drunk driving to the list of aggravated felonies for which an alien may be deported.

Every day—every day—an innocent life is taken because someone decides to drink and drive. An individual who gets behind the wheel after drinking is not exercising sound judgment.

Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, foreign nationals are required to be of ''good moral character'' before they are able to adjust status or become citizens of the United States. Unfortunately, habitual drunk driving does not stand in one's way from gaining these benefits. In other words, it is not a deportable offense.

There are numerous stories about individuals who have taken innocent lives because they were driving under the influence of alcohol. In 2011, an undocumented alien in Cook County, IL, killed a man in a drunk driving accident. Unfortunately, he was released by the county, absconded, and remains in the United States. There was also a Virginia man who killed a Catholic nun in Prince William County in 2010. He was an illegal immigrant and repeat offender and never should have been allowed to remain in the country.

There are many more cases, and, unfortunately, the law will allow drunk driving to continue without repercussions for foreign nationals who are on a path to citizenship. It is time that these offenses were classified as an aggravated felony. It is time to get these people off the streets. Residing in the United States is a privilege, not a right.

The Congress has every prerogative to dictate which behavior is acceptable, especially for noncitizens who should be of ''good moral character.'' Last Congress, the Judiciary Committee adopted an amendment to this bill that would have classified habitual drunk driving offenses as aggravated felonies. But in the bill before us now, the majority has dropped that provision. I cannot understand why we would be so lenient with respect to habitual drunk drivers.

When we get to amendments—the substitute I just talked about—I intend to offer that substitute, and I would urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the Republican substitute bill being offered by the Senator from Iowa does not meet the needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Respectfully, I must say it is a poor substitute for the bipartisan Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act we developed over the last 2 years that has 62 bipartisan Senate cosponsors. I urge Senators to vote against it.

The Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act already reflects many efforts we have undertaken to address the concerns of Senator GRASSLEY and to meet Republican members halfway, and to accommodate them where we could. Our bill includes significant new accountability provisions modeled on language Senator GRASSLEY had us include in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act.

Our bill significantly reduces authorization levels to all programs. This is the first time a reauthorization reduced authorization levels, and we do so by almost 20 percent. Our bill consolidates and streamlines 13 programs. Our bill limits the percentage of grants that organizations can use for planning purposes. In drafting our bill, we eliminated several provisions that Senator GRASSLEY indicated were problematic. We took these steps in an effort to work together to pass a bipartisan bill.

The proposed substitute bill would remove fundamental points of fairness that are at the core of this legislation. We need to cover everyone who experiences domestic and sexual violence in this country. No exceptions.

About 3½ years ago, the Congress finally adopted the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act which protected those targeted with violence in a similar way to what we are considering today. We should not retreat from that position when we are addressing domestic and sexual violence.

The Republican substitute abandons VAWA's historic emphasis on abuse of women. Women are still more often the victims of domestic and sexual violence with more catastrophic results. The Republican substitute not only fails women, it also fails to guarantee that services will actually reach those victims who have in the past been unable to access them because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

We should listen to those on the front lines of these tragedies who have told us about underserved communities needing protection. We should respond to law enforcement when they tell us about the importance of the U visa program, which enables them to take dangerous people off the street. We should not adopt the measures included in the Republican substitute that would make it more difficult for victims to apply for U visas. The Republican substitute would abandon our provisions that address domestic and sexual violence in tribal areas, which has reached epidemic proportions with rates of victimization far exceeding those in the general population. Taking money from other Justice Department programs to impose Federal judges and prosecutors on Indian lands is costly, unworkable and a non-solution to the problem. The bipartisan reauthorization bill, by contrast, takes the approach recommended by our Committee on Indian Affairs. We include local, community-based approaches to domestic violence that have worked so well in so many VAWA programs. Federal prosecutors already have authority to prosecute on these lands and have not solved the problem. Federal judges have plenty to do and our Federal courts are stretched thin with 83 current vacancies. Giving tribes the authority to prosecute those who commit violence against Indian victims on Indian land is a better and less costly solution than bringing in large numbers of Federal officials to Indian country.

All these differences are in the wrong direction and would result in leaving victims out. The Grassley substitute also includes costly and inefficient bureaucratic provisions that could cripple the delivery of needed services to victims and tie up the work of the Justice Department's Office of Inspector General.

In contrast to the Republican substitute, the bipartisan VAWA reauthorization bill responds to the needs we have heard from the professionals, including law enforcement, who work every day to help victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. No one I have worked with has identified Federal sentencing as an area requiring changes. The sentencing provisions in this substitute, which include mandatory minimum sentences, are unnecessary and counterproductive. In fact, leading sexual assault advocacy groups like the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence oppose mandatory minimum sentences because they have a chilling effect on reporting and prosecution of

sexual assaults. The sentencing provisions in the substitute make victims and, by extension, our communities less safe.

We should not include extraneous provisions, as this substitute does, that have nothing to do with domestic violence or sexual assault. Comprehensive immigration reform is coming before us. The Judiciary Committee is hard at work on that. Proposals to change deportations may be appropriate in the context of comprehensive immigration reform. They have nothing to do with VAWA. Yet they are included in the Republican substitute. And when a provision of that type was included in the measure last year, its author nonetheless opposed VAWA reauthorization. It can be considered with comprehensive immigration reform, not here.

Every previous reauthorization of VAWA has contained new protections for immigrants and underserved communities. Our bill builds on that foundation with changes that are modest and widely supported.

The Republican substitute would gut core provisions of our bipartisan legislation that we all know we need and that professionals in the field tell us are needed. I thank Senator CANTWELL, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and Senator DURBIN for their excellent statements in opposition and urge all Senators to oppose the substitute and support the bipartisan Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I listened to everything the chairman said. I am not going to rebut point by point. I wish to take a little bit of time to emphasize the key points I have tried to make. In a sense, I might be asking the chairman to think in terms of what we are trying to accomplish just on a couple of points.

First of all, I think this is pointed out with the underlying bill that somehow all victims are not protected. The point is, that for however many years now—I suppose it is 25 years that this legislation has been on the books—all victims are protected under the substitute and, I want to emphasize, under current law.

It was then-Senator BIDEN, now Vice President BIDEN, writing the current law. His law did not discriminate. As Senator LEAHY says, those who provide domestic violence services believe a victim is a victim. They do not discriminate.

On another point about the tribal courts, I made reference to the Congressional Research Service when I gave my longer remarks on this point of questionable constitutional issues. As for the tribal court provisions, the Congressional Research Service has raised serious constitutional problems both with respect to the authority of tribal courts to prosecute non-Indians and the constitutional rights of non-Indians. What is very cruel is to provide tribal women the illusion of a solution that courts may well strike down on constitutional grounds in the future.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the only first-degree amendments in order to the bill: Grassley substitute amendment No. 14, Leahy amendment No. 21, Portman amendment No. 10, Murkowski amendment No. 11, Coburn amendment No. 13, Coburn amendment No. 15, and Coburn amendment No. 16; that the time until 4 p.m. be for debate on the Grassley substitute; that the debate be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that at 4 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Grassley substitute amendment; that there be no amendments in order to any of the amendments on this list prior to votes in relation to the amendments; that when the Senate resumes consideration of the bill following any leader remarks on Monday, February 11, the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to votes in relation to the remaining amendments and passage of the underlying bill as amended, if amended; further, that Senator CORNYN have 45 minutes under his control on the Republican side; and there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I have spoken on this earlier, but I would just tell my colleagues why I will oppose this substitute which will be voted on in a few minutes. The substitute does not meet the needs of victims of domestic violence or dating violence or sexual assault or stalking. I think it is a poor substitute for the bipartisan Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act that we have developed over the last 2 years, and which has 62 bipartisan Senate cosponsors. That is why I will urge Senators to vote against it.

The proposed substitute bill would remove fundamental points of fairness that are at the core of this legislation. We need to cover everyone who experiences domestic and sexual violence in this country, with no exceptions. Again, I have said 100 times on this floor, a victim is a victim is a victim; violence is violence is violence. You can't say this victim will get protection, but this victim won't get protection. The police never do that; we shouldn't do it.

Also, this substitute abandons VAWA's historic emphasis on abuse of women. Women are still more often the victims of domestic and sexual violence, with more catastrophic results. The substitute not only fails women, it fails to guarantee that services will actually reach those victims who in the past have been unable to access them.

Every previous reauthorization of VAWA has contained new protections for immigrants and underserved communities. Our bill builds on that foundation with changes that are modest and are widely supported by faith-based organizations, the law enforcement community, and those who work against domestic violence.

We have gone all over this country to find the best way to do this. This is what we have done in this bill. And what bothers me the most about the substitute is that it guts the core provisions of our bipartisan legislation. We know we need these services, and professionals in the field tell us they are needed. Look at what we have in our bipartisan reauthorization bill. It responds to the needs we have heard of from the professionals, including law enforcement. These are the people who work every day to help victims of domestic violence and sexual assault and dating violence and stalking.

No one I have worked with has identified Federal sentencing as an area that requires changes, so the sentencing provisions in the substitute are unnecessary and counterproductive.

Earlier I went through this I think point by point. I won't repeat that, but I would say to all the Members of this body, Republicans and Democrats alike, who have worked to craft this bipartisan piece of legislation: Please vote against this substitute amendment, because it is nothing, nothing at all like what we have worked on.

Madam President, what is the amendment before us now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has not yet been offered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, under the unanimous consent request agreement, am I correct the Grassley substitute is to be voted on in about 30 seconds?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, normally I would call it up, but I understand Senator GRASSLEY is almost here. As a matter of courtesy, I will not call it up; but if there is going to be a delay, because people are expecting this 4 o'clock vote—

Mrs. BOXER. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam President: What is the order right now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order is for the Grassley substitute to be offered and voted upon.

Mrs. BOXER. At 4 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 4 o'clock.

Mrs. BOXER. Due to what is happening here, I would say that if he doesn't make his presentation in 5 minutes that we could vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 14

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, on behalf of Senator GRASSLEY, and probably to his dismay, I call up the Grassley amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for Mr. GRASSLEY, for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. JOHANNS proposes an amendment numbered 14.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 65, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 13 Leg.]

YEAS—34

Alexander	Flake	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hatch	Scott
Burr	Heller	Sessions
Chambliss	Hoeven	Shelby
Coats	Inhofe	Thune
Cochran	Isakson	Toomey
Corker	Johanns	Vitter
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Wicker
Enzi	McCain	
Fischer	McConnell	

NAYS—65

Ayotte	Feinstein	McCaskill
Baldwin	Franken	Menendez
Baucus	Gillibrand	Merkley
Begich	Hagan	Mikulski
Bennet	Harkin	Moran
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Murkowski
Boxer	Heitkamp	Murphy
Brown	Hirono	Murray
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Nelson
Cardin	Kaine	Paul
Carper	King	Pryor
Casey	Kirk	Reed
Collins	Klobuchar	Reid
Coons	Landrieu	Rockefeller
Cowan	Lautenberg	Rubio
Crapo	Leahy	Sanders
Cruz	Lee	Schatz
Donnelly	Levin	Schumer
Durbin	Manchin	Shaheen
Stabenow	Udall (NM)	Whitehouse
Tester	Warner	Wyden
Udall (CO)	Warren	

NOT VOTING—1

Coburn

The amendment (No. 14) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

CARL LEVIN'S 12,000TH VOTE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, a few minutes ago Senator CARL LEVIN cast his 12,000th vote. It is my honor to say a few words about CARL LEVIN. He has served the State of Michigan for 35 years and is the longest serving Senator in the history of that State. During his 35 years in the Senate, he has been known as a workhorse. If there is a problem that needs to be looked over by someone who understands the issue, go to Senator LEVIN. He is a person who dots all the I's and crosses all the T's. I depend—and have depended—on him so much for issues that are difficult.

He is a native of Detroit and attended Swathmore College. He graduated—as I always remind him—from Harvard Law School. I called them several times, but obviously my application was lost. I never heard back from them.

He served as general counsel to the Michigan Civil Rights Commission and as assistant attorney general for the State of Michigan. He ran for the Detroit City Council and served two terms there. He was elected in 1978 to the U.S. Senate where he has served six terms and is an effective champion for the people of Michigan.

Public service runs in his family. SANDER LEVIN is his older brother, who came to the House of Representatives in 1982 with me, Durbin, Carper, Boxer, to name just a few.

Senator LEVIN has heard me say this several times, and I will continue to say it because it is one of the most impressive, memorable statements I have ever had in a very personal setting. I was in the House of Representatives, and I was thinking about running for the Senate. I went over to meet with CARL LEVIN to get his ideas. As I was trying to establish some rapport with him, I said: I am serving with your brother. He and I came here together. Without hesitation and so sincerely, he looked up at me and said: Yes, he is my brother, but he is also my best friend.

I have never, ever forgotten that. That speaks so well of the Levin family. Sandy has been the chair of the House Ways and Means Committee and is now the ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee. CARL is very proud of his brother's service, as Sandy is proud of the service of his brother.

CARL LEVIN has been the chair of the Armed Services Committee, which of course is one of the most important and powerful committees in the entire Congress. He is a respected voice on issues dealing with national security. He has done so much to improve the status of men and women in the military for our great country.

The very first bill he introduced as a Senator speaks to the kind of person he is and the issues he cares about. He introduced a bill to end discrimination by credit card companies. Two Congresses ago we did some real good reforms during the credit card debate. Senator LEVIN was involved in that, as well he should have been, because he was the first to bring to the attention of the American people what needed to be done.

He is also the chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which for decades has done great work for this country. Under his guidance and leadership, it has done some remarkably good work. He was the one who delved deeply into the Enron collapse. Again, that committee has done a lot of work on abusive credit card practices. It is one of the main reasons we were able to get the credit card reform done.

He led investigations in the 2008 financial crisis. He has looked very closely and did a wonderful report on what I refer to as tax loopholes, and I think that is how he refers to it also. He has been one of the country's leading experts—and certainly one of the leading experts in this body—of American manufacturers. We know that manufacturing has had such strong forces in Michigan in years past and they are coming back as a result of the work the Michigan delegation has done, led by Senator LEVIN.

He is someone who understands that we have a new world, we have global markets, and we have to continue working hard to make sure we are a part of that, and we are.

He has fought to protect the Great Lakes—Michigan's signature natural resource.

He is married to Barbara, a wonderful woman, who has been so thoughtful and kind to me, but especially my wife, during her recent illness. They have been married since 1961. They have three daughters and six grandchildren.

CARL LEVIN is somebody whom I so admire. He has a lot of service left in him. There are so many things he is capable of doing as a result of the positions he now holds in the Senate. The one thing I admire so much about CARL LEVIN—as I have already indicated—is how strongly he feels about his family. He and his brother have a piece of property in Michigan. They call it the tree farm. In Searchlight I still have my hat they gave me that says ''Tree Farm.'' He has talked to me on many occasions—we haven't talked lately—about how he and his brother like to walk on their tree farm. There is nothing there but trees, but it is an occasion for them to be together as brothers.

Congratulations to CARL LEVIN on reaching this impressive milestone of 12,000 votes. Not only has he left that mark—he left that mark in my mind and anyone who has served with him—but he has left his mark as being an extraordinary man.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it has been my honor to have served with the senior Senator from Michigan for almost three decades now, and I too want to rise and congratulate him on achieving this milestone. There is no Member of the Senate who is brighter or more hard working. We have had a good example of that here in the last couple of months of Senator LEVIN's respect for the institution and his desire to protect the traditions of this institution. I want him to know that he is widely respected all throughout the Senate, and particularly on this side of the aisle.

I congratulate him for this important achievement and look forward to working with him in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan. This is the day he has cast his 12,000th vote. What is most significant is not the quantity of his votes, but the quality of his votes. Each one of those has had Michigan's face on it when he cast those votes.

As our majority leader indicated, Senator LEVIN has been a champion for the automotive industry, manufacturing, his beloved Detroit, our beautiful and wonderful Great Lakes, the Department of Defense and, more particularly, the men and women who serve us every day.

I rise on behalf of everyone in Michigan to say how proud we are of Senator LEVIN. We have great confidence in his judgment, integrity, and hard work. In my book, there is nobody better.

Of course, I am very thrilled with the wonderful family he and Barbara have. He is ahead of me on grandchildren, but I am working on it. He is not only someone with the right ethics, integrity, and love for his family, nobody fights harder and does the right thing for Michigan more than CARL LEVIN.

I join in congratulating him. Once again I want to say it is not about the number of votes but the quality of votes. Every one of those 12,000 votes has had Michigan's name on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, first I want to thank my dear colleague from Michigan, Senator STABENOW. We have worked so closely together on Michigan issues. She is one great partner, and I am proud to represent Michigan with her at my side and her as a partner.

Talking about partners, my wife Barbara has been married to me for 51 years, and she is my lifelong—excuse me. I have to straighten this out. My brother is my lifelong best buddy. He was there when I was born. I have to modify what Senator REID said. For the last 51 years, my wife has been my best buddy, and my brother has been my second-best buddy, but I am blessed with family. I would like to thank everyone for mentioning my family.

I am blessed with a staff that is led by David Lyles. I have great friendships here in this body and there is no substitute for the kind of friendships and relationships which make this body work. Even when it doesn't appear to be working, it is working. I know the public gets frustrated with us at times, but this is an extraordinarily resilient body.

Many times during the 34 years I have been here there have been periods when we have been frustrated in terms of getting our work done, but we pull through in this wonderful, noble institution. This venerable institution is being protected here by people who love it, and I cherish those relationships with the people who do cherish this body and what it uniquely stands for in the world. There is no other body like it in the world. I only wish that people such as Robert Byrd and Danny Inouye could live forever to help protect this body, but that is not the case.

I want to mention one other thing. I am very grateful to Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL for their comments. I wanted to speak about something Senator MCCONNELL referenced.

A few weeks ago this body did something which was very bipartisan and very essential to its health and its survival, and that was to make sure we continue to protect the minority but not to overprotect the few Members if those Members take excessive advantage of our rules.

Eight of us got together. Senator MCCAIN and I pulled together three Democrats and three Republicans. For many weeks we worked together, without staff, and came up with an alternative which the leaders used to work through this complicated situation we found ourselves in relative to the rules.

On the Democratic side, we had Senator SCHUMER, Senator CARDIN, and Senator PRYOR, and on the Republican side we had Senator ALEXANDER, Senator Kyl, and Senator BARRASSO join Senator MCCAIN and me. I believe it was one of the most important things we have done in recent years here, which was to change the procedures. They were not working. They were being used to frustrate efforts to get legislation to the floor.

We had to do that. We had to do something to change the rules which were being misused in terms of postcloture hours. There were judges who were going to be approved by votes of 95 to 1 or 2, and those postcloture hours were being used to stall the Senate. We took care of that situation. We acted on a bipartisan basis, and hopefully that spirit of bipartisanship, which is so essential to making this place work, will continue and be given a boost not just by what the leaders essentially did in accepting our recommendations on these procedural changes but will now apply and work with other efforts that will be underway in this Congress.

I want to mention that because eight of us, on a bipartisan basis, did something which we believe very deeply about as a way of avoiding what was called the nuclear option. If that were used, it would have led to a change in a way which was not provided for in the rules. Under the rules, this is a continuing body. If that were used, it could have gone around the rules and essentially put the Presiding Officer in the position of ignoring the advice of our Parliamentarian and saying that we could, by majority vote, do something which our rules say could only be done by two-thirds of us. That would have done severe, long-lasting damage to this institution. We were able to avoid that, Democrats and Republicans—well beyond the eight of us—including the Presiding Officer, who was so helpful to me in working through this idea and giving me suggestions. I am very grateful to him for the kind of suggestions and conversations we had. We were able to work through an issue on a bipartisan basis and then the body came together and about 80 or more voted for these procedural changes. I thought it was a great day, personally. I know that. I know the eight of us feel very strongly about the important contribution we made to this body, working together. So we feel very good about it. I hope over time some of the people who were critical of it will see it as being a significant advance in making this body work better, allowing us to work our will. I wanted to mention that because it was mentioned by one of our leaders—Senator MCCONNELL—and I know Senator REID worked so closely with him and his staff, and they helped us through a very difficult situation which would have, if not resolved on a bipartisan basis, created some real problems for the ongoing operations of this body.

So I thank our leaders. I thank Senator REID, of course, who is such a dear friend, and I thank him for not just mentioning my beloved wife Barbara but also my brother Sandy.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Keystone XL Pipeline project.

Gas prices are now about $3.50—actually, $3.53—a gallon, which is up over 90 percent since President Obama took office. Economic activity for the fourth quarter of 2012 declined by one-tenth of 1 percent. It was projected to go up by about 1 to 1.2 percent, and actually it declined by one-tenth of 1 percent.

Still, the President refuses to approve a multibillion-dollar project—the Keystone XL Pipeline—that will provide energy, create jobs, generate tax revenue, and help reduce our dependence on oil from the Middle East. He is still delaying even though every State on the pipeline route has consented to the project. So every single State on the route has approved the project and will have better environmental stewardship with the project than without it. Let me repeat that. Every State on the route has approved the project and will have better environmental stewardship with the project than without it, and yet the President continues to delay.

Let me elaborate. Recently, a group of 53 Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, signed a letter that I helped organize to President Obama asking him to approve without delay the Keystone XL Pipeline project. The letter was signed by a majority of the Senate within just 1 day—1 day—of Nebraska Governor Dave Heineman's approval of a new route through his State of Nebraska. The new path addressed Nebraska's concerns about the route, as well as the President's, by circumventing the environmentally sensitive Sandhills region, effectively removing the last obstacle to approval.

Prior to sending this letter, in November Senator MAX BAUCUS and myself organized a similar letter—that was in November—signed by nine Republican Senators and nine Democratic Senators asking to meet with the President to discuss the many benefits that accrue to our Nation by building the Keystone XL Pipeline. Now, let me read that letter. It is very short.

With the elections of 2012 behind us, we write to remind you of the continuing importance of the Keystone XL Pipeline. We want to work together to keep creating jobs, and Keystone XL is one vital piece of the puzzle. We would like to meet with you in the near future to discuss this important project.

Setting politics aside, nothing has changed about the thousands of jobs that Keystone XL will create. Nothing has changed about the energy security to be gained through an important addition to the existing pipeline network built with sound environmental stewardship and the best modern technology. Nothing has changed about the security to be gained from using more fuel produced at home and by a close and stable ally. And nothing has changed about the need for America to remain a place where businesses still build things.

We hope that you will follow through on your directive of March 22, 2012, to Federal agencies to move forward vital energy infrastructure like Keystone XL. The state of Nebraska is nearing completion of the new pipeline route within Nebraska. With that process near completion, we look forward to an affirmative determination of national interest soon.

We sent that letter to the President in November—a bipartisan letter, nine Republican Senators, nine Democratic Senators. To date, we have received no direct response from the White House despite the fact that there is clearly strong bipartisan support for the project.

The only response we received was not from the White House but, rather, from the State Department. Let me read that letter. It is very short too. It is from David S. Adams, Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs at the U.S. Department of State. Basically, it says:

Thank you for your November 16 letter to President Obama concerning the status of the administration's review of TransCanada's new application for a Presidential Permit for the proposed Keystone XL pipeline project. We have been asked to respond on behalf of the President.

The letter then kind of goes: Yes, we recognize it is an important project. We are looking at it. We are doing some more draft supplemental reviews, and we hope this information is helpful to you. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of further assistance.

That is the extent of the response.

So it has now been more than 4½ years since the permit applications were submitted to the State Department for this vital energy project. Yet, even with an exhaustive review process, the consent now of every State along the route, the backing of a majority of Congress, and the support of the American people, the Keystone XL Pipeline project is still languishing at the hands of the President of the United States—after 4½ years.

Let me expand on the point about all of the States on the route approving the project. After Governor Heineman, on behalf of the State of Nebraska, sent a letter to the President approving the project, which happened just several weeks ago, after I worked with Senator BAUCUS and others to get 53 Senators in 1 day on a letter saying to the President, let's get this approved, the Governors along the route also sent a letter to the President saying, hey, let's approve the project.

So now you have every single State saying—every single State on the route saying: Hey, fine, let's do the project—every single one.

Here is the letter. It also includes the Honorable Brad Wall, the Premier of Saskatchewan. The pipeline passes through Saskatchewan as well. I am not going to read the whole letter but just a few excerpts.

Dear Mr. President:

As you begin your second term, we are writing to respectfully urge you to move forward on the Keystone XL Pipeline project.

The energy relationship between the United States and Canada is vital to the future of both our countries. It is an interest we share, transcending political lines and geographic boundaries.

The letter goes on and talks about how the project is crucial to U.S. energy security, working with Canada for our energy rather than getting it from the Middle East.

The letter talks about ''thousands of jobs'' the project creates not only building this $7 billion pipeline but then all the jobs that go to the refineries and the other activities that go with it. And it talks about safety, efficiency, and reliability.

The letter concludes:

Mr. President, we consider the Keystone XL Pipeline fundamentally important to the future economic prosperity of both the United States and Canada.

We strongly urge you to issue a Presidential Permit and act swiftly to approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

It is signed by Governors—now, remember, Senator BAUCUS and I have been working on this on behalf of Montana. You have Nebraska here. Governor Heineman just sent in a letter. Here are some of the other Governors on this letter: Gov. Sam Brownback from Kansas, Gov. Jack Dalrymple from North Dakota, Gov. Dennis Daugaard from South Dakota, Gov. Mary Fallin from Oklahoma, Gov. Rick Perry from Texas, in addition to other Governors who are not on the route, such as Gov. Butch Otter of Idaho, Gov. Brian Sandoval of Nevada, Gov. Matt Mead of Wyoming, Gov. Jan Brewer of Arizona—Republicans and Democrats.

But the point is that on the whole route, all the Governors have written and said: Hey, let's do this. Let's do it.

So what is going on here? Why does the President continue to delay the project?

The long wait for approval is dismaying enough, but it represents a larger issue for our Nation and begs a bigger question for policyholders: How will America ever build an ''all of the above'' energy policy if the President takes nearly 5 years to approve one piece of an inclusive plan, particularly, as I say, after everybody on the route has said: Hey, can we do this after 5 years, please. Can we move forward, Mr. President?

To account briefly, this $7 billion, 1,700-mile, high-tech pipeline will carry oil not only from Alberta, Canada, to refineries in Oklahoma and the Texas gulf coast, but it will also carry growing quantities of U.S. sweet crude from the Bakken oilfields in North Dakota and Montana. Even by modest estimates, it will create tens of thousands of jobs, boost the American economy, and raise much needed revenues for State and Federal governments. We have a deficit. Here is a project to get substantial tax revenue without raising taxes, through economic activity, through job creation.

Further, and perhaps most importantly, it will help put our country within striking range of a long-sought goal: true energy security. For the first time in generations, the United States, with its friend and ally Canada, will have the capacity to produce more energy than we use, reducing or eliminating our reliance on the Middle East and other volatile parts of the world.

The argument has been advanced that the oil sands will increase carbon emissions and that failing to build the Keystone XL will somehow reduce emissions. But let's look at that claim. That is the other piece. Let's look at the environmental aspects of this project.

Today, more than 80 percent of all new recovery in the oil sands is being accomplished ''in situ,'' a technology

that makes the oil sands' carbon footprint comparable to conventional drilling. In fact, the oil sands industry has reduced greenhouse gas emissions per barrel of oil produced by an average of 26 percent since 1990, with some facilities achieving reductions as high as 50 percent. Today, heavy crude oil from the Middle East and even from California produces more carbon emissions over its life cycle than the Canadian oil sands. Let me repeat that. Today, heavy crude that we import from the Middle East and even some of the California heavy crude produce more carbon emissions over their life cycle than Canadian oil sands.

We also need to factor in that if the pipeline is not built from Alberta to the United States, a similar pipeline will be built to Canada's Pacific coast. That is what I show right here on this chart. From there, the oil will be shipped across the Pacific Ocean, a much larger, sensitive ecosystem than the Sandhills—which we are not even going through now—to be refined at facilities in China with weaker environmental standards and more emissions than facilities in the United States. The United States, moreover, will continue to import oil from the Middle East, again, on tankers. Factor in the cost of trucking and railing the product to market overland, and the result, contrary to the claims of opponents, will be more emissions and a less secure distribution system without the Keystone XL Pipeline project.

Think about it. So we say: OK, we are not going to have this pipeline, even though we have built other pipelines already. We are not going to get oil from Canada. What happens? That oil goes to China, with higher emissions. You are going to take it across the ocean, which is a greater risk than putting it in a pipeline. You are going to have it refined in refineries in China, which have much worse emissions standards than our own. And guess what we get to do. Let's see, we do not get the jobs. We do not get the tax revenues. Do you know what we do get to do? We get to continue to import our oil from the Middle East. How does that sound? Is that a good idea with what is going on in Iran and with what is going on in Egypt and with what is going on in Syria—the risk that the Strait of Hormuz could be blockaded or that you could have further conflict over there that could cut off oil supplies? Is that what the American people want? They want to continue to get oil from the Middle East rather than our closest friend and ally, Canada? The American people would rather that oil go to China? Of course not. And that is what we are talking about with this project.

Well, that raises another important point. The administration's own State Department completed its 3-year National Environmental Protection Act—NEPA—review of the Keystone XL project back in 2011 and determined that ''there would be no significant impacts'' on the environment. That is what the administration determined in their own NEPA process.

And that raises another point. The White House says: Well, we do not want to get ahead of the process. But the President effectively abandoned the process more than a year ago when he halted the project by Executive action. Had he not, the State Department, in keeping with the usual process, would have issued a decision on the permit—after 4 years—by December 2011, according to a letter Secretary Clinton sent to me in August 2011.

I have worked toward approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline—first as the Governor of North Dakota and now as a Senator—because I believe it is just the kind of project that will grow our economy and create the jobs our country so desperately needs, and it will do so with good environmental stewardship. At the same time, it will reduce our dependence on the Middle East for oil, which is what the American people have desired for decades. The Keystone XL Pipeline project is long overdue. For the benefit of our economy, our environment, and our long-term energy security, President Obama needs to approve it now, without further delay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for several minutes on another topic in regard to a recipient of the Medal of Honor from my State of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO ARMY STAFF SERGEANT CLINTON ROMESHA

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor one of our Nation's true heroes—Army SSG Clinton Romesha.

On Monday the President will present Sergeant Romesha with our country's highest military award—the Medal of Honor—for ''acts of gallantry . . . above and beyond the call of duty.''

Clint comes from a long line of military heroes. His father is a veteran of the Vietnam war. His grandfather fought in the U.S. Army during World War II. Romesha often cites his grandfather as his greatest hero, so it was not surprising that Clint followed his example and joined the Army in 1999.

Staff Sergeant Romesha showed courage every day that he donned his Army uniform but especially on October 3, 2009, one of the deadliest days of the war in Afghanistan. On that day hundreds of Taliban fighters ambushed American Combat Outpost Keating from all sides with grenades, machine guns, mortars, and rifles. Heavily outnumbered, Clint Romesha and his fellow soldiers quickly fought back in what would turn out to be a deadly daylong battle.

Sergeant Romesha fought valiantly. He darted into danger to draw out the enemy many times. He himself took out a machine gun team. Staff Sergeant Romesha was working to take out a second when he was wounded by shrapnel from an exploding grenade.

His Medal of Honor citation reads:

> Undeterred by his injuries, Staff Sergeant Romesha continued to fight and upon the arrival of another soldier to aid him and the assistant gunner, he again rushed through the exposed avenue to assemble additional soldiers.
>
> With complete disregard for his own safety, he continually exposed himself to heavy enemy fire as he moved confidently about the battlefield engaging and destroying multiple enemy targets.

Staff Sergeant Romesha exemplified the valor that President Theodore Roosevelt—also a Medal of Honor recipient—spoke of when he said: ''Courage is not having the strength to go on; it is going on when you don't have the strength.''

Despite his wounds, Sergeant Romesha never stopped fighting. He stayed in the battle—leading his team, directing air support, protecting wounded soldiers, and helping to recover the bodies of his fallen friends.

The battle lasted for 12 hours. Eight soldiers lost their lives, and 22 were wounded—a fact that Romesha humbly reminds us of whenever his bravery is touted.

In fact, Sergeant Romesha said:

> What I got injured with was nothing. I have buddies who lost their eyesight, who lost limbs. For that, I would rather give them all the credit they deserve for the sacrifices they made. For me, it was nothing.

To Sergeant Romesha, it was just doing his job. To the rest of us, he is a true example of courage and selfless sacrifice. He went above and beyond the call of duty, repeatedly risking his life to defend his post and, more importantly, to help his fellow soldiers. We are grateful for his service and for his example to us all.

Today, Clint resides in Minot, ND, where he and his wife Tamara are raising their three children. I am certain he is every much the hero and inspiration to them that his own grandfather was to him.

My wife Mikey and I join our fellow North Dakotans and Americans in honoring Sergeant Romesha for his heroic and selfless service. We thank him for his exemplary actions on that dangerous day in Afghanistan and every day he served our great country.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to morning business, with the Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TIMBUKTU ANTIQUITIES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there was a lot of attention recently on the French military's operation to repel Islamic extremists and Tuareg nationalist rebels who had terrorized the local population of northern Mali, including in the ancient city of Timbuktu. That operation was widely welcomed by local Malian citizens and the international community. Many of the rebels are believed to be hiding out among the local population until the French soldiers leave, so whether they are ultimately vanquished remains to be seen. It will depend in large measure on the longer term capability of a multinational force of African troops supported by the United States and others.

Besides terrorizing, torturing, mutilating, and slaughtering innocent people, the rebels destroyed ancient tombs, shrines, and manuscripts dating to a period many centuries ago when Timbuktu was a crossroads for commerce and a center of intellectual pursuits in northern Africa. I mention this not only to inform those who may be unaware of Mali's ongoing cultural importance, but also to call attention to the fact that Irina Bokova, Director General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, commonly known as UNESCO, has already pledged to reconstruct the damaged mausoleums. As she was quoted in the New York Times on February 4, 2013, ''This is the record of the golden ages of the Malian empire. If you let this disappear, it would be a crime against humanity.''

There are also little known heroes in this otherwise humanitarian and cultural disaster. Malian residents, particularly Ali Iman Ben Essayouti, who knew the importance of priceless manuscripts preserved in a library funded by international donors, including the Library of Congress and Department of State, managed to carefully move some of them to another location where the rebels did not find them. As a result, although the rebels burned the library, only a small portion of the manuscripts were destroyed.

The other point of this is that, as many Senators are aware, the United States, once the largest contributor to UNESCO, including under President George W. Bush, was forced to sever its support last year due to a 1990s law that prohibits U.S. funding to any United Nations-affiliated agency in which the Palestinian Liberation Organization, PLO, obtains the same standing as a member state. After UNESCO's members voted, against the advice of Ms. Bokova, to grant the PLO that standing, the law was triggered and U.S. funding abruptly ended.

This is illogical and self-defeating. First, although the PLO was a terrorist organization in the 1990s, it is no longer. Second, by cutting off our contribution to UNESCO we not only empower its other members, including Russia, Iran, and Syria, we also make it impossible to assist the organization in the kind of cultural preservation activities it is now undertaking in Mali, which are clearly in the national interest of the United States. There are many other examples, including World Heritage Sites like the Great Barrier Reef, which UNESCO designates and protects today without the support of the United States. Finally, if U.S. funding is not restored before the end of this fiscal year, we will lose our vote in the organization. Ironically, despite PLO membership in UNESCO, Israel has paid its dues through 2014. Presumably, Israeli officials recognize, as we should, that their interests are far better served by participating in a U.N. agency, not by watching from the sidelines.

Mr. President, regardless of what one may think about Palestinian President Abbas' effort to obtain U.N. membership for the PLO, and I am among those who regard it as an unhelpful distraction, cutting off U.S. funding to UNESCO and thereby weakening our influence and empowering our adversaries makes no sense. It is time we recognize that a law that might have seemed sensible to some people years ago has had unintended consequences that run directly counter to our interests, and should be amended or repealed.

TRIBUTE TO MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Mark Sullivan, who is retiring from his position as Director of the United States Secret Service on February 22, 2013.

Serving as Director for nearly 7 years, and working for five Presidents, Mark Sullivan leaves his mark on the agency by achieving such benchmarks as the Secret Service Uniformed Division Modernization Act, and the Former Presidents Protection Act. He also oversaw the complete overhaul of the Secret Service IT Modernization and Operation Mission Support, which enhanced White House security. He led the effort to create the National Computer Forensic Institute in Hoover, AL, and established numerous overseas field offices to build partnerships between all levels of law enforcement.

Mark Sullivan began his distinguished 30-year career with the Secret Service as a special agent assigned to the Detroit Field Office in 1983. In 1990, Mr. Sullivan was transferred to the Fraud Division in Washington, DC, where he coordinated and monitored multi-jurisdictional criminal investigations involving credit card fraud, bank fraud, and other criminal activity. In 1991, Mr. Sullivan received his first assignment to the Presidential Protective Division, where he served 4 years.

In 1996, Mr. Sullivan was selected as Assistant Special Agent in Charge of the Office of Protective Operations. He returned to the field in 1997 as the Resident Agent in Charge of the Columbus Resident Office, which oversaw all Secret Service activities in Central Ohio. Twenty months later, Mr. Sullivan was promoted back to Washington, DC as Deputy Special Agent in Charge of the Counterfeit Division, where he managed the agency's investigative activities related to the criminal production and distribution of counterfeit currency and other financial instruments. In July of 1999, he returned to the Presidential Protective Division as an Assistant Special Agent in Charge.

Mr. Sullivan was promoted into the Federal Senior Executive Service in July, 2000, when he was selected as a Deputy Assistant Director in the Office of Protective Operations. In 2002, he was reassigned to the position of Deputy Special Agent in Charge of the Vice Presidential Protective Division. A year later, he was reassigned to the position of Deputy Assistant Director of the Office of Human Resources and Training. He next served as Assistant Director for the Office of Protective Operations, where he oversaw all protective activities for the agency, encompassing 12 divisions and 2,300 employees.

Mr. Sullivan was named Deputy Director in January, 2006 and on May 31, 2006, he was sworn in as the 22nd Director of the U.S. Secret Service.

Prior to joining the Secret Service, Mr. Sullivan spent 3 years as a special agent in the Office of the Inspector General for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mark Sullivan has received numerous awards for superior performance throughout his 34-year career in Federal law enforcement. In 2010 he was recognized by President Obama as the recipient of the Distinguished Presidential Rank Award, which he also received in 2005 from then President George W. Bush. Mr. Sullivan is to be honored for his dedication and commitment to public service, devoting his life to the safety of our first families, our Nation's leaders, and the general public. He has been a steadfast partner to the legislative branch, assisting with State of the Union addresses, Inaugurals and other joint partnerships. He will be greatly missed here in the Capitol and we wish him well in his future endeavors.

A native of Arlington, MA, Mr. Sullivan, who is from a large Irish Catholic family, received his bachelor's degree in Criminal Justice from Saint Anselm College in Manchester, NH. He and his wife of 26 years, Laurie have three daughters, one of which, Lauren, has followed in her father's footsteps by entering public service after graduating from college. She has worked for the Senate Sergeant Arms for over 3 years. A former boss once said of Sullivan, ''If you were casting someone for the role of director of the Secret Service, he looks the part. He's a tall, handsome Irishman, with grey hair and the demeanor of a born leader.'' I join with my colleagues from both sides of the

aisle in thanking Director Sullivan for his outstanding service to our Nation.

REMEMBERING CARDISS COLLINS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, I want to pay tribute to an exceptional, Illinoisan who passed away this weekend.

Congresswoman Cardiss Collins served my State and the city of Chicago with distinction for more than two decades, and I was honored to have served with her in the House.

Representative Collins did not plan for a political life. She was an accountant and a mother. But when her husband, Congressman George Collins, died in a place crash, Cardiss was convinced to run in a special election to succeed him. And she won, becoming the first African American woman elected to Congress from Illinois.

When she arrived in Washington, she learned the job quickly and became a leader on a variety of issues—from women's rights, to children's rights, to healthcare. Her colleagues quickly recognized her leadership qualities. After just a few terms, they elected her chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus. She also soon became the first African American woman to be elected Democratic Majority Whip At-Large.

I am glad that I had the chance to get to know Cardiss Collins. I—and countless Illinoisans—will remember her fighting spirit, her conviction in what was right and, of course, her sense of humor.

In 1993, a newly elected Illinois Senator by the name of Carol Moseley-Braun had decided—along with Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI—to do something no woman had ever done on the Senate floor: wear pants, instead of a dress or skirt. At the time, women were actually prohibited by the Senate rules from wearing trousers. And these Senators' decision ruffled a few feathers around here.

Well, this didn't sit right with Congresswoman Collins, and she had something to say about it. What she said was, ''They shouldn't be concerned about the dress code, unless the men Senators start wearing dresses.''

Soon after, the Senate amended its rules.

Congresswoman Collins played a part in tearing down that barrier, just as she did for so many other barriers and inequalities for women and minorities across the country. That is the kind of person she was: a fighter.

I will close by simply acknowledging for all the good she did, both here in Congress and back home in Chicago, fighting the good fight. Congresswoman Cardiss Collins will be missed.

TRIBUTE TO JIM MOLINARI

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the service of one of the Senate's most dedicated, loyal and capable employees, James J. Molinari.

Jim has served as my State director for more than a decade, but his public service began many years ago.

In 1967, Jim began his 45-year career in public service when he became a patrol officer with the San Francisco Police Department.

For 27 years he rose through the ranks of the police department, and he did it all. From street patrol to investigations, undercover assignment to a Federal liaison, Jim was given the responsibilities.

From 1977 through 1986, during my tenure as mayor of San Francisco, Jim was a senior staff member in the mayor's office. He was responsible for security for both the mayor and visiting dignitaries, and he served as my advisor on law enforcement matters.

Jim was at my side for many of the most significant moments of my service as mayor.

We hosted two Super Bowl parades in 1982 and 1985, the 1984 Democratic National Convention, and even visits by the Pope and the Queen of England.

I still remember those days, and I am happy that Jim was there to share them with me.

In 1992 he became a captain and commanding officer of the Planning and Research Division.

I have no doubt that Jim would have kept climbing the ladder in the Police Department, but in 1994 I helped convince him that his talents were suitable for a larger stage and that he would make a fine U.S. Marshal.

On February 11, 1994, President Clinton appointed Jim the United States Marshal for the Northern District of California.

Jim served as a Marshal for 7 years, during which time he was responsible for the administration of Federal law enforcement for 15 northern California counties, or about 12 million people.

He oversaw a $35 million budget and had a staff of about 130.

In 2001, Jim decided to focus his experience on counternarcotics and became director of the San Francisco Bay Area High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area. As executive director, he oversaw coordination and implementation of the agency's programs and initiatives.

In 2002, I convinced Jim to return to my office as State director.

As State director, Jim advises around 30 employees and oversees operations in my four State offices, in San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego and Fresno.

It is an understatement for me to call Jim one of my most trusted public policy and legislative advisors.

I don't know if it's his roots as a police officer or his Italian sensibilities, but Jim is practical, he cuts through the red tape and he calls it how he sees it.

Jim is a real 10.

Mr. President, I ask that you and all of our colleagues join in thanking Jim Molinari for his years of service, not only to the Senate but to the State of California and the Nation.

We wish him a wonderful retirement and want him to know we all appreciate his service and friendship.

CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, for more than 150 years, leaders from President Abraham Lincoln to Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. have challenged us to keep faith with the true spirit of our Constitution. Today we continue the work of these two dynamic men who courageously led the charge—during times of national division and civil strife—in pursuing a more perfect union where all Americans are truly free and have equal access to opportunity.

As we celebrate Black History Month this year, I am honored to reflect on the historical and everyday contributions of African-Americans to the State of Colorado and to our country. Their efforts to ensure equality for all Americans are tightly woven into the fabric of our ever-evolving Nation.

Last month, millions of Americans and I watched as President Barack Obama took the oath for his second Presidential term. And for the first time in our Nation's history, there are two African-American U.S. Senators serving at the same time—Senators TIM SCOTT of South Carolina and MO COWAN of Massachusetts. Following the 2012 elections, Colorado celebrated a record number of African-American lawmakers in the Colorado House of Representatives, known as the ''historic five'' who are paving the way for more diversity. I also am proud of how our State set the precedent for the country 4 years ago, when two African-American lawmakers, Rep. Terrance Carroll and Senator Peter Groff, held the top leadership roles in the Colorado General Assembly. These public servants were role models and leaders on so many important issues—one of which was pushing hard to create educational opportunities for all Coloradans.

Creating opportunity through education is critical, and as we work to close achievement and economic opportunity gaps throughout our State and country, I would like to pay homage to two of Colorado's African-American pioneers who have worked tirelessly to guarantee equal access to quality education for all Coloradans.

Omar D. Blair, a member of the Tuskegee Airmen in the 1940s, served as the first African-American president of the Denver Board of Education and went on to become the first African-American president of the Colorado Association of School Boards. During his tenure as president of the Denver Board of Education, Blair championed quality education and led the city through the controversial desegregation of its public schools.

Rachel B. Noel, known as the lion of the African-American civil rights movement in Denver, became the first African-American elected to the Denver Board of Education and was also

the first African-American woman elected to office in Colorado. On April 25, 1968, Noel spearheaded a resolution to integrate Denver's public schools. Despite the school board's decision to overturn the resolution in 1969, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed Noel's historic resolution in its 1973 decision, Keyes v. Denver Public Schools No. 1.

These exceptional Coloradans changed the way we educate our youth and supported access to opportunity for all. But while we have seen progress, there is still much work to do.

In this rapidly changing world where we increasingly rely on technology, we must provide our youth with the math and science skills they need to become leaders and keep our Nation on the cutting edge of innovation and ingenuity. That is why I stand with President Obama and Gov. Hickenlooper in supporting science, technology, engineering and mathematics, STEM, education programs to provide our youth with viable pathways to academic and professional success. With a strong investment in STEM programs, and by ensuring Colorado's students continue to have access to language and arts education, we will give our students the tools they need to be successful in the 21st century.

From Colorado's earliest days as a western territory to the present, African-American community leaders and public servants have been a driving force in transforming the works and vision of our Founding Fathers into reality. I am humbled and inspired by their commitment to pushing our country to reach its fullest potential. I will continue to do my part to honor African-Americans' legacy of triumph over challenge. I hope you will join me in doing the same.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, please let the record show that I was in Minot, ND, on January 29, 2013, to speak at the funeral and honor the life of Chester Reiten when the confirmation vote on Senator John Kerry to be Secretary of State was held. Chester Reiten was a dedicated public servant who devoted a considerable amount of his time and energy to serving his community and State. His efforts included lengthy tenures as a State senator and mayor of Minot.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FMLA

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the 20th Anniversary of the enactment of The Family and Medical Leave Act, FMLA. For 20 years, this historic law has helped individuals balance their family and work obligations. As a husband, and the father of three daughters, the flexibility to care for your family and children without the fear of losing your job is invaluable.

The passage of the FMLA represented a broad, bipartisan Congressional effort to improve working conditions for American families. Since the FMLA was signed into law by President Clinton in 1993, workers have used it more than 100 million times to take job-protected leave. Under the FMLA, an employee may take up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for the birth or adoption of a child or placement of a foster child. An employee can also use the FMLA to care for a spouse, child or parent suffering from a serious health condition.

At the core of the FMLA is the concept of flexibility. And that idea—not just flexibility in taking leave, but flexibility across the board, in all facets of the workplace experience—is something we must strive for in today's office environment. We must allow our workers to be productive and commit themselves to their jobs, while also allowing them to be great parents.

In my home State of Colorado, we have expanded the benefits under the FMLA by adopting two additional State leave policies—Domestic Abuse Leave and Colorado Small Necessities Leave. Under Domestic Abuse Leave, employees who are victims of domestic violence and sexual assault may take leave in order to seek various medical and legal services. Colorado Small Necessities Leave allows workers to take 18 hours of unpaid annual leave each school year in order to participate in their children's school activities, including attending parent/teacher conferences.

Despite the vast improvements in practices since the enactment of the FMLA, our country still has a ways to go. Most part-time workers and nearly half of full-time workers are not eligible for leave under FMLA. And millions of employees who are eligible cannot afford to take unpaid leave. With this is mind, this law must not be considered an end, but instead a first step in the right direction—there is room for improvement. For example, we should consider expanding the definition of a family to include members of the LGBT community.

But it is a worthwhile start, and so again, I would like to take this opportunity to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the FMLA. I hope we can use the upcoming session of Congress to look for ways to strengthen this important law.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO VINNIE BAIOCCHETTI

● Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I wish to recognize and congratulate chief of police Vinnie Baiocchetti of the Belmont, NH, Police Department for his 37 years of dedicated service to the firefighting and law enforcement professions, the town of Belmont, and the State of New Hampshire.

Beginning his public safety career as a firefighter and emergency medical technician in 1976, Vinnie then joined the Laconia, NH, Police Department in 1983 as a part-time police officer, became a full-time officer for the Gilmanton, NH, Police Department in 1984, and was promoted to sergeant in that agency in 1991. He joined the Belmont, NH, Police Department in 2001, where he was promoted to sergeant in 2002, and appointed chief of police in 2003.

During his long career as a public safety professional, Chief Baiocchetti continued to serve with the Laconia NH, Fire Department as a call firefighter and fire investigator. Chief Baiocchetti has been a leader in promoting community-oriented policing, improving public safety within the State of New Hampshire, and promoting sound public policies and practices, which have helped keep New Hampshire one of the safest States in the Nation. Chief Baiocchetti has worked tirelessly with his peers and with other public safety officials to better the administration of justice and to train members of New Hampshire's police and fire communities. He has focused on mentoring young people interested in the law enforcement profession through Law Enforcement Exploring. Chief Baiocchetti served as an adviser, assistant commander, and commander of the New Hampshire Police Cadet Training Academy during his more than 25 years of work with this unique and nationally emulated summer program for teenagers.

As Chief Baiocchetti celebrates his retirement, I want to commend him on a job well done and ask my colleagues to join me in wishing him, his wife Tammy, and daughter Ashley, well in all future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO ELAINE BALSLEY

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Elaine Balsley, an intern in my Rapid City, SD, office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past few months.

Elaine is a graduate of Stevens High School in Rapid City, SD. Currently, she is attending Black Hills State University where she is majoring in mass communications. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Elaine for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

REMEMBERING RICHARD WALTON

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Rhode Island is mourning the loss of one of our most renowned and accomplished citizens. Richard Walton was an activist, a teacher, a journalist, and a force for good in our State, in our Nation, and indeed in the world.

It would take most of us many lifetimes to achieve as much and to touch as many as Richard did in his 84 years.

Richard organized workers to win collective bargaining rights, and he organized communities to win social justice. He helped build houses for homeless Rhode Islanders, and he helped preserve Rhode Island's historic buildings. He volunteered at and helped lead the State's largest soup kitchen, and he emceed concerts for and helped lead the Stone Soup Folks Arts Foundation. He served in the Navy, and he protested against war.

Richard worked to improve our country, promoting third-party politics. He was the Citizens Party candidate for Vice President in 1984, and was a central figure in the founding of the Green Party. Richard worked to improve our world, documenting movements for independence in Africa and heading up educational and medical initiatives in Central America.

Richard was known for his hospitality. Every year he welcomed hundreds of friends and strangers to his home on Pawtuxet Cove in Warwick for a combination birthday party/folk music jam. And he was known for his generosity. He asked his guests to donate to one of his favorite causes instead of bringing gifts.

One of the many social welfare organizations that benefitted from Richard's passion and brilliance was the George Wiley Center, a grassroots antipoverty nonprofit. In 2008, the Center asked Richard to compose its statement of philosophy. It begins like this:

The George Wiley Center is, in the short term, ''a voice for the voiceless,'' but our enduring task is to help them find their own voice, to speak out for their own legitimate basic needs and not let those in power treat them as powerless, for they are not powerless once they recognize that their numbers count, that their voices count, that their moral worth as human beings, as residents of the United States, counts.

Richard's allies would attest that this was indeed his own philosophy, lived out each day of his life. Richard will be missed by many, including his children, Cathy and Richard. But his legacy of justice, compassion, and empowerment will be felt by many, for years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the presiding officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:34 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 225. An act to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a National Pediatric Research Network, including with respect to pediatric rare diseases or conditions.

H.R. 297. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following member on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

At 11:42 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 444. An act to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 643(c) of The American Taxpayer Relief Act (Public Law 112–240), the Minority Leader appoints the following individuals on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Long-Term Care: Bruce Allen Chernof of Los Angeles, California, Judith Stein of Storrs, Connecticut, and George Vradenburg of Washington, DC.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 225. An act to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a National Pediatric Research Network, including with respect to pediatric rare diseases or conditions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 297. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 444. An act to require that, if the President's fiscal year 2014 budget does not achieve balance in a fiscal year covered by such budget, the President shall submit a supplemental unified budget by April 1, 2013, which identifies a fiscal year in which balance is achieved, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 209. A bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–1. A resolution adopted by the Municipal Legislature of Luquillo, Puerto Rico relative to urging the President and the Congress of the United States of America to act on the results from the November 6, 2012 plebiscite by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which would assure democratic justice for 3.7 million U.S. citizens; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM–2. A resolution adopted by the Municipal Legislature of Fajardo, Puerto Rico relative to urging the President and the Congress of the United States of America to act on the results from the November 6, 2012 plebiscite by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which would assure democratic justice for 3.7 million U.S. citizens; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM–3. A resolution adopted by the Municipal Legislature of Naranjito, Puerto Rico relative to urging the President and the Congress of the United States of America to act on the results from the November 6, 2012 plebiscite by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which would assure democratic justice for 3.7 million U.S. citizens; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM–4. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, urging the United States Senate and the House of Representatives to pass legislation granting tax relief to individuals and businesses who suffered financial loss due to Hurricane Sandy; to the Committee on Finance.

POM–5. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, forwarding correspondence from the Chairman of the National Assembly of Vietnam expressing condolences to the Senate on the death of Senator Daniel Inouye; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM–6. Communications from the Speaker of the Jogorku Kenesh of the Kyrgyz Republic expressing condolences to the Senate on the death of Senator Daniel Inouye and also conveying wishes of continued friendly Kyrgyz-American relations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM–7. A resolution adopted by the Township of Edison, New Jersey, urging the President, Governor and Legislators to enact more stringent gun laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

Special Report entitled ''Legislative and Oversight Activities During the 111th Congress by the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs'' (Rept. No. 113–1).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Robert E. Bacharach, of Oklahoma, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

William J. Kayatta, Jr., of Maine, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit.

Richard Gary Taranto, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 229. A bill to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the ''Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

S. 230. A bill to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

S. 231. A bill to reauthorize the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BURR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 232. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 233. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 815 County Road 23 in Tyrone, New York, as the ''Specialist Christopher Scott Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. REID:

S. 234. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 235. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 236. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a Medicare payment option for patients and physicians or practitioners to freely contract, without penalty, for Medicare fee-for-service items and services, while allowing Medicare beneficiaries to use their Medicare benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 237. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and extend the Fetal Alcohol Syndrome prevention and services program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 238. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to improve the functioning and transparency of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 239. A bill to extend the frontier extended stay clinic demonstration; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 240. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for non-regular service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 241. A bill to establish the Rio Grande del Norte National Conservation Area in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CASEY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 242. A bill to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

S. 243. A bill to provide assistance for watersheds adversely affected by qualifying natural disasters; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 244. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 245. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize a bipartisan majority of Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission to hold nonpublic collaborative discussions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 246. A bill to prevent the escapement of genetically altered salmon in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 247. A bill to establish the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 248. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require labeling of genetically engineered fish; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 249. A bill to provide for the expansion of affordable refinancing of mortgages held by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the treatment of foreign corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 251. A bill to amend the renewable fuel program under section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act to require the cellulosic biofuel requirement to be based on actual production; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 252. A bill to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 253. A bill establishing the Committee to Reduce Government Waste; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 254. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize and support the creation of cardiomyopathy education, awareness, and risk assessment materials and resources by the Secretary of Health and Human Services through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the dissemination of such materials and resources by State educational agencies to identify more at-risk families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 255. A bill to withdraw certain Federal land and interests in that land from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under the mineral and geothermal leasing laws; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) (by request):

S. 256. A bill to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 257. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require courses of education provided by public institutions of higher education that are approved for purposes of the educational assistance programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to charge veterans tuition and fees at the in-State tuition rate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. LEE, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 258. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to improve the management of grazing leases and permits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

S. 259. A bill to assure equity in contracting between the Federal Government and small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 260. A bill to require the collection of data by officers enforcing immigration law and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 261. A bill to establish and clarify that Congress does not authorize persons convicted of dangerous crimes in foreign courts to freely possess firearms in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 262. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide equity for tuition and fees for individuals entitled to educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs who are pursuing programs of education at institutions of higher learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 263. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to modify the discretionary spending limits to take into account savings resulting from the reduction in the number of Federal employees; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 264. A bill to expand access to community mental health centers and improve the quality of mental health care for all Americans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 265. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants for community-based mental health infrastructure improvement; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 266. A bill to provide for the inclusion of Israel in the visa waiver program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 26. A resolution recognizing that access to hospitals and other health care providers for patients in rural areas of the United States is essential to the survival and success of communities in the United States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. Res. 27. A resolution designating the week of February 4 through 8, 2013, as ''National School Counseling Week''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 40

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 40, a bill to restore Americans' individual liberty by striking the Federal mandate to purchase insurance.

S. 46

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 46, a bill to protect Social Security benefits and military pay and require that the United States Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached.

S. 47

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. COWAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 47, a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

S. 54

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 54, a bill to increase public safety by punishing and deterring firearms trafficking.

S. 80

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 80, a bill to amend the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 to provide for Debbie Smith grants for auditing sexual assault evidence backlogs and to establish a Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Reporting System, and for other purposes.

S. 84

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 84, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 91

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 91, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify eligibility for the child tax credit.

S. 116

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 116, a bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

S. 126

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 126, a bill to prohibit earmarks.

S. 134

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 134, a bill to arrange for the National Academy of Sciences to study the impact of violent video games and violent video programming on children.

S. 140

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 140, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit to certain recently discharged veterans, to improve the coordination of veteran job training services between the Department of Labor, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Defense, to require transparency for Executive departments in meeting the Government-wide goals for contracting with small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 146

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 146, a bill to enhance the safety of America's schools.

S. 162

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 164, a bill to prohibit the United States from providing financial assistance to Pakistan until Dr. Shakil Afridi is freed.

S. 169

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 169, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize additional visas for well-educated aliens to live and work in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 183

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 183, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 190

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 190, a bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for certain activities of the National Labor Relation Board and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

S. 191

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 191, a bill to codify and modify regulatory requirements of Federal agencies.

S. 195

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 195, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

S. 209

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 209, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraudulent representations about having received military declarations or medals.

S. 218

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 218, a bill to ensure that amounts credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used for harbor maintenance.

S. 223

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 223, a bill to amend section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the visa waiver program, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 8

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 8, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress holds the sole authority to borrow money on the credit of the United States and shall not cede this power to the President.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REID:

S. 234. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of our Nation's disabled veterans to once again discuss an end to an unjust and outdated policy known as ''concurrent receipt.'' For the past 122 years, this practice has prevented veterans from receiving the full benefits earned through years of service and personal injury in defense of our Nation. The law requires that a retired disabled veteran reduce their retirement pay dollar-for-dollar by the amount of any disability compensation received, in many cases wiping out retirement pay altogether. This is simply wrong.

I have worked over the past decade to fight to change this outdated policy and commend the progress Congress has made on behalf of our Nation's veterans. In 2002, I was pleased that Congress passed a measure known as combat-related special compensation, or CSRC, allowing for disabled retired veterans to receive payments that are the financial equivalent of concurrent receipt. In 2003 I was pleased that Congress enacted a 10-year phase-in of concurrent receipt for military retirees whose disability is 50 percent or greater, and in 2004, Congress eliminated the 10-year waiting period for those veterans with 100 percent service-related disability. Moreover, in 2008, concurrent receipt eligibility was expanded to include those who are 100 percent disabled due to un-employability and extended equivalent financial payments to those who are medically retired or have retired prematurely due to force reduction programs. Most recently, in 2012, I was pleased to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act ensuring that our combat-disabled military retirees receive proper combat-related disability and retirement benefits by eliminating the ''glitch'' in the CRSC formula that can actually cause a reduction in their compensation amount when the VA increases their disability rating. While I am proud that the 10-year phase-in period for veterans who are rated 50–90 percent will finally come to fruition this year, I still believe that Congress has fallen short of meeting the commitment of providing full concurrent receipt to all of our Nation's heroes. This is unacceptable and that is why we have to take care of the hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans who still need our help.

For me, this is a simple matter of fairness. No other Federal retiree is forced to forfeit their retirement—only our disabled military retirees. Veterans' disability compensation is recompense for pain, suffering, and lost future earning power caused by a service-connected illness or injury. Few retirees can afford to live on their retired pay alone, and a severe disability only makes the problem worse by limiting or denying any post-service working life. There is no reason to deny veterans who have served their country honorably the right to the full value of their retirement pay simply because their service also led to disability.

Today I reintroduce the Retired Pay Restoration Act of 2013 in order to eliminate all restrictions to concurrent receipt. I hope my Senate colleagues will join me in supporting this bill. We must take action now and support the veterans who have given so much to our grateful Nation. This is the right thing to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 234

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 ''Retired Pay Restoration Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENT OF BOTH RETIRED PAY AND VETERANS' DISABILITY COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN MILITARY RETIREES WITH COMPENSABLE SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES.

(a) EXTENSION OF CONCURRENT RECEIPT AUTHORITY TO RETIREES WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES RATED LESS THAN 50 PERCENT.—

(1) REPEAL OF 50 PERCENT REQUIREMENT.—Section 1414 of title 10, United States Code,

is amended by striking paragraph (2) of subsection (a).

(2) COMPUTATION.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) For a month for which the retiree receives veterans' disability compensation for a disability rated as 40 percent or less or has a service-connected disability rated as zero percent, $0.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading of section 1414 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans' disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''1414. Members eligible for retired pay who are also eligible for veterans' disability compensation: concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2014, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

SEC. 3. COORDINATION OF SERVICE ELIGIBILITY FOR COMBAT-RELATED SPECIAL COMPENSATION AND CONCURRENT RECEIPT.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO STANDARDIZE SIMILAR PROVISIONS.—

(1) QUALIFIED RETIREES.—Subsection (a) of section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 2(a), is amended—

(A) by striking ''a member or'' and all that follows through ''retiree')'' and inserting ''a qualified retiree''; and

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

''(2) QUALIFIED RETIREES.—For purposes of this section, a qualified retiree, with respect to any month, is a member or former member of the uniformed services who—

''(A) is entitled to retired pay (other than by reason of section 12731b of this title); and

''(B) is also entitled for that month to veterans' disability compensation.''.

(2) DISABILITY RETIREES.—Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 1414 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETIREES WITH FEWER THAN 20 YEARS OF SERVICE.—The retired pay of a qualified retiree who is retired under chapter 61 of this title with fewer than 20 years of creditable service is subject to reduction by the lesser of—

''(A) the amount of the reduction under sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38; or

''(B) the amount (if any) by which the amount of the member's retired pay under such chapter exceeds the amount equal to 2½ percent of the member's years of creditable service multiplied by the member's retired pay base under section 1406(b)(1) or 1407 of this title, whichever is applicable to the member.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2014, and shall apply to payments for months beginning on or after that date.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 247. A bill to establish the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, as we start Black History Month, I rise today to discuss a national hero that I have spoken about many times on the Senate floor. 2013 is a particularly remarkable year for Harriet Ross Tubman in that March 13, 2013 will mark the 100th anniversary of her death. This noteworthy anniversary makes it all the more appropriate for me to talk about Maryland's Harriet Ross Tubman and her dedication to justice, equality and service to this country. It is also why it is important for Congress to take action this year on The Harriet Tubman National Historical Park and The Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park Act that I am reintroducing today.

In my career, I have spoken on the Senate Floor, at events in Maryland, in meetings with constituents and with my colleagues about Harriet Tubman's legacy. While I hope each opportunity I have taken to discuss the life of this remarkable woman helps raise awareness about her importance to the history of our great Nation, my ultimate goal is to properly commemorate her life and her work by establishing the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park on the Eastern Shore of Maryland and, in working with my colleagues from New York, also establish the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, NY.

For the last 5 years I have championed the legislation I am reintroducing today. I appreciate the active support and work my cosponsors of this bill, Senators MIKULSKI, SCHUMER and GILLIBRAND have put into advancing this bill through the Senate. We all share a deep appreciation for how important establishing these parks is to preserving the legacy of this remarkable historical figure in American History but also to how important these parks will be to the communities where they will be located.

I also greatly appreciate the support this legislation has received in the Senate Energy and Natural Resource Committee. In the last Congress, the bill was reported out of committee with bi-partisan support including the support of Chairman Bingaman and Ranking Member MURKOWSKI. I look forward to working with the Committee's new Chairman, the Senior Senator from Oregon in reporting this bill quickly for the full Senate's consideration.

The establishment of the Harriet Tubman Historical Parks has been years in the making and is long overdue. The mission of the National Park Service has evolved over time from not only preserving natural wonders across the U.S. for recreational purposes but also commemorating unique places of significance to historical events and extraordinary Americans that have shaped our nation.

The woman, who is known to us as Harriet Tubman, was born in approximately 1822 in Dorchester County, MD and given the name Araminta, Minty, Ross. She spent nearly 30 years of her life in slavery on Maryland's Eastern Shore. She worked on a number of different plantations on Maryland's Eastern Shore and as a teenager was trained to be a seamstress. As an adult she took the first name Harriet, and when she was 25 years-old married John Tubman.

In her late twenties, Harriet Tubman escaped from slavery in 1849. She fled in the dead of night, navigating the maze of tidal streams and wetlands that, to this day, comprise the Eastern Shore's landscape. She did so alone, demonstrating courage, strength and fortitude that became her hallmarks. Not satisfied with attaining her own freedom, she returned repeatedly for more than 10 years to the places of her enslavement in Dorchester and Caroline counties where, under the most adverse conditions, she led away many family members and other slaves to freedom in the Northeastern United States. She helped develop a complex network of safe houses and recruited abolitionist sympathizers residing along secret routes connecting the Southern slave states and Northern Free States. No one knows exactly how many people she led to freedom or the number of trips between the North and South she led, but the legend of her work was an inspiration to the multitude of slaves seeking freedom and to abolitionists fighting to end slavery. Tubman became known as ''the Moses of her people'' by African-Americans and white abolitionists alike. Tubman once proudly told Frederick Douglass that in all of her journeys she ''never lost a single passenger.'' She was so effective that in 1856 there was a $40,000 reward offered for her capture in the South. She is the most famous and most important conductor of the network of resistance known as the Underground Railroad.

During the Civil War, Tubman served the Union forces as a spy, a scout and a nurse. She served in Virginia, Florida and South Carolina. She is credited with leading slaves from those slave states to freedom during those years as well.

Following the Civil War, and the emancipation of all black slaves, Tubman settled in Auburn, NY. There she was active in the women's suffrage movement, and she also established one of the first incorporated African-American homes for aged to care for the elderly. In 1903 she bequeathed the Tubman Home to the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church in Auburn where it stands to this day. Harriet Tubman died in Auburn in 1913 and she is buried in the Fort Hill Cemetery. Fortunately many of the structures and landmarks in New York remain intact and in relatively good condition.

Only recently has the Park Service begun establishing units dedicated to the lives of African-Americans. Places like Booker T. Washington National

Monument on the campus the Tuskegee University in Alabama, the George Washington Carver National Monument in Missouri, The Buffalo Soldiers at Guadalupe Mountains National Park, the National Historical Trail commemorating the March for Voting Rights from Selma to Montgomery Alabama, and most recently the Martin Luther King Jr. memorial on the National Mall are all important monuments and places of historical significance that help tell the story of the African-American experience.

As the National Park Service continues its important work to recognize and preserve African-American history by providing greater public access and information about the places and people that have shaped the African-American experience, there are very few units dedicated to the lives of African-American women, and there are no National Historical Parks commemorating African-American women.

I cannot think of a more fitting hero than Harriet Tubman to be the first African-American woman to be memorialized with National Historical Parks that tell both her personal story and her lifelong fight for justice and freedom starting with her fight against the cruel institution of slavery and work of the Underground Railroad she led to her work in the women's suffrage movement.

I hope that my colleagues will support my effort to honor Harriet Tubman and support passage of my bill to authorize the creation of the Tubman National Historical Parks in New York and Maryland. These parks will hopefully pave the way for the Park Service to develop more National Historical Park commemorating the lives of many other important African-American women in our history.

The vision for the Tubman National Historical Parks is to preserve the places significant to the life of Harriet Tubman and tell her story through interpretative activities and continue to discover aspects of her life and the experience of passage along the Underground Railroad through archaeological research and discovery.

The buildings and structures in Maryland have mostly disappeared. Slaves were forced to live in primitive buildings even though many slaves were skilled tradesmen who constructed the substantial homes of their owners. Not surprisingly, few of the structures associated with the early years of Tubman's life remain standing today. The landscape of the Eastern Shore of Maryland, however, is still evocative of the time that Tubman lived there. Farm fields and loblolly pine forests dot the lowland landscape, which is also notable for its extensive network of tidal rivers and wetlands that Tubman, and the people she guided to freedom, under the cover of night. In particular, a number of properties including the homestead of Ben Ross, her father, Stewart's Canal, where he worked, the Brodess Farm, where she worked as a slave, and others are within the master plan boundaries of the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge.

Similarly, Poplar Neck, the plantation from which she escaped to freedom, is still largely intact in Caroline County. The properties in Talbot County, immediately across the Choptank River from the plantation, are currently protected by various conservation easements. Were she alive today, Tubman would recognize much of the landscape that she knew intimately as she secretly led black men, women and children to freedom.

There has never been any doubt that Tubman led an extraordinary life. Her contributions to American history are surpassed by few. Determining the most appropriate way to recognize that life and her contributions, however, has been exceedingly difficult. The National Park Service determined that designating a Historical Park that would include two geographically separate units would be an appropriate tribute to the life of this extraordinary American. The New York unit would include the tightly clustered Tubman buildings in the town of Auburn. The Maryland portion would include large sections of landscapes that are evocative of Tubman's time and are historically relevant.

Harriet Tubman was a true American patriot. She was someone for whom liberty and freedom were not just concepts but values she fought tirelessly for. She lived those principles and so selflessly helped hundreds of other people attain freedom. In doing so, she has earned a nation's respect and honor.

Harriet Tubman is one of many great Americans that we honor and celebrate every February during Black History Month. In schools across the country, American History curriculums teach our children about Tubman's courage, conviction, her fight for freedom and her contributions to the greatness of our Nation during a contentious time in U.S. history. Now it is time to add to Tubman's legacy by preserving and commemorating the places evocative of Harriet Tubman's extraordinary life.

Every year, millions of school children, as well as millions of adults, visit our National Historical Parks gain experiences and knowledge about our Nation's history that simply cannot be found in history books or on the Internet. Our Nation's strength and character comes from the actions of the Americans who came before us and the significant events that shaped our Nation. The National Park Service is engaged in the important work of preserving the places where American history was made and providing a tangible experience for current and future generations to experience and understand. It is one thing to learn about Harriet Tubman from a book, and it is yet a completely different and fulfilling experience to explore, see, listen to and feel the places where she worked as a slave, where she escaped from and where she lived out her life as a free American.

The National Park Service is uniquely suited to honor and preserve these places of historical significance and I urge my colleagues to join me in preserving and growing the legacy of Harriet Tubman by establishing the Harriet Tubman National Historical Parks in her honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 247

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 ''Harriet Tubman National Historical Parks Act''.

SEC. 2. HARRIET TUBMAN UNDERGROUND RAILROAD NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, MARYLAND.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term ''historical park'' means the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park established by subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Authorized Acquisition Area for the Proposed Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park'', numbered T20/80,001, and dated July 2010.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Maryland.

(b) HARRIET TUBMAN UNDERGROUND RAILROAD NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), there is established the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, as a unit of the National Park System.

(B) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—The historical park shall not be established until the date on which the Secretary determines that a sufficient quantity of land, or interests in land, has been acquired to constitute a manageable park unit.

(C) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary makes a determination under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the historical park, including an official boundary map for the historical park.

(D) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The official boundary map published under subparagraph (C) shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the historical park is to preserve and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations the historical, cultural, and natural resources associated with the life of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad.

(3) LAND ACQUISITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the areas depicted on the map as ''Authorized Acquisition Areas'' by purchase from willing sellers, donation, or exchange.

(B) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—On acquisition of land or an interest in land under subparagraph (A), the boundary of the historical park shall be adjusted to reflect the acquisition.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historical park in accordance

with this section and the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(A) the National Park System Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(B) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(2) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the historical park is established, the Director of the National Park Service and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall enter into an agreement to allow the National Park Service to provide for public interpretation of historic resources located within the boundary of the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge that are associated with the life of Harriet Tubman, consistent with the management requirements of the Refuge.

(3) INTERPRETIVE TOURS.—The Secretary may provide interpretive tours to sites and resources located outside the boundary of the historical park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, relating to the life of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad.

(4) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the State, political subdivisions of the State, colleges and universities, non-profit organizations, and individuals—

(i) to mark, interpret, and restore nationally significant historic or cultural resources relating to the life of Harriet Tubman or the Underground Railroad within the boundaries of the historical park, if the agreement provides for reasonable public access; or

(ii) to conduct research relating to the life of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad.

(B) VISITOR CENTER.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the State to design, construct, operate, and maintain a joint visitor center on land owned by the State—

(i) to provide for National Park Service visitor and interpretive facilities for the historical park; and

(ii) to provide to the Secretary, at no additional cost, sufficient office space to administer the historical park.

(C) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity carried out under this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent.

(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out an activity under this paragraph may be in the form of in-kind contributions or goods or services fairly valued.

(d) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the historical park in accordance with section 12(b) of the National Park Service General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–7(b)).

(2) CONSULTATION.—The general management plan shall be prepared in consultation with the State (including political subdivisions of the State).

(3) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the preparation and implementation of the management plan with—

(A) the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge;

(B) the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park established by section 3(b)(1)(A); and

(C) the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 3. HARRIET TUBMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, AUBURN, NEW YORK.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term ''historical park'' means the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park established by subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) HOME.—The term ''Home'' means The Harriet Tubman Home, Inc., located in Auburn, New York.

(3) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Harriet Tubman National Historical Park'', numbered T18/80,000, and dated March 2009.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of New York.

(b) HARRIET TUBMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), there is established the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, as a unit of the National Park System.

(B) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—The historical park shall not be established until the date on which the Secretary determines that a sufficient quantity of land, or interests in land, has been acquired to constitute a manageable park unit.

(C) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary makes a determination under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the historical park.

(D) MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(2) BOUNDARY.—The historical park shall include the Harriet Tubman Home, the Tubman Home for the Aged, the Thompson Memorial AME Zion Church and Rectory, and associated land, as identified in the area entitled ''National Historical Park Proposed Boundary'' on the map.

(3) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the historical park is to preserve and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations the historical, cultural, and natural resources associated with the life of Harriet Tubman.

(4) LAND ACQUISITION.—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the areas depicted on the map by purchase from a willing seller, donation, or exchange.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historical park in accordance with this section and the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(A) the National Park System Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(B) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(2) INTERPRETIVE TOURS.—The Secretary may provide interpretive tours to sites and resources located outside the boundary of the historical park in Auburn, New York, relating to the life of Harriet Tubman.

(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the owner of any land within the historical park to mark, interpret, or restore nationally significant historic or cultural resources relating to the life of Harriet Tubman, if the agreement provides that—

(i) the Secretary shall have the right of access to any public portions of the land covered by the agreement to allow for—

(I) access at reasonable times by historical park visitors to the land; and

(II) interpretation of the land for the public; and

(ii) no changes or alterations shall be made to the land except by mutual agreement of the Secretary and the owner of the land.

(B) RESEARCH.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the State, political subdivisions of the State, institutions of higher education, the Home and other nonprofit organizations, and individuals to conduct research relating to the life of Harriet Tubman.

(C) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity carried out under this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent.

(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share may be in the form of in-kind contributions or goods or services fairly valued.

(D) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the Attorney General for review any cooperative agreement under this paragraph involving religious property or property owned by a religious institution.

(ii) FINDING.—No cooperative agreement subject to review under this subparagraph shall take effect until the date on which the Attorney General issues a finding that the proposed agreement does not violate the Establishment Clause of the first amendment to the Constitution.

(d) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the historical park in accordance with section 12(b) of the National Park Service General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–7(b)).

(2) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the preparation and implementation of the management plan with—

(A) the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park established by section 2(b)(1); and

(B) the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act, except that not more than $7,500,000 shall be available to provide financial assistance under subsection (c)(3).

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) (by request):

S. 256. A bill to amend Public Law 93–435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce, with my colleague LISA MURKOWSKI, the Ranking Member on the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and at the request of the Delegate from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Island, CNMI, Gregorio ''Kilili'' Sablan, legislation to amend Public Law 93–435, the Territorial Submerged Lands Act. This legislation would convey to the CNMI the same rights to offshore waters and submerged lands that were conveyed to the territories of Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and American Samoa nearly 40 years ago.

This bill is non-controversial. In 2005, it was first introduced by then-Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Pete Domenici. A companion measure was introduced in

the House of Representatives by then-Congressman JEFF FLAKE. In the 111th Congress, this bill passed the House as H.R. 934 on a 416–0 vote, and it was reported by the Senate Committee. In the 112th Congress, it again passed the House unanimously, on a 297–0 vote, and a hearing was held in the Senate on its companion measure, S. 590. I sincerely hope that this will be the year this bill is signed into law and the people of the CNMI will begin to enjoy the economic benefits that will result from gaining ownership of the waters and submerged lands adjacent to their shores, just as those benefits are enjoyed by every other State and territory of the Nation.

The CNMI faces huge economic challenges that began with the phase-out of World Trade Organization garment quotas in 2005 and resulted in the departure of garment manufacturing. Gaining ownership of the waters and submerged lands adjacent to the 14 islands of the CNMI would help to stimulate the CNMI's struggling economy by allowing the use and management of these areas for near-shore infrastructure development, the extraction of minerals, energy development, aquaculture and other activities. Currently, under Federal ownership, there are no such activities in these areas because the Federal Government has no history of such near-shore jurisdiction and there is no Federal agency with responsibility for their management.

Congress granted the States ownership of the waters and submerged lands out to three miles under the Submerged Lands Act of 1953. In 1974, Congress granted ownership of these areas to the territories. However, the Covenant which established the political union between the U.S. and the CNMI in 1976 was ambiguous on this matter of seaward ownership. Eventually, in 2005, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the submerged lands and waters off the CNMI's coasts fell under Federal ownership. Importantly, the Court also recognized that Congress had the power to convey these waters and lands to the CNMI. That is what this legislation would do.

The CNMI is the only territory or State that does not have ownership of its adjacent waters and lands out to at least 39les. I urge my colleagues to support prompt passage of this bill to correct this disparity and to assist the CNMI in meeting its economic challenges. I'm not aware of any policy objections to this bill's enactment.

I refer those interested in additional information to Senate Report 111–197. Included in that report is a CBO estimate stating that enactment of H.R. 934, the bill on which the legislation being introduced today is based, would not affect direct spending or revenues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 256

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section and section 2 of Public Law 93–435 (48 U.S.C. 1705, 1706) are amended by inserting ''the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,'' after ''Guam,'' each place it appears.

(b) REFERENCES TO DATE OF ENACTMENT.—For the purposes of the amendment made by subsection (a), each reference in Public Law 93–435 to the ''date of enactment'' shall be considered to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this section.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2013.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 304 Dirksen Senate Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WYDEN: One of the legislative issues for this Congress that we discussed at our recent meeting was the conveyance of submerged lands to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. I would like to follow up on our discussion by asking you to consider sponsoring the necessary legislation.

The Energy and Natural Resources Committee did report out a conveyance bill in the last Congress, H.R. 670 as amended, but time expired before the Senate could act on the measure. With this groundwork in place it would seem that this particular issue could be moved quickly as the 113th Congress gets to work.

I am enclosing a draft bill, which reflects the Energy and Natural Resources Committee amendments. I have reached out to Senator Murkowski, as well, asking her to co-sponsor the legislation, as she did with Chairman Bingaman two years ago; and I am hopeful that this bipartisanship can prevail again.

In the House I will also be introducing the language recommended by the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, though the Senate may well be able to act first.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. Thank you, too, for having taken the time to meet with me to discuss issues of importance to the Northern Mariana Islands that may come before your Committee in the 113th Congress. I look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,
GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN,
Member of Congress.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

S. 259. A bill to assure equity in contracting between the Federal Government and small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I have reintroduced the Assuring Contracting Equity, or ACE Act, with a correction to a drafting error in order to ensure increases in contracting goals for service-disabled veteran owned small businesses and qualified HUBZone small businesses. I look forward to working with my colleagues to address the issues facing entrepreneurs who do business with the Federal Government and hope that we can ensure that more Federal dollars are getting out to main street.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 261. A bill to establish and clarify that Congress does not authorize persons convicted of dangerous crimes in foreign courts to freely possess firearms in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the No Firearms for Foreign Felons Act of 2013. This bill would close a loophole in current law, by ensuring that people convicted of foreign felonies and crimes involving domestic violence cannot possess firearms. We must close this gap in our laws before it is exploited by terrorists, drug gangs, and other dangerous criminals who threaten our communities.

Under current Federal law, people who are convicted in the United Sates of violent felonies like rape, murder, and terrorism are prohibited from possessing firearms. But, shockingly, Federal law does not bar criminals convicted of these same violent crimes in foreign courts from possessing guns. This outrageous loophole for foreign convicts is the result of a 2005 U.S. Supreme Court decision in the case of Small v. United States.

In that case, the Court analyzed the 1968 Gun Control Act, which states that anyone who has been convicted of a felony ''in any court'' cannot possess firearms. The Court concluded that the phrase only applied to American courts, despite the fact that the Gun Control Act had been applied to foreign felonies since 1968, the year it took effect.

At the time, the Supreme Court was very much aware that its ruling could have serious consequences. As Justice Clarence Thomas noted in his dissent, ''the majority's interpretation permits those convicted overseas of murder, rape, assault, kidnapping, terrorism, and other dangerous crimes to possess firearms freely in the United States.'' But whatever one may think of the Court's ruling, it is now the law of the land.

We must make every effort to close this dangerous loophole and the bill I am introducing today would do just that.

Under this bill, section 921 of Title 18 would be amended to state that ''[the term 'any court' includes any Federal, State, or foreign court.'' Similar changes would be made in other sections of the Gun Control Act. Where there are references to ''state offenses'' or ''offenses under state law,'' the bill would expand these terms to include convictions of offenses under foreign law.

In other words, the bill would make it clear that if someone was convicted in a foreign court of an offense that would have disqualified him from possessing a gun in the U.S., then they will be disqualified from gun possession under U.S. law. The only exception will be if there is reason to think the conviction entered by the foreign jurisdiction is somehow invalid.

Under the bill, a foreign conviction will not constitute a ''conviction'' under the Gun Control Act, if either: the foreign conviction resulted from a denial of fundamental fairness that would violate due process if committed in the United States, or the conduct on which the foreign conviction was based would be legal if committed in the United States.

I expect that these circumstances will be fairly rare, but the bill does take them into account and will provide a complete defense to anyone with an invalid foreign conviction. In any event, it is clear that we should not keep in place a dangerous policy which essentially treats every foreign conviction as invalid.

Ensuring that foreign convictions count as convictions under U.S. law is important for a second reason. When someone with a felony conviction is arrested for another crime, the government may charge that person with being a felon in possession of a firearm or may seek a sentence enhancement. However, if a foreign conviction is not treated as a conviction under our law, then the defendant may receive a significantly lower sentence than is appropriate given the number of convictions on his record.

Particularly in these times, America cannot continue to give foreign-convicted murderers, rapists, and even terrorists the right to buy firearms in the United States.

With each passing day, we run a risk that foreign felons are exploiting this loophole in our law. This is unacceptable.

Criminals convicted in foreign courts should not be able to have guns when U.S. law forbids those convicted of the same crimes on U.S. soil from possessing guns. We should not wait for lives to be lost before we act to close this loophole.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 262. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide equity for tuition and fees for individuals entitled to educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs who are pursuing programs of education at institutions of higher learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. The original GI Bill proved to be a landmark initiative for our troops and an outstanding investment in the future of our nation. The Post 9/11 GI bill, signed into law in 2008, built on the success of the original program by providing helpful and hard-earned educational and economic benefits for our newest generation of veterans.

Just as the veterans of WWII were the engine of economic recovery and expansion in the postwar period, the most recent generation of veterans will continue their service to America by reaching their full educational and economic potential through the Post 9/11 GI Bill.

In January 2011, Congress made further changes to the Post 9/11 GI Bill which caps the amount of education benefits for veterans enrolled in private colleges at $17,500 and limits the education benefit for veterans enrolled in public colleges to the amount charged for in-state tuition and fees. That seemed reasonable, but what we have learned is that many veterans are not eligible for in-state tuition. And the cost difference between in-state and out-of-state tuition for public universities can be substantial.

Current law unintentionally burdens a significant number of veterans, requiring them to pay thousands of dollars in out of pocket costs for non-resident tuition and fee rates. These costs add up over the course of a college career—so much so that veterans often drop out of college or transfer to another school, with a significant amount of debt and without an actual degree. But veterans at private schools have their tuition covered up to $18,077.

I am introducing the Veterans Equity Act of 2013 to remedy the inequality between benefits for those at a private institution and those at a public school charging out-of-state fees. This bill would allow veterans who are considered non-residents of the state school they attend to receive up to $18,077 in tuition benefits, the same benefit that would be available to that veteran if attending a private institution.

This legislation is supported by American Council on Education, Association of State Colleges and Universities, Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, Association of American Universities and the American Association of Community Colleges.

I am deeply concerned that some for-profit institutions may be abusing G.I. tuition payments by aggressively targeting veterans for academic programs that may not provide value to students, such as preparation for future employment. The Veterans Equity Act will help more veterans attend public institutions without significant out of pocket costs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 262

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 ''Veterans Education Equity Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. PROTECTING EQUITY FOR TUITION AND FEES FOR INDIVIDUALS ENTITLED TO ASSISTANCE UNDER THE POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM WHO ARE PURSUING PROGRAMS OF EDUCATION AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause (i) of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 3313 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(i) In the case of a program of education pursued at a public institution of higher learning, the lesser of—

''(I) the actual net cost for tuition and fees assessed by the institution for the program of education after the application of—

''(aa) any waiver of, or reduction in, tuition and fees; and

''(bb) any scholarship, or other Federal, State, institutional, or employer-based aid or assistance (other than loans and any funds provided under section 401(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a)) that is provided directly to the institution and specifically designated for the sole purpose of defraying tuition and fees; or

''(II) the greater of—

''(aa) the actual net cost for in-State tuition and fees assessed by the institution for the program of education after the application of—

''(AA) any waiver of, or reduction in, tuition and fees; and

''(BB) any scholarship, or other Federal, State, institutional, or employer-based aid or assistance (other than loans and any funds provided under section 401(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a)) that is provided directly to the institution and specifically designated for the sole purpose of defraying tuition and fees; or

''(bb) the amount equal to—

''(AA) for the academic year beginning on August 1, 2011, $17,500; or

''(BB) for any subsequent academic year, the amount in effect for the previous academic year under this subclause, as increased by the percentage increase equal to the most recent percentage increase determined under section 3015(h) of this title.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the payment of educational assistance for an academic year beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 265. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants for community-based mental health infrastructure improvement; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce, along with my colleague, Senator STABENOW, the Community Based Mental Health Infrastructure Improvements Act.

According to the National Survey on Drug Use and Health, a survey conducted by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration in 2011, Rhode Island has the highest rate of serious mental illness among adults in the country. According to this survey, approximately 7.2 percent of adults aged 18 or older in my state have a serious mental illness, above the 4.6 percent national average.

While too often the stigma of mental illness prevents individuals from seeking diagnosis and treatment, thankfully, states like Rhode Island have made strides in meeting this challenge. In Rhode Island, mental health parity laws have been on the books since 2001. Similarly, Rhode Island's Medicaid program, RIteCare, covers mental and behavioral health care for low-income children and families.

Those who need this treatment must have access to it. Community Mental Health Centers play a vital role in helping individuals get the mental and behavioral health care that they need to lead healthier, more productive lives. In 2012, Community Mental Health Centers in Rhode Island treated approximately 45,000 individuals at over 1 million distinct encounters. Next year, the number of individuals treated by Community Mental Health Centers will likely increase, as over 50,000 Rhode Islanders gain access to health insurance.

As more Americans across the country gain access to health insurance, these centers and other providers will see an increased caseload. Yet, many Community Mental Health Centers are in outdated and outmoded facilities that make if difficult to provide the optimal level of care.

The Community Based Mental Health Infrastructure Improvements Act we are introducing today would support the necessary updates and expansions of some facilities, and the construction of entirely new facilities in other instances in order to meet the growing demand.

I am pleased that this legislation has also been included in a broader bill, the Excellence in Mental Health Act, which I joined Senators STABENOW, BLUNT, BOXER, COLLINS, LEAHY and RUBIO in introducing today, to make other updates to the way Community Mental Health Centers are reimbursed for services. I look forward to working with my colleagues to address the critical needs of our mental and behavioral health care delivery system.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 26—RECOGNIZING THAT ACCESS TO HOSPITALS AND OTHER HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS FOR PATIENTS IN RURAL AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES IS ESSENTIAL TO THE SURVIVAL AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 26

Whereas access to quality health care services determines whether individuals in the United States can remain in the communities they call home and whether their children will return to those communities to raise families of their own;

Whereas more than 60,000,000 individuals in rural areas of the United States rely on rural hospitals and other providers as critical access points to health care;

Whereas rural areas of the United States need quality health care services to attract and retain business and industry;

Whereas, to ensure that communities in the United States survive and flourish, Congress must address the unique health care needs of individuals in rural areas of the United States;

Whereas individuals in rural areas of the United States are, per capita, older, poorer, and sicker than individuals in urban areas of the United States;

Whereas, according to the Department of Health and Human Services, ''rural areas have higher rates of poverty, chronic disease, and uninsurance, and millions of rural Americans have limited access to a primary care provider'';

Whereas, according to the Department of Agriculture, individuals in rural areas of the United States have higher rates of age-adjusted mortality, disability, and chronic disease than individuals in urban areas of the United States;

Whereas the 20 percent of the population of the United States that lives in rural areas is scattered over 90 percent of the landmass of the United States;

Whereas the geography and weather of rural areas of the United States can make accessing health care difficult, and cultural, social, and language barriers compound rural health challenges;

Whereas individuals in rural areas of the United States are more likely to be uninsured and more likely to receive coverage through public sources than individuals in urban areas of the United States;

Whereas the proportion of uninsured and underinsured individuals is rising faster in rural areas of the United States than in urban areas of the United States;

Whereas access to health care continues to be a major challenge in rural areas of the United States, as—

(1) 77 percent of the 2,050 rural counties in the United States are designated as primary care Health Professional Shortage Areas (commonly referred to as ''HPSAs'');

(2) rural areas of the United States have fewer than half as many primary care physicians per 100,000 people as urban areas of the United States; and

(3) more than 50 percent of patients in rural areas of the United States travel at least 20 miles to receive specialty medical care, compared to only 6 percent of patients in urban areas of the United States;

Whereas, because rural hospitals and other providers face unique challenges in administering care to patients, Congress has traditionally supported those providers by implementing—

(1) specific programs to address rural hospital closures that occurred in the 1980s by providing financial support to hospitals that are geographically isolated and in which Medicare patients make up a significant percentage of hospital inpatient days or discharges; and

(2) a program established in 1997 to support limited-service hospitals that, being located in rural areas of the United States that cannot support a full-service hospital, are critical access points to health care for rural patients;

Whereas hospitals in rural areas of the United States achieve high levels of performance, according to standards for quality, patient satisfaction, and operational efficiency, for the types of care most relevant to rural communities;

Whereas, in addition to the vital care that rural health care providers provide to patients, rural health care providers are critical to the local economies of their communities and are one of the largest types of employers in rural areas of the United States where, on average, 14 percent of total employment is attributed to the health sector;

Whereas a hospital in a rural area of the United States is typically one of the top 2 largest employers in that area;

Whereas 1 primary care physician in a rural community annually generates approximately $1,500,000 in total revenue, and 1 general surgeon in a rural community annually generates approximately $2,700,000 in total revenue;

Whereas the average Critical Access Hospital, a limited-service rural health care facility, creates 107 jobs and generates $4,800,000 in annual payroll, and the wages, salaries, and benefits provided by a Critical Access Hospital can amount to 20 percent of the output of a rural community's economy;

Whereas hospitals in rural communities play a vital role in caring for the residents of those communities and preserving the special way of life that communities in the United States foster; and

Whereas the closure of a hospital in a rural community often results in severe economic decline in the community and the departure of physicians, nurses, pharmacists, and other health providers from the community, and forces patients to travel long distances for care or to delay receiving care, leading to decreased health outcomes, higher costs, and added burden to patients: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that access to hospitals and other health care providers for patients in rural areas of the United States is essential to the survival and success of communities in the United States;

(2) recognizes that preserving and strengthening access to quality health care in rural areas of the United States is crucial to the success and prosperity of the United States;

(3) recognizes that strengthening access to hospitals and other health care providers for patients in rural areas of the United States makes Medicare more cost-effective and improves health outcomes for patients;

(4) recognizes that, in addition to the vital care that rural health care providers provide to patients, rural health care providers are integral to the local economies and are one of the largest types of employers in rural areas of the United States; and

(5) celebrates the many dedicated medical professionals across the United States who work hard each day to deliver quality care to the nearly 1 in 5 people in the United States living in rural areas, because the dedication and professionalism of those medical professionals preserves the special way of life and sense of community enjoyed and cherished by individuals in rural areas of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 27—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 4 THROUGH 8, 2013, AS ''NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK''

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. LEVIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 27

Whereas the American School Counselor Association has designated the week of February 4 through 8, 2013, as ''National School Counseling Week'';

Whereas the importance of school counseling has been recognized through the inclusion of elementary- and secondary-school counseling programs in amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.);

Whereas school counselors have long advocated that the education system of the United States must provide equitable opportunities for all students;

Whereas personal and social growth results in increased academic achievement;

Whereas school counselors help develop well-rounded students by guiding the students through academic, personal, social, and career development;

Whereas school counselors play a vital role in ensuring that students are college- and career-ready, and are aware of financial aid and college opportunities;

Whereas school counselors assist with and coordinate efforts to foster a positive school culture resulting in a safer learning environment for all students;

Whereas school counselors have been instrumental in helping students, teachers, and parents deal with personal trauma as well as tragedies in the community and the United States;

Whereas students face myriad challenges every day, including peer pressure, bullying, depression, the deployment of family members to serve in conflicts overseas, and school violence;

Whereas school counselors are one of the few professionals in a school building who are trained in both education and mental-health matters;

Whereas the roles and responsibilities of school counselors are often misunderstood;

Whereas the school-counselor position is often among the first to be eliminated to meet budgetary constraints;

Whereas the national average ratio of students to school counselors of 471 to 1 is almost twice that of the ratio of 250 to 1 recommended by the American School Counselor Association, the National Association for College Admission Counseling, and other organizations; and

Whereas the celebration of National School Counseling Week would increase awareness of the important and necessary role school counselors play in the lives of students in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of February 4 through 8, 2013, as ''National School Counseling Week''; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the role school counselors play in the school and the community at large in preparing students for fulfilling lives as contributing members of society.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 10. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 11. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 12. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 13. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 14. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra.

SA 15. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 16. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 17. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 18. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 19. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 20. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 21. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

AMENDMENTS

SA 10. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 302 and insert the following:

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

Subtitle L of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 is amended by striking sections 41201 through 41204 (42 U.S.C. 14043c through 14043c–3) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 41201. CREATING HOPE THROUGH OUTREACH, OPTIONS, SERVICES, AND EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH ('CHOOSE CHILDREN & 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, stalking, or sex trafficking and prevent future violence.

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

''(1) SERVICES TO ADVOCATE FOR AND RESPOND TO YOUTH.—To develop, expand, and strengthen victim-centered interventions and services that target youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking. 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, 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. Funds may be used to—

''(A) assess and analyze currently available services for youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking, 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, stalking, or sex trafficking 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, stalking, and sex trafficking, and to properly refer such children, youth, and their families to appropriate services.

''(2) SUPPORTING YOUTH THROUGH EDUCATION AND PROTECTION.—To enable middle schools, high schools, and institutions of higher education to—

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

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

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

''(D) implement developmentally appropriate educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking and the impact of such violence on youth; or

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

''(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, or population-specific or community-based organization with a demonstrated history of effective work addressing the needs of youth who are, including runaway or homeless youth affected by, victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or sex trafficking;

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

''(C) 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, a school district, or an institution of higher education.

''(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 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, a school district, or an institution of higher education.

''(B) OTHER PARTNERSHIPS.—All applicants under this section are encouraged to work in partnership with organizations and agencies that work with the relevant 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, nongovernmental 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 all with priority on victim safety and autonomy; and

''(3) ensure that all individuals providing intervention or prevention programming 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, stalking, and sex trafficking.

''(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 2014 through 2018.

''(g) 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. The requirements of this section shall not apply to funds allocated under this paragraph.

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

SA 11. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 186, strike line 5 and all that follows through page 187, line 3, and insert the following:

SEC. 905. TRIBAL PROTECTION ORDERS.

Section 2265 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) TRIBAL COURT JURISDICTION.—For purposes of this section, a court of an Indian tribe shall have full civil jurisdiction to issue and enforce protection orders involving any person, including the authority to enforce any orders through civil contempt proceedings, to exclude violators from Indian land, and to use other appropriate mechanisms, in matters arising anywhere in the Indian country of the Indian tribe (as defined in section 1151) or otherwise within the authority of the Indian tribe.''.

Beginning on page 193, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 194, line 3, and insert the following:

SEC. 910. SPECIAL RULE FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA.

(a) EXPANDED JURISDICTION.—In the State of Alaska, the amendments made by sections 904 and 905 shall only apply to the Indian country (as defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code) of the Metlakatla Indian Community, Annette Island Reserve.

(b) RETAINED JURISDICTION.—The jurisdiction and authority of each Indian tribe in the State of Alaska under section 2265(e) of title 18, United States Code (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act)—

(1) shall remain in full force and effect; and

(2) are not limited or diminished by this Act or any amendment made by this Act.

(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act limits or diminishes the jurisdiction of the State of Alaska, any subdivision of the State of Alaska, or any Indian tribe in the State of Alaska.

SA 12. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 177, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 194, line 3, and insert the following:

SEC. 904. 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 (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''; and

(ii) by striking ''fine'' and inserting ''a fine''; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) 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) DEFINITIONS.—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 intentionally, 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 intentionally, 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''.

(c) REPEAT OFFENDERS.—Section 2265A(b)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or tribal'' after ''State''.

SEC. 905. 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 2013, the National''; and

(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''; 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 2013''; 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 2014 and 2015''.

(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 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 906. EFFECTIVE DATES; PILOT PROJECT.

Except as provided in section 4, the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 907. INDIAN LAW AND ORDER COMMISSION; REPORT ON THE ALASKA RURAL JUSTICE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 15(f) of the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act (25 U.S.C.

2812(f)) is amended by striking ''2 years'' and inserting ''3 years''.

(b) REPORT.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Attorney General of the State of Alaska, the Commissioner of Public Safety of the State of Alaska, the Alaska Federation of Natives and Federally recognized Indian tribes in the State of Alaska, shall report to Congress not later than one year after enactment of this Act with respect to whether the Alaska Rural Justice and Law Enforcement Commission established under Section 112(a)(1) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 should be continued and appropriations authorized for the continued work of the commission. The report may contain recommendations for legislation with respect to the scope of work and composition of the commission.

SEC. 908. LIMITATION.

Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act limits, alters, expands, or diminishes the civil or criminal jurisdiction of the State of Alaska, any subdivision of the State of Alaska, or any Indian tribe in the State of Alaska.

SA 13. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 177, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 187, line 3.

Beginning on page 191, strike like 12 and all that follows through page 192, line 22, and insert the following:

Except as provided in section 4, the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

Beginning on page 193, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 194, line 3, and insert the following:

Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act limits, alters, expands, or diminishes the civil or criminal jurisdiction of the State of Alaska, any subdivision of the State of Alaska, or any Indian tribe in the State of Alaska.

SA 14. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. JOHANNS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 3. UNIVERSAL 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) by striking paragraphs (17), (18), (23), (33), (36), and (37);

(2) by redesignating—

(A) paragraph (37) as paragraph (47);

(B) paragraphs (34) and (35) as paragraphs (43) and (44), respectively;

(C) paragraphs (24) through (32) as paragraphs (32) through (40), respectively;

(D) paragraphs (21) and (22) as paragraphs (28) and (29), respectively;

(E) paragraphs (19) and (20) as paragraphs (25) and (26), respectively;

(F) paragraph (18) as paragraph (22);

(G) paragraphs (15) and (16) as paragraphs (20) and (21), respectively;

(H) paragraph (13) as paragraph (19);

(I) paragraph (14) as paragraph (18);

(J) paragraphs (10) through (12) as paragraphs (15) through (17), respectively;

(K) paragraph (9) as paragraph (13);

(L) paragraph (6) as paragraph (12);

(M) paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (10) and (11), respectively;

(N) paragraph (1) as paragraph (7);

(O) paragraph (5) as paragraph (6);

(P) paragraph (3) as paragraph (5); and

(Q) paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(3) by inserting before paragraph (3), as redesignated, the following:

''(1) 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.).

''(2) CHILD.—The term 'child' means a person who is under 11 years of age.'';

(4) in paragraph (3), as redesignated, by striking ''serious harm.'' and inserting ''serious harm to an unemancipated minor.'';

(5) in paragraph (5), as redesignated, by striking ''The term'' through ''that—'' and inserting ''The term 'community-based organization' means a nonprofit, nongovernmental, or tribal organization that serves a specific geographic community that—'';

(6) by inserting after paragraph (7), as redesignated, the following:

''(8) CULTURALLY SPECIFIC.—The term 'culturally specific' means primarily directed toward racial and ethnic minority groups (as defined in section 1707(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–6(g)).

''(9) CULTURALLY SPECIFIC SERVICES.—The term 'culturally specific services' means community-based services that offer culturally relevant and linguistically specific services and resources to culturally specific communities.'';

(7) in paragraph (12), as redesignated, by inserting ''or intimate partner'' after ''former spouse'' and ''as a spouse'';

(8) by inserting after paragraph (13), as redesignated, the following:

''(14) HOMELESS.—The term 'homeless' has the meaning provided in section 41403(6).'';

(9) in paragraph (20), as redesignated, by inserting ''or Village Public Safety Officers'' after ''governmental victim services programs'';

(10) in paragraph (21), as redesignated, by inserting at the end the following:

''Intake or referral, by itself, does not constitute legal assistance.'';

(11) by inserting after paragraph (21), as redesignated, the following:

''(22) 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.

''(23) 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.

''(24) POPULATION SPECIFIC SERVICES.—The term 'population specific services' means victim-centered services that address the safety, health, economic, legal, housing, workplace, immigration, confidentiality, or other needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and that are designed primarily for and are targeted to a specific underserved population.'';

(12) in paragraph (25), as redesignated, by striking ''services'' and inserting ''assistance'';

(13) by inserting after paragraph (26), as redesignated, the following:

''(27) RAPE CRISIS CENTER.—The term 'rape crisis center' means a nonprofit, nongovernmental, or tribal organization, or governmental entity in a State other than a Territory that provides intervention and related assistance, as specified in section 41601(b)(2)(C), to victims of sexual assault without regard to their age. In the case of a governmental entity, the entity may not be part of the criminal justice system (such as a law enforcement agency) and must be able to offer a comparable level of confidentiality as a nonprofit entity that provides similar victim services.'';

(14) in paragraph (28), as redesignated—

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

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by inserting at the end the following:

''(C) any federally recognized Indian tribe.'';

(15) in paragraph (29), as redesignated—

(A) by striking ''52'' and inserting ''57''; and

(B) by striking ''150,000'' and inserting ''250,000'';

(16) by inserting after paragraph (29), as redesignated, the following:

''(30) 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.

''(31) 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.'';

(17) by inserting after paragraph (40), as redesignated, the following:

''(41) UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.—The term 'underserved populations' means populations who face barriers in accessing and using victim services, and includes populations underserved because of geographic location, 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 by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, as appropriate.

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

(18) by inserting after paragraph (44), as redesignated, the following:

''(45) VICTIM SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term 'victim service provider' means a nonprofit, nongovernmental or tribal organization or rape crisis center, including a State or tribal coalition, that assists domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking victims, including domestic violence shelters, faith-based organizations, and other organizations, with a documented history of effective work concerning domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

''(46) VICTIM SERVICES OR SERVICES.—The terms 'victim services' and 'services' mean services provided to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including telephonic or web-based hotlines, legal advocacy, economic advocacy, emergency and transitional shelter, 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.

''(47) YOUTH.—The term 'youth' means a person who is 11 to 20 years old.''.

(b) GRANTS CONDITIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following:

''(i) disclose, reveal, or release any personally identifying information or individual information collected in connection with services 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 consent for release may not be given by the abuser of the minor, incapacitated person, or the abuser of the other parent of the minor.

If a minor or a person with a legally appointed guardian is permitted by law to receive services without the parent's or guardian's consent, the minor or person with a guardian may release information without additional consent.'';

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

''(D) INFORMATION SHARING.—

''(i) 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) In no circumstances may—

''(I) an adult, youth, or child victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking be required 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;

''(II) any personally identifying information be shared in order to comply with Federal, tribal, or State reporting, evaluation, or data collection requirements, whether for this program or any other Federal, tribal, or State 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 section prohibits a grantee or subgrantee from reporting suspected abuse or neglect, as those terms are defined by law, where specifically mandated by the State or tribe involved.''; and

(E) by inserting after subparagraph (F), as redesignated, the following:

''(G) CONFIDENTIALITY ASSESSMENT AND ASSURANCES.—Grantees and subgrantees must

document 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, or 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 available to the public via the agency's website.''; 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 the United States shall on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or disability be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination 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 2013, and 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) EXCEPTION.—If gender segregation or gender-specific programming is necessary to the essential operation of a program, nothing in this paragraph shall prevent any such program or activity from consideration of an individual's gender. In such circumstances, alternative reasonable accommodations are sufficient to meet the requirements of this paragraph.

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

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

''(14) CLARIFICATION OF VICTIM SERVICES AND LEGAL ASSISTANCE.—Victim services and legal assistance provided under this title 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).

''(15) ACCOUNTABILITY.—All grants awarded by the Attorney General that are authorized under this Act shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

''(A) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—Beginning in fiscal year 2014, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct an audit of not fewer than 10 percent of all recipients of grants under this Act to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees.

''(B) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this Act that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this Act during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the 12-month period described in subparagraph (E).

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

''(D) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this Act during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (B), the Attorney General shall—

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

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

''(E) UNRESOLVED AUDIT FINDING DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'unresolved audit finding' means an audit report finding, statement, or recommendation that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within a 12-month period beginning on the date of an initial notification of the finding or recommendation.

''(F) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

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

''(ii) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General shall not award a grant under any grant program described in this Act 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.

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

''(G) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Unless otherwise explicitly provided in authorizing legislation, not more than 7.5 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses of the Department of Justice.

''(H) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

''(i) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice, or Department of Health and Human Services under this Act may be used by the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or by any individual or organization awarded funds under this Act, to host or support any expenditure for conferences, unless in the case of the Department of Justice, the Deputy 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 a conference.

''(ii) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under clause (i) may not be delegated and 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.

''(iii) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General and Deputy Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved and denied.

''(I) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

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

''(II) lobby any representative of a Federal, State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

''(ii) PENALTY.—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a grant under this Act has violated clause (i), the Attorney General shall—

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

''(II) prohibit the grant recipient from receiving another grant under this Act for not less than 5 years.

''(J) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, 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 an annual certification that—

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

''(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under subparagraph (B) have been issued;

''(iii) all reimbursements required under subparagraph (D) have been made; and

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

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

SEC. 101. STOP GRANTS.

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

(1) in section 1001(a)(18) (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(18)), by striking ''$225,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$222,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018'';

(2) in section 2001 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg), by striking ''against women'' each place that term appears and inserting ''against victims'';

(3) 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 striking ''sexual assault and domestic violence'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking''; and

(ii) by inserting '', classifying,'' after ''identifying'';

(F) in paragraph (5)—

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

(ii) by striking ''domestic violence and dating violence'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking'';

(iii) by striking ''sexual assault and domestic violence'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking''; and

(iv) 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 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 redesignated by subparagraph (G), by striking ''and dating violence'' and inserting ''dating violence, and stalking'';

(J) in paragraph (9), as redesignated by subparagraph (G), by striking ''domestic violence or sexual assault'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking'';

(K) in paragraph (12), as 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) by striking ''and'' at the end;

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

(i) by striking ''to provide'' and inserting ''providing'';

(ii) by striking ''nonprofit nongovernmental'';

(iii) by striking the comma after ''local governments''; and

(iv) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(M) by inserting after paragraph (13), as 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) developing, enhancing, or strengthening prevention and educational programming to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, with not more than 5 percent of the amount allocated to a State to be used for this purpose.''; and

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

(4) in section 2007 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–1)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''nonprofit nongovernmental victim service 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 striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(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 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 needed for the planning process;'';

(ii) by striking paragraph (4);

(iii) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

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

''(3) grantees shall coordinate the State implementation plan described in paragraph (2) with the State plans described in section 307 of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10407) and the 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).'';

(v) in paragraph (4), as 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 (C) and (D);

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

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

(IV) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated by subclause (II), by striking ''culturally specific community based'' and inserting ''population specific''; and

(V) in subparagraph (D) as redesignated by subclause (II) by striking ''for'' and inserting ''to''; and

(vi) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, not less than 30 percent of the total amount granted to a State under this part 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.'';

(D) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(E) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (2)—

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

(II) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''linguistically and culturally'' and inserting ''population''; 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 to ensure that the States meet statutory, regulatory, and other programs 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 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—

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

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

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

''(i) the need for the grant funds;

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

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

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

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

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

''(F) a description of how the State plans to meet the requirements of subsection (c)(5);

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

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

(5) in section 2010 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–4)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local government shall not be entitled to funds under this part 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 amended 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 this Act to come into compliance with this subsection.''; and

(6) 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'' and all that follows through ''sexual assault'' and inserting ''domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking''.

SEC. 102. GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ACCOUNTABILITY 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 but not policies that mandate the arrest of an individual by law enforcement in responding to an incident of domestic violence in the absence of probable cause'' 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, courts, and court-based and court-related personnel'';

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

(viii) in paragraph (10), by striking ''nonprofit, 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.

''(20) To provide human immunodeficiency virus testing programs, counseling, and prophylaxis for victims of sexual assault.

''(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''; and

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

(III) in clause (ii), as redesignated by subclause (III) of this clause, by striking ''subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''clause (i)''; and

(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;

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

(I) by striking the comma that immediately follows another comma; and

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

''(1) States''; and

(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''; and

(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''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) ALLOCATION FOR SEXUAL ASSAULT.—Of the amounts appropriated for purposes of this part for each fiscal year, not less than 30 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 2014 through 2018.''; and

(2) by striking the period that immediately follows another 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''; and

(B) in the second sentence, by inserting ''or arising out of'' after ''relating to'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the heading, by inserting ''AND GRANT CONDITIONS'' after ''DEFINITIONS''; and

(B) by inserting ''and grant conditions'' after ''definitions'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''victims services organizations'' and inserting ''victim service providers''; and

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

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

(4) in subsection (d)—

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

''(A) has demonstrated expertise in providing legal assistance 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;''; and

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

(5) in subsection (f)(1), by striking ''this section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''this section $41,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

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

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

''(A) court infrastructure (such as specialized courts, 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 are proceeding with the assistance of a legal advocate; and

''(7) to improve training and education to assist judges, judicial personnel, attorneys, child welfare personnel, and legal advocates in the civil justice system.

''(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) 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), if the applicant proposes to operate supervised visitation programs and services or safe visitation exchange;

''(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 organization 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 fiscal years 2014 through 2018. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall 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 3796gg–10 of this title.

''(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. SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT.

Section 40152(c) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13941) is amended by striking ''$5,000,000'' and all that follows and inserting ''$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 106. 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) by striking ''Code of Ethics'' in section (c)(2) and inserting ''Standards for Programs''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(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 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 107. CRIMINAL PROVISION RELATING TO STALKING, INCLUDING CYBERSTALKING.

Section 2261A of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2261A. Stalking

''Whoever—

''(1) travels in interstate or foreign commerce or is present within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or enters or leaves Indian country, with the intent to kill, injure, harass, intimidate, or place under surveillance with intent to kill, injure, harass, or intimidate another person, and in the course of, or as a result of, such travel or presence engages in conduct that—

''(A) places that person in reasonable fear of the death of, or serious bodily injury to—

''(i) that person;

''(ii) an immediate family member (as defined in section 115) of that person; or

''(iii) a spouse or intimate partner of that person; or

''(B) causes, attempts to cause, or would be reasonably expected to cause substantial emotional distress to a person described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A); or

''(2) with the intent to kill, injure, harass, intimidate, or place under surveillance with intent to kill, injure, harass, or intimidate another person, uses the mail, any interactive computer service or electronic communication service or electronic communication system of interstate commerce, or any other facility of interstate or foreign commerce to engage in a course of conduct that—

''(A) places that person in reasonable fear of the death of or serious bodily injury to a person described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of paragraph (1)(A); or

''(B) causes, attempts to cause, or would be reasonably expected to cause substantial emotional distress to a person described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of paragraph (1)(A),

shall be punished as provided in section 2261(b) of this title.''.

SEC. 108. 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 (3) shall not apply to this grant program.

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

''(A) Section 2001 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (STOP Grants).

''(B) Section 2101 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Grants to Encourage Accountability 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 implementing prevention, outreach and intervention strategies to address the barriers to accessing services, promoting community engagement in the prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking within the targeted underserved populations, and evaluating the program.

''(d) IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—The Attorney General shall make grants to eligible entities for the purpose of providing or enhancing population specific outreach and services to 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 victim 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 submit to the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women a report that describes the activities carried out with grant funds.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to the funds identified in subsection (a)(1), there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(h) DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.—In this section the definitions and grant conditions in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925) shall apply.''.

SEC. 109. 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 striking subsection (a)(2) and inserting:

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

''(A) Section 2101 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Grants to Encourage Accountability Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders).

''(B) Section 1401 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 40802a 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. 110. REAUTHORIZATION OF 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 and inserting ''$2,300,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 111. OFFSET OF RESTITUTION AND OTHER STATE JUDICIAL DEBTS AGAINST INCOME TAX REFUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to authority to make credits or refunds) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g) through (l) as subsections (h) through (m), respectively; and

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

''(g) COLLECTION OF PAST-DUE, LEGALLY ENFORCEABLE RESTITUTION AND OTHER STATE JUDICIAL DEBTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In any State which wishes to collect past-due, legally enforceable State judicial debts, the chief justice of the State's highest court shall designate a single State entity to communicate judicial debt information to the Secretary. In making such designation, the chief justice of the State's highest court shall select, whenever practicable, a relevant State official or agency responsible under State law for collecting the State's income tax or other statewide excise at the time of the designation. Upon receiving notice from a State designated entity that a named person owes a past-due, legally enforceable State judicial debt to or in such State, the Secretary shall, under such conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary—

''(A) reduce the amount of any overpayment payable to such person by the amount of such State judicial debt;

''(B) pay the amount by which such overpayment is reduced under subparagraph (A) to such State designated entity and notify such State designated entity of such person's name, taxpayer identification number, address, and the amount collected; and

''(C) notify the person making such overpayment that the overpayment has been reduced by an amount necessary to satisfy a past-due, legally enforceable State judicial debt.

If an offset is made pursuant to a joint return, the notice under subparagraph (B) shall include the names, taxpayer identification numbers, and addresses of each person filing such return.

''(2) PRIORITIES FOR OFFSET.—Any overpayment by a person shall be reduced pursuant to this subsection—

''(A) after such overpayment is reduced pursuant to—

''(i) subsection (a) with respect to any liability for any internal revenue tax on the part of the person who made the overpayment;

''(ii) subsection (c) with respect to past-due support;

''(iii) subsection (d) with respect to any past-due, legally enforceable debt owed to a Federal agency; and

''(iv) subsection (e) with respect to any past-due, legally enforceable State income tax obligations; and

''(B) before such overpayment is credited to the future liability for any Federal internal revenue tax of such person pursuant to subsection (b).

If the Secretary receives notice from 1 or more State designated entities of more than 1 debt subject to paragraph (1) that is owed by such person to such State agency or State judicial branch, any overpayment by such person shall be applied against such debts in the order in which such debts accrued.

''(3) NOTICE; CONSIDERATION OF EVIDENCE.—Rules similar to the rules of subsection (e)(4) shall apply with respect to debts under this subsection.

''(4) PAST-DUE, LEGALLY ENFORCEABLE STATE JUDICIAL DEBT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'past-due, legally enforceable State judicial debt' means a debt—

''(i) which resulted from a judgment or sentence rendered by any court or tribunal of competent jurisdiction which—

''(I) handles criminal or traffic cases in the State; and

''(II) has determined an amount of State judicial debt to be due; and

''(ii) which resulted from a State judicial debt which has been assessed and is past-due but not collected.

''(B) STATE JUDICIAL DEBT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'State judicial debt' includes court costs, fees, fines, assessments, restitution to victims of crime, and other monies resulting from a judgment or sentence rendered by any court or tribunal of competent jurisdiction handling criminal or traffic cases in the State.

''(5) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations prescribing the time and manner in which State designated entities must submit notices of past-due, legally enforceable State judicial debts and the necessary information that must be contained in or accompany such notices. The regulations shall specify the types of State judicial monies and the minimum amount of debt to which the reduction procedure established by paragraph (1) may be applied. The regulations shall require State designated entities to pay a fee to reimburse the Secretary for the cost of applying such procedure. Any fee paid to the Secretary pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be used to reimburse appropriations which bore all or part of the cost of applying such procedure.

''(6) ERRONEOUS PAYMENT TO STATE.—Any State designated entity receiving notice from the Secretary that an erroneous payment has been made to such State designated entity under paragraph (1) shall pay promptly to the Secretary, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, an amount equal to the amount of such erroneous payment (without regard to whether any other amounts payable to such State designated entity under such paragraph have been paid to such State designated entity).''.

(b) DISCLOSURE OF RETURN INFORMATION.—Section 6103(l)(10) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to disclosure of certain information to agencies requesting a reduction under subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 6402) is amended by striking ''or (f)'' each place it appears in the text and heading and inserting ''(f), or (g)''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 6402(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and (f)'' and inserting ''(f), and (g),''.

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 6402(d) of such Code is amended by striking ''subsections (e) and (f)'' and inserting ''subsections (e), (f), and (g)''.

(3) Paragraph (3)(B) of section 6402(e) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(B) before such overpayment is—

''(i) reduced pursuant to subsection (g) with respect to past-due, legally enforceable State judicial debts, and

''(ii) credited to the future liability for any Federal internal revenue tax of such person pursuant to subsection (b).''.

(4) Section 6402(h) of such Code, as so redesignated, is amended by striking ''or (f)'' and inserting ''(f), or (g)''.

(5) Section 6402(j) of such Code, as so redesignated, is amended by striking ''or (f)'' and inserting ''(f), or (g)''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to refunds payable for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012.

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)—

(A) by striking ''governmental and nongovernmental''; and

(B) by striking ''other programs'' and all that follows 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.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations for programs and activities'' and inserting ''nongovernmental or tribal programs and activities''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)(v), by striking ''linguistically and''.

(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 2014 through 2018''.

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 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) developing, enlarging, or strengthening 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 2014 through 2018''.

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 ''nonprofit 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 2014 through 2018''.

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 'exploitation' means domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

''(3) the term 'later life', relating to an individual, means the individual is 60 years of age or older; and

''(4) the term 'neglect' means the failure of a caregiver or fiduciary to provide the goods or services that are necessary to maintain the health or safety of an individual in later life.

''(b) GRANT PROGRAM.—

''(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may make grants to eligible entities to carry out the activities described in paragraph (2).

''(2) MANDATORY AND PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—

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

''(i) provide training programs to assist law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, agencies of States or units of local government, population specific organizations, victim service providers, victim advocates, and relevant officers in Federal, tribal, State, territorial, and local courts in recognizing and addressing 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 2014 through 2018.''.

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

SEC. 301. RAPE PREVENTION 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''; and

(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 2014 through 2018''.

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 is amended by striking sections 41201 through 41204 (42 U.S.C. 14043c through 14043c–3) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 41201. CREATING HOPE THROUGH OUTREACH, OPTIONS, SERVICES, AND EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH ('CHOOSE CHILDREN & 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, stalking, or sex trafficking and prevent future violence.

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

''(1) SERVICES TO ADVOCATE FOR AND RESPOND TO YOUTH.—To develop, expand, and strengthen victim-centered interventions and services that target youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking. 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, 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. Funds may be used to—

''(A) assess and analyze currently available services for youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking, 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, stalking, or sex trafficking 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, stalking, and sex trafficking, as well as runaway and homeless youth, and to properly refer such children, youth, and their families to appropriate services.

''(2) SUPPORTING YOUTH THROUGH EDUCATION AND PROTECTION.—To enable middle schools, high schools, and institutions of higher education to—

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

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

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

''(D) implement scientifically valid educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking and the impact of such violence on youth; or

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

''(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, or population-specific or community-based organization with a demonstrated history of effective work addressing the needs of youth who are victims of (including runaway or homeless youth affected by) domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or sex trafficking;

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

''(C) 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, a school district, or an institution of higher education.

''(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 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, a school district, or an institution of higher education.

''(B) OTHER PARTNERSHIPS.—All applicants under this section are encouraged to work in partnership with organizations and agencies that work with the relevant 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, nongovernmental 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 all with priority on victim safety and autonomy; and

''(3) ensure that all individuals providing intervention or prevention programming 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, stalking, and sex trafficking.

''(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 2014 through 2018.

''(g) 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. The requirements of this section shall not apply to funds allocated under this paragraph.

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

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

''(16) REQUIREMENT FOR SCIENTIFICALLY VALID PROGRAMS.—All grant funds made available by this Act shall be used to provide scientifically valid educational programming, training, and public awareness communications regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking that is produced by accredited entities, as appropriate.''.

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 ''stalking on campuses, and'' and inserting ''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 inserting ''including the use of technology to commit these crimes,'' after ''sexual assault and stalking,'';

(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 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 scientifically valid educational programming for students regarding domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking that is produced by accredited entities.

''(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 ''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;''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''2012 through 2016'';

(4) in subsection (d)—

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

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

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

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

(1) in paragraph (1)(F)—

(A) in clause (i)(VIII), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) by striking ''sexual orientation'' and inserting ''national origin, sexual orientation,''; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking incidents that were reported to campus security authorities or local police agencies.'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting '', that withholds the names of victims as confidential,'' after ''that is timely'';

(3) in paragraph (6)(A)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) as clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively;

(B) by inserting before clause (ii), as redesignated by subparagraph (A), the following:

''(i) The terms 'dating violence', 'domestic violence', and 'stalking' have the meaning given such terms in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)).''; and

(C) by inserting after clause (iv), as redesignated by subparagraph (A), the following:

''(v) The term 'sexual assault' means an offense classified as a forcible or nonforcible sex offense under the uniform crime reporting system of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.'';

(4) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking ''paragraph (1)(F)'' and inserting ''clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(F)''; and

(B) by inserting after ''Hate Crime Statistics Act.'' the following: ''For the offenses of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, such statistics shall be compiled in accordance with the definitions used in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)).'';

(5) by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

''(8)(A) Each institution of higher education participating in any program under this title and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, other than a foreign institution of higher education, shall develop and distribute as part of the report described in paragraph (1) a statement of policy regarding—

''(i) such institution's programs to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

''(ii) the procedures that such institution will follow once an incident of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking has been reported.

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

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

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

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

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

''(III) options regarding law enforcement and campus authorities, including notification of the victim's option to—

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

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

''(cc) decline to notify such authorities; and

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

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

''(iv) Notification of students about existing counseling, health, mental health, victim advocacy, legal assistance, and other services available for victims both on-campus and in the community.

''(v) Notification of victims about options for, and available assistance in, changing academic, living, transportation, and working situations, if so requested by the victim and if such accommodations are reasonably available, regardless of whether the victim chooses to report the crime to campus police or local law enforcement.

''(C) A student or employee who reports to an institution of higher education that the student or employee has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, whether the offense occurred on or off campus, shall be provided with a written explanation of the student or employee's rights and options, as described in clauses (ii) through (vii) of subparagraph (B).'';

(6) in paragraph (9), by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General of the United States,'';

(7) by striking paragraph (16) and inserting the following:

''(16)(A) The Secretary shall seek the advice and counsel of the Attorney General of the United States concerning the development, and dissemination to institutions of higher education, of best practices information about campus safety and emergencies.

''(B) The Secretary shall seek the advice and counsel of the Attorney General of the United States and the Secretary of Health and Human Services concerning the development, and dissemination to institutions of higher education, of best practices information about preventing and responding to incidents of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including elements of institutional policies that have proven successful based on evidence-based outcome measurements.''; and

(8) by striking paragraph (17) and inserting the following:

''(17) No officer, employee, or agent of an institution participating in any program under this title shall retaliate, intimidate, threaten, coerce, or otherwise discriminate against any individual for exercising their rights or responsibilities under any provision of this subsection.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect with respect to the annual security report under section 485(f)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092(f)(1)) prepared by an institution of higher education 1 calendar year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each subsequent calendar year.

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 ''$500,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

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 and provide education and skills training 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) scientifically valid age appropriate education that is produced by accredited entities 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, healthcare 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.

''(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be an 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 non-profit, 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 non-profit, nongovernmental organization that has a history of effective work preventing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and at least one of the following:

''(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 non-profit, 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) Healthcare 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—

''(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 grantee 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 2014 through 2018.

''(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 (a).

''(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 HEALTHCARE SYSTEM'S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING

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

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

''SEC. 399P. GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEM'S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

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

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

''(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 culturally competent 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;

''(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 follow-up 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 GRANTEES.—

''(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 40002(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 confidentially 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) APPLICATION.—

''(A) 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.

''(B) SUBSECTION (a)(1) AND (2) GRANTEES.—Applications for grants under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall include—

''(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.

''(C) SUBSECTION (a)(3) GRANTEES.—An entity desiring a grant under subsection (a)(3) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such a 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 organizations, State or tribal law enforcement task forces (where appropriate), and population specific organizations with demonstrated expertise in 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) GRANTEES.—To be eligible to receive funding under subsection (a)(3), an entity shall be—

''(A) a State department (or other division) of health, a State, tribal, or territorial domestic violence or sexual assault coalition or victim service provider, or any other nonprofit, 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, dating or sexual violence 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 2014 through 2018.

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

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

(1) Section 40297 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13973).

(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''; and

(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) the program under subtitle A of 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)) that bears interest at a rate determined under the proviso under paragraph (5) of such section 221(d);

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

''(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 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 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, 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.

''(2) PROVISION.—Each public housing agency or owner or manager of housing assisted under a covered housing program shall provide the notice developed under paragraph (1), together with the form described in subsection (c)(3)(A), to an applicant for or tenants 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;

''(C) with any notification of eviction or notification of termination of assistance; and

''(D) 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 TRANSFERS.—Each appropriate agency shall adopt a model emergency transfer plan for use by public housing agencies and owners or managers of housing assisted under covered housing programs that—

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

''(A) the tenant expressly requests the transfer; and

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

''(ii) in the case of a tenant who is a victim of sexual assault, the sexual assault occurred on the premises during the 90 day period preceding the request for transfer; and

''(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.

''(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, assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)).

''(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 (l)—

(i) in paragraph (5), by striking '', and that an incident or incidents of actual or threatened domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking will not be construed as a serious or repeated violation of the lease by the victim or threatened victim of that violence and will not be good cause for terminating the tenancy or occupancy rights of the 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 or participant is or has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking is not an appropriate basis for denial of program assistance or for denial of admission if the applicant otherwise qualifies for assistance or admission''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (ii), by striking '', and that an incident or incidents of actual or threatened domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking will not be construed as a serious or repeated violation of the lease by the victim or threatened victim of that violence and will not be good cause for terminating the tenancy or occupancy rights of the 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 or incidents of actual or threatened domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking shall not be construed as a serious or repeated violation of the lease by the victim or threatened victim of that violence and shall not be good cause for terminating the tenancy or occupancy rights of the 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

(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.

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

Chapter 11 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13975 et seq.) 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**'';

(B) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''fleeing''; and

(C) in subsection (g)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011'' and inserting ''$35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''; 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 2014 through 2018''; 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 2014 through 2018''.

TITLE VII—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

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

Section 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 2014 through 2018''.

TITLE VIII—IMMIGRATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. APPLICATION OF SPECIAL RULE FOR BATTERED SPOUSE OR CHILD.

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 adjudicating applications under this paragraph, the Secretary of Homeland Security 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). The determination of what evidence is credible and the weight to be given that evidence shall be within the sole discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security.

''(E) FRAUD DETECTION EFFORTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon filing of an application under this paragraph, the Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services shall—

''(I) review such an application for completeness and clear indicators of fraud or misrepresentation of material fact;

''(II) conduct an in-person interview of the alien who filed the application; and

''(III) facilitate cooperation between the service center that adjudicates all applications under this paragraph and the local service centers that have the resources to investigate and interview the applicant to review any evidence that may pertain to the application.

''(ii) GUIDELINES.—The Director may issue guidelines for alternatives to the in-person interview so long as the guidelines do not jeopardize national security and include measures to detect fraud and abuse.

''(iii) EVIDENCE.—The Director may gather other evidence and interview other witnesses, including the accused United States citizen or legal permanent resident, if such individual consents to be interviewed.

''(F) PRIORITY OF ONGOING IMMIGRATION AND LAW ENFORCEMENT INVESTIGATIONS OR PROSECUTIONS.—

''(i) DETERMINATION.—During the adjudication of an application under this paragraph, the Director shall determine whether any Federal, State, territorial, tribal, or local law enforcement agency has undertaken an investigation or prosecution of the petitioning alien for—

''(I) conduct relating to the battering or abuse alleged by the petitioning alien under this paragraph;

''(II) a violation of any immigration law; or

''(III) a violation of any other criminal law.

''(ii) USE OF INFORMATION.—If such an investigation or prosecution was commenced, the investigative officer of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services shall—

''(I) obtain as much information as possible about the investigation or prosecution; and

''(II) consider that information as part of the adjudication of the application.

''(iii) PENDING INVESTIGATION.—If such an investigation or prosecution is pending, the adjudication of the application 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 application.

''(iv) EFFECT OF DETERMINATION TO REMOVE OR INDICT.—If such an investigation determines that the alien is removable, or if the alien is indicted, the application under this paragraph shall be denied.

''(v) EFFECT OF NOT GUILTY DETERMINATION.—If an investigation has been undertaken and a determination was made that a prosecution was not warranted or if a criminal proceeding finds the United States citizen or legal permanent resident not guilty of the charges, such determination shall be binding and the application under this paragraph shall be denied.

''(G) EFFECT OF MATERIAL MISREPRESENTATION.—If an alien makes a material misrepresentation during the application process under this paragraph, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

''(i) deny the application and remove the alien on an expedited basis; and

''(ii) make the alien ineligible for any taxpayer funded benefits or immigration benefits.''.

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 penalty of perjury that—

''(i) the petitioner reported the criminal activity to a law enforcement agency within 120 days of its occurrence;

''(ii) the statute of limitations for prosecuting an offense based on the criminal activity has not lapsed;

''(iii) the criminal activity is actively under investigation or a prosecution has been commenced; and

''(iv) the petitioner has provided to a law enforcement agency 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 Naturalization 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.''.

(3) In paragraph (5)(B)—

(A) by striking ''In circumstances'' and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In circumstances''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) FRAUDULENT FAILURES OF UNITED STATES CLIENTS TO MAKE REQUIRED SELF-DISCLOSURES.—A person who knowingly and with intent to defraud another person outside the United States in order to recruit, solicit, entice, or induce that other person into entering a dating or matrimonial relationship, makes false or fraudulent representations regarding the disclosures described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of subsection (d)(2)(B), including by failing to make any such disclosures, shall be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.''.

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. DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PURPOSES.

(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.—Section 384(d) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1367(d)) is amended by inserting ''and severe forms of trafficking in persons or criminal activity listed in section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(u))'' after ''domestic violence''.

(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 1986 is amended by striking ''241(a)(2)'' in the matter following subparagraph (F) and inserting ''237(a)(2)''.

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''; and

(B) by inserting '', and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013'' before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services'' and inserting ''Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of the Interior,''; and

(B) in paragraph (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. 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''; and

(ii) by striking ''fine'' and inserting ''a fine''; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) 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) DEFINITIONS.—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''.

(c) REPEAT OFFENDERS.—Section 2265A(b)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or tribal'' after ''State''.

SEC. 905. 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 2013, the National''; and

(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''; 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 2013''; and

(4) in paragraph (5), by striking ''this section $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008'' and inserting ''this subsection $500,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 and 2015''.

(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 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 906. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 907. TRIBAL PROTECTION ORDERS.

Section 2265(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''COURT JURISDICTION'' and inserting ''PROTECTION ORDERS'';

(2) by striking ''For purposes of this section'' and inserting the following:

''(1) TRIBAL COURT JURISDICTION.—For purposes of this section and subject to paragraph (2)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) UNITED STATES COURT JURISDICTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An Indian tribe may petition a district court of the United States in

whose district the tribe is located for an appropriately tailored protection order excluding any person from areas within the Indian country of the tribe.

''(B) REQUIRED SHOWING.—The court shall issue a protection order prohibiting the person identified in a petition under subparagraph (A) from entering all or part of the Indian country of the tribe upon a showing that—

''(i) the person identified in the petition has assaulted an Indian spouse or intimate partner who resides or works in such Indian country, or an Indian child who resides with or is in the care or custody of such spouse or intimate partner; and

''(ii) a protection order is reasonably necessary to protect the safety and well-being of the spouse, intimate partner, or child described in clause (i).

''(C) FACTORS TO CONSIDER.—In determining the areas from which the person identified in a protection order issued under subparagraph (B) shall be excluded, the court shall consider all appropriate factors, including the places of residence, work, or school of—

''(i) the person identified in the protection order; and

''(ii) the spouse, intimate partner, or child described in subparagraph (B)(i).

''(D) PENALTY FOR WILLFUL VIOLATION.—A person who willfully violates a protection order issued under subparagraph (B) shall be punished as provided in section 2261(b).''.

SEC. 908. ALASKA RURAL JUSTICE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMISSION.

The Attorney General, in consultation with the Attorney General of the State of Alaska, the Commissioner of Public Safety of the State of Alaska, the Alaska Federation of Natives, and Federally recognized Indian tribes in the State of Alaska, shall report to Congress not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act with respect to whether the Alaska Rural Justice and Law Enforcement Commission established under Section 112(a)(1) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 should be continued and appropriations authorized for the continued work of the commission. The report may contain recommendations for legislation with respect to the scope of work and composition of the commission.

SEC. 909. FUNDING FOR FEDERAL PROSECUTORS AND MAGISTRATE JUDGES TO PROSECUTE AND ADJUDICATE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CASES IN INDIAN COUNTRY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018—

(1) $18,750,000 to the Attorney General for salaries and expenses of assistant United States attorneys who are located in Indian country and prosecute only cases of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, or stalking in Indian country; and

(2) $6,250,000 to the district courts of the United States for salaries and expenses of United States magistrate judges who are located in Indian country and hear only—

(A) cases of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, or stalking in Indian country; or

(B) petitions for protection orders under paragraph (2) of section 2265(e) of title 18, United States Code, as added by this Act.

(b) OFFSET OF AUTHORIZATIONS.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 for any grant administered by the Department of Justice, including amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or the amendments made by this Act, is reduced by 1 percent.

TITLE X—VIOLENT CRIME AGAINST WOMEN

SEC. 1001. 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 2013, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall publish a final rule adopting national standards for the detection, prevention, reduction, and punishment of rape and sexual assault in facilities that maintain custody of aliens detained for a violation of the immigrations laws of the United States.

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

''(3) COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

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

''(B) include the results of the assessments in performance evaluations of facilities 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 2013, 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. 1002. REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH THE DNA FINGERPRINT ACT OF 2005.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall prepare and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) describes, in detail, the measures and procedures taken by the Secretary to comply with any regulation promulgated pursuant to section 3(e)(1) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135a(e)(1)); and

(2) provides a detailed explanation of the circumstances and specific cases, if available, in which—

(A) the Secretary failed to comply with any regulation promulgated pursuant to such section 3(e)(1);

(B) the Secretary requested the Attorney General approve additional limitations to, or exceptions from, any regulation promulgated pursuant to such section 3(e)(1); or

(C) the Secretary consulted with the Attorney General to determine that the collection of DNA samples is not feasible because of operational exigencies or resource limitations.

SEC. 1003. REPORT ON CAPACITY UTILIZATION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare a study on the availability of services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

(b) CONTENT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) The services or categories of services that are currently being offered or provided to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

(2) The approximate number of victims receiving these services.

(3) The approximate number of victims, and the percentage of the total population of victims, who request services but are not provided services.

(4) The reasons why victims are not provided services, including—

(A) shelter or service organization lack of resources;

(B) shelter or organization limitations not associated with funding;

(C) geographical, logistical, or physical barriers;

(D) characteristics of the perpetrator; and

(E) characteristics or background of the victim.

(5) For any refusal to provide services to a victim, the reasons for the denial of services, including victim characteristics or background, including—

(A) employment history;

(B) criminal history;

(C) illegal or prescription drug use;

(D) financial situation;

(E) status of the victim as a parent;

(F) personal hygiene;

(G) current or past disease or illness;

(H) religious association or belief;

(I) physical characteristics of the victim or the provider facility

(J) gender;

(K) race;

(L) national origin or status as alien;

(M) failure to follow shelter or organization rules or procedures;

(N) previous contact or experiences with the shelter or service organization; or

(O) any other victim characteristic or background that is determined to be the cause of the denial of services.

(6) The frequency or prevalence of denial of services from organizations who receive Federal funds.

(7) The frequency or prevalence of denial of service from organizations who do not receive Federal funds.

SEC. 1004. MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCE FOR AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ABUSE.

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. 1005. REMOVAL OF DRUNK DRIVERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(a)(43)(F) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43)(F)) is amended by striking ''for which the term of imprisonment'' and inserting '', including a third drunk driving conviction, regardless of the States in which the convictions occurred or whether the offenses are classified as misdemeanors or felonies under State or Federal law, for which the term of imprisonment is''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to a conviction for drunk driving that occurred before, on, or after such date.

(B) TWO OR MORE PRIOR CONVICTIONS.—An alien who has received two or more convictions for drunk driving prior to the date of the enactment of this Act may not be subject to removal for the commission of an aggravated felony pursuant to section 101(a)(43)(F) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43)(F)), as amended by subsection (a), on the basis of such convictions until the date that the alien is convicted of a drunk driving offense after such date of enactment.

SEC. 1006. ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR INTERSTATE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RESULTING IN DEATH, LIFE-THREATENING BODILY INJURY, PERMANENT DISFIGUREMENT, AND SERIOUS BODILY INJURY.

Section 2261(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''not less than 15 years'' after ''any term of years'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''20 years'' and inserting ''25 years''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''10 years'' and inserting ''15 years''.

SEC. 1007. MINIMUM PENALTIES FOR THE POSSESSION OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.

(a) CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATING TO MATERIAL INVOLVING THE SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF MINORS.—Section 2252(b)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''imprisoned for not more than 20 years'' and inserting ''imprisoned for not less than 1 year and not more than 20 years''.

(b) CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATING TO MATERIAL CONSTITUTING OR CONTAINING CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.—Section 2252A(b)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''imprisoned for not more than 20 years'' and inserting ''imprisoned for not less than 1 year and not more than 20 years''.

SEC. 1008. AUDIT OF OFFICE FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME.

(a) AUDIT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an objective and credible audit of the expenditure of funds by the Office for Victims of Crime (in this section referred to as the ''Office'') from the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601) (in this section referred to as the ''Fund'').

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General 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 audit conducted under subsection (a) that—

(1) addresses whether the Office provides amounts from the Fund to individuals or entities that support individuals who are not victims of crime;

(2) addresses whether the Office is authorized to provide amounts from the Fund to individuals or entities described in paragraph (1);

(3) addresses whether the Office provides amounts from the Fund for legal services for victims of crime; and

(4) if the Office no longer provides amounts from the Fund for the services described in paragraph (3), contains an explanation for why the Office no longer provides amounts for such services.

TITLE XI—THE SAFER ACT

SEC. 1101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Reporting Act of 2013'' or the ''SAFER Act of 2013''.

SEC. 1102. DEBBIE SMITH GRANTS FOR AUDITING SEXUAL ASSAULT EVIDENCE BACKLOGS.

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

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(7) To conduct an audit consistent with subsection (n) of the samples of sexual assault evidence that are in the possession of the State or unit of local government and are awaiting testing.

''(8) To ensure that the collection and processing of DNA evidence by law enforcement agencies from crimes, including sexual assault and other violent crimes against persons, is carried out in an appropriate and timely manner and in accordance with the protocols and practices developed under subsection (o)(1).'';

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

''(4) ALLOCATION OF GRANT AWARDS FOR AUDITS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2017, not less than 5 percent, but not more than 7 percent, of the grant amounts distributed under paragraph (1) shall, if sufficient applications to justify such amounts are received by the Attorney General, be awarded for purposes described in subsection (a)(7).

''(B) NO EFFECT ON MINIMUM AMOUNTS FOR CERTAIN DNA ANALYSES.—None of the funds required to be distributed under this paragraph shall decrease or otherwise limit the availability of funds required to be awarded to States or units of local government under paragraph (3).''; and

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

''(n) USE OF FUNDS FOR AUDITING SEXUAL ASSAULT EVIDENCE BACKLOGS.—

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

''(A) submits a plan for performing the audit of samples described in such subsection; and

''(B) includes in such plan a good-faith estimate of the number of such samples.

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

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

''(B) shall—

''(i) not later than 1 year after receiving the grant, complete the audit referred to in paragraph (1)(A) in accordance with the plan submitted under such paragraph;

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

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

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

''(II) identify the date or dates after which the State or unit of local government would be barred by any applicable statutes of limitations from prosecuting a perpetrator of the sexual assault to which the sample relates;

''(iv) provide that—

''(I) the chief law enforcement officer of the State or unit of local government, respectively, is the individual responsible for the compliance of the State or unit of local government, respectively, with the reporting requirements described in clause (v); or

''(II) the designee of such officer may fulfill the responsibility described in subclause (I) so long as such designee is an employee of the State or unit of local government, respectively, and is not an employee of any governmental laboratory or non-governmental vendor laboratory; and

''(v) comply with all grantee reporting requirements described in paragraph (4).

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

''(4) SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EVIDENCE REPORTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For not less than 12 months after the completion of an initial count of sexual assault evidence that is awaiting testing during an audit referred to in paragraph (1)(A), a State or unit of local government that receives a grant award under subsection (a)(7) shall, not less than every 60 days, submit a report to the Department of Justice, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, which shall contain the information required under subparagraph (B).

''(B) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—A report under this paragraph shall contain the following information:

''(i) The name of the State or unit of local government filing the report.

''(ii) The period of dates covered by the report.

''(iii) The cumulative total number of samples of sexual assault evidence that, at the end of the reporting period—

''(I) are in the possession of the State or unit of local government at the reporting period;

''(II) are awaiting testing; and

''(III) the State or unit of local government has determined should undergo DNA or other appropriate forensic analyses.

''(iv) The cumulative total number of samples of sexual assault evidence in the possession of the State or unit of local government that, at the end of the reporting period, the State or unit of local government has determined should not undergo DNA or other appropriate forensic analyses, provided that the reporting form shall allow for the State or unit of local government, at its sole discretion, to explain the reasoning for this determination in some or all cases.

''(v) The cumulative total number of samples of sexual assault evidence in a total under clause (iii) that have been submitted to a laboratory for DNA or other appropriate forensic analyses.

''(vi) The cumulative total number of samples of sexual assault evidence identified by an audit referred to in paragraph (1)(A) or under paragraph (2)(B)(ii) for which DNA or other appropriate forensic analysis has been completed at the end of the reporting period.

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

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

''(C) PUBLICATION OF REPORTS.—Not later than 7 days after the submission of a report under this paragraph by a State or unit of local government, the Attorney General shall, subject to subparagraph (D), publish and disseminate a facsimile of the full contents of such report on an appropriate internet website.

''(D) PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—The Attorney General shall ensure that any information published and disseminated as part of a report under this paragraph, which reports information under this subsection, does not include personally identifiable information or details about a sexual assault that might lead to the identification of the individuals involved.

''(E) OPTIONAL REPORTING.—The Attorney General shall—

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

''(ii) make available to all States and units of local government the reporting form created pursuant to subparagraph (A), whether or not they are required to submit such reports, and allow such States or units of local government, at their sole discretion, to submit such reports for publication.

''(F) SAMPLES EXEMPT FROM REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The reporting requirements described in paragraph (2) shall not apply to a sample of sexual assault evidence that—

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

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

''(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) AWAITING TESTING.—The term 'awaiting testing' means, with respect to a sample of sexual assault evidence, that—

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

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

''(iii) the sample is related to a criminal case or investigation in which final disposition has not yet been reached.

''(B) FINAL DISPOSITION.—The term 'final disposition' means, with respect to a criminal case or investigation to which a sample of sexual assault evidence relates—

''(i) the conviction or acquittal of all suspected perpetrators of the crime involved;

''(ii) a determination by the State or unit of local government in possession of the sample that the case is unfounded; or

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

''(C) POSSESSION.—

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

''(ii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in clause (i) shall be construed to create or amend any Federal rights or privileges for non-governmental vendor laboratories described in regulations promulgated under section 210303 of the DNA Identification Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14131).

''(o) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROTOCOLS, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND DEFINITIONS.—

''(1) PROTOCOLS AND PRACTICES.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the SAFER Act of 2013, the Director, in consultation with Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and government laboratories, shall develop and publish a description of protocols and practices the Director considers appropriate for the accurate, timely, and effective collection and processing of DNA evidence, including protocols and practices specific to sexual assault cases, which shall address appropriate steps in the investigation of cases that might involve DNA evidence, including—

''(A) how to determine—

''(i) which evidence is to be collected by law enforcement personnel and forwarded for testing;

''(ii) the preferred order in which evidence from the same case is to be tested; and

''(iii) what information to take into account when establishing the order in which evidence from different cases is to be tested;

''(B) the establishment of a reasonable period of time in which evidence is to be forwarded by emergency response providers, law enforcement personnel, and prosecutors to a laboratory for testing;

''(C) the establishment of reasonable periods of time in which each stage of analytical laboratory testing is to be completed;

''(D) systems to encourage communication within a State or unit of local government among emergency response providers, law enforcement personnel, prosecutors, courts, defense counsel, crime laboratory personnel, and crime victims regarding the status of crime scene evidence to be tested; and

''(E) standards for conducting the audit of the backlog for DNA case work in sexual assault cases required under subsection (n).

''(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—The Director shall make available technical assistance and training to support States and units of local government in adopting and implementing the protocols and practices developed under paragraph (1) on and after the date on which the protocols and practices are published.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms 'awaiting testing' and 'possession' have the meanings given those terms in subsection (n).''.

SEC. 1103. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year for which a grant is made for the purpose described in section 2(a)(7) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000, as amended by section 1102, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) lists the States and units of local government that have been awarded such grants and the amount of the grant received by each such State or unit of local government;

(2) states the number of extensions granted by the Attorney General under section 2(n)(3) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000, as added by section 1102; and

(3) summarizes the processing status of the samples of sexual assault evidence identified in Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Reports established under section 2(o)(4) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Act of 2000, including the number of samples that have not been tested.

SEC. 1104. REDUCING THE 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—

(a) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(b) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, not less than 75 percent of the total grant amounts shall be awarded for a combination of purposes under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a).''.

SEC. 1105. OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

All grants awarded by the Department of Justice that are authorized under this title shall be subject to the following:

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

(2) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this title that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this title during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the 12-month period described in paragraph (5).

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

(4) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this title during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall—

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

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

(5) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term ''unresolved audit finding'' means an audit report finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed

or resolved within a 12-month period beginning on the date when the final audit report is issued.

(6) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

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

(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General shall not award a grant under any grant program described in this title to a nonprofit organization that 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.

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

(7) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Unless otherwise explicitly provided in authorizing legislation, not more than 7.5 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 Department of Justice.

(8) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this title may be used by the Attorney General or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this title, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than $20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General or the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, Director, or principal deputy as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

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

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

(9) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this title may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 1106. SUNSET.

Effective on December 31, 2018, subsections (a)(7) and (n) of section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(a)(7) and (n)) are repealed.

SA 15. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. IDENTIFYING UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE..

(a) REQUIREMENT TO IDENTIFY AND DESCRIBE PROGRAMS.—Each fiscal year, for purposes of the report required by subsection (c), the Attorney General shall—

(1) identify and describe every program administered by the Department of Justice;

(2) for each such program—

(A) determine the total administrative expenses of the program;

(B) determine the expenditures for services for the program;

(C) estimate the number of clients served by the program and beneficiaries who received assistance under the program (if applicable); and

(D) estimate—

(i) the number of full-time employees who administer the program; and

(ii) the number of full-time equivalents (whose salary is paid in part or full by the Federal Government through a grant or contract, a subaward of a grant or contract, a cooperative agreement, or another form of financial award or assistance) who assist in administering the program; and

(3) identify programs within the Federal Government (whether inside or outside the agency) with duplicative or overlapping missions, services, and allowable uses of funds.

(b) RELATIONSHIP TO CATALOG OF DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE.—With respect to the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2)(B) of subsection (a), the Attorney General may use the same information provided in the catalog of domestic and international assistance programs in the case of any program that is a domestic or international assistance program.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than February 1 of each fiscal year, the Attorney General shall publish on the official public Internet website of the agency a report containing the following:

(1) The information required under subsection (a) with respect to the preceding fiscal year.

(2) The latest performance reviews (including the program performance reports required under section 1116 of title 31, United States Code) of each program of the agency identified under subsection (a)(1), including performance indicators, performance goals, output measures, and other specific metrics used to review the program and how the program performed on each.

(3) For each program that makes payments, the latest improper payment rate of the program and the total estimated amount of improper payments, including fraudulent payments and overpayments.

(4) The total amount of unspent and unobligated program funds held by the Department and grant recipients (not including individuals) stated as an amount—

(A) held as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the report is submitted; and

(B) held for 5 fiscal years or more.

(5) Such recommendations as the Attorney General considers appropriate—

(A) to consolidate programs that are duplicative or overlapping;

(B) to eliminate waste and inefficiency; and

(C) to terminate lower priority, outdated, and unnecessary programs and initiatives.

(d) CONSOLIDATING UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and not later than 150 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Attorney General shall—

(1) use available administrative authority to eliminate, consolidate, or streamline Government programs and agencies with duplicative and overlapping missions identified in—

(A) the March 2011 Government Accountability Office report to Congress entitled ''Opportunities to Reduce Government Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue'' (GAO 11 318SP);

(B) the February 2012 Government Accountability Office report to Congress entitled ''2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue'' (GAO 12 342SP);

(C) the July 2012 Government Accountability Office report to Congress entitled ''Justice Grant Programs'' (GAO 12 517); and

(D) subsection (a);

(2) identify and report to Congress any legislative changes required to further eliminate, consolidate, or streamline Government programs and agencies with duplicative and overlapping missions identified in—

(A) the March 2011 Government Accountability Office report to Congress entitled ''Opportunities to Reduce Government Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue'' (GAO 11 318SP);

(B) the February 2012 Government Accountability Office report to Congress entitled ''2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue'' (GAO 12 342SP);

(C) the July 2012 Government Accountability Office report to Congress entitled ''Justice Grant Programs'' (GAO 12 517); and

(D) subsection (c); and

(3) develop a plan that would result in financial cost savings of no less than 20 percent of the nearly $3,900,000,000 in duplicative grant programs identified by the Government Accountability Office as a result of the actions required by paragraph (1).

(e) ELIMINATING THE BACKLOG OF UNANALYZED DNA FROM SEXUAL ASSAULT, RAPE, KIDNAPPING, AND OTHER CRIMINAL CASES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and not later than 1 year after the enactment of this section, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in consultation with Attorney General shall—

(1) rescind from the appropriate accounts the total amount of cost savings from the plan required in subsection (d)(3);

(2) apply as much as 75 percent of the savings towards alleviating any backlogs of analysis and placement of DNA samples from rape, sexual assault, homicide, kidnapping and other criminal cases, including casework sample and convicted offender backlogs, into the Combined DNA Index System; and

(3) return the remainder of the savings to the Treasury for the purpose of deficit reduction.

(f) REPORTING THE SAVINGS RESULTING FROM CONSOLIDATING UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision

of law, the Attorney General shall post a report on the public Internet website of the Department of Justice detailing—

(1) the programs consolidated as a result of this section, including any programs eliminated;

(2) the total amount saved from reducing such duplication;

(3) the total amount of such savings directed towards the analysis and placement of DNA samples into the Combined DNA Index System;

(4) the total amount of such savings returned to the Treasury for the purpose of deficit reduction; and

(5) additional recommendations for consolidating duplicative programs, offices, and initiatives within the Department of Justice.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The term ''administrative expenses'' has the meaning as determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under section 504(b)(2) of Public Law 111–85 (31 U.S.C. 1105 note), except the term shall also include, for purposes of that section and this section—

(A) costs incurred by the Department as well as costs incurred by grantees, subgrantees, and other recipients of funds from a grant program or other program administered by the Department; and

(B) expenses related to personnel salaries and benefits, property management, travel, program management, promotion, reviews and audits, case management, and communication about, promotion of, and outreach for programs and program activities administered by the Department.

(2) PERFORMANCE INDICATOR; PERFORMANCE GOAL; OUTPUT MEASURE; PROGRAM ACTIVITY.—The terms ''performance indicator'', ''performance goal'', ''output measure'', and ''program activity'' have the meanings provided by section 1115 of title 31, United States Code.

(3) PROGRAM.—The term ''program'' has the meaning provided by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in consultation with the Attorney General and shall include any organized set of activities directed toward a common purpose or goal undertaken by the Department that includes services, projects, processes, or financial or other forms of assistance, including grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts, loans, leases, technical support, consultation, or other guidance.

(4) SERVICES.—The term ''services'' has the meaning provided by the Attorney General and shall be limited to only activities, assistance, and aid that provide a direct benefit to a recipient, such as the provision of medical care, assistance for housing or tuition, or financial support (including grants and loans).

SA 16. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SPEEDY NOTICE TO VICTIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2101 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796hh) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (13), by striking ''human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)'' and inserting ''sexually transmitted disease''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(14) To pay for treatment for victims of sexual assault who are diagnosed with a sexually transmitted disease as a result of a test described in subsection (d)(1).'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''5 percent'' and inserting ''20 percent''; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''the immunodeficiency virus (HIV)'' and inserting ''any sexually transmitted disease for which a diagnostic exists that the victim requests'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting '', including the relevant information about any sexually transmitted diseases identified in such results'' after ''testing results''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''HIV'' and inserting ''any sexually transmitted disease for which a diagnostic exists that the victim requests'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(4) by adding before subsection (f), as redesignated, the following:

''(e) REQUIREMENT TO USE FUNDS TO TREAT VICTIMS.—A State or unit of local government shall use funds allocated under this part to pay for treatment for a victim of sexual assault who is diagnosed with a sexually transmitted disease as a result of a test described in subsection (d)(1).''.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit a report to Congress regarding the level of compliance by States and units of local government with—

(1) the speedy notice requirements of section 2101(d) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796hh(d)), as amended by this Act; and

(2) the requirement to use funds to treat victims under section 2101(e) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796hh(e)), as amended by this Act, including the number of victims who were exposed to human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) or any other sexually transmitted disease and received assistance under such section.

SA 17. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROHIBITING USE OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUNDS FOR PARTY CONVENTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 95 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking section 9008.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 95 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 9008.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS TO CANDIDATES.—The third sentence of section 9006(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking '', section 9008(b)(3),''.

(2) REPORTS BY FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.—Section 9009(a) of such Code is amended—

(A) by adding ''and'' at the end of paragraph (2);

(B) by striking the semicolon at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraphs (4), (5), and (6).

(3) PENALTIES.—Section 9012 of such Code is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking the second sentence; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(4) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS FROM PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY MATCHING PAYMENT ACCOUNT.—The second sentence of section 9037(a) of such Code is amended by striking ''and for payments under section 9008(b)(3)''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections occurring after December 31, 2012.

SA 18. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XI, add the following:

SEC. 1106. GUIDANCE ON TREATMENT OF INJURIES IN CONNECTION WITH SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) GUIDANCE REQUIRED.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness shall, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, issue guidance for the military departments on the procedures and practices to be followed by health care providers in the military medical treatment system in the provision of treatment to members of the Armed Forces for injuries incurred as a result of sexual assault during their service in the Armed Forces.

(b) SCOPE OF GUIDANCE.—The guidance issued pursuant to subsection (a) shall be designed to address the deficiencies identified in the treatment described in that subsection as identified in the January 2013 Government Accountability Office Report to Congressional Addressees entitled ''DOD Has Taken Steps to Meet the Health Needs of Deployed Servicewomen, but Actions are Needed to Enhance Care for Sexual Assault Victims''.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The guidance issued pursuant to subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the responsibilities of health care providers in the military medical treatment system in the treatment of members of the Armed Forces for injuries incurred as a result of sexual assault during service in the Armed Forces, including responsibilities for observing the rights of members to disclose such assaults in a confidential manner.

(2) Procedures for the proper collection and preservation of forensic evidence regarding incidents of sexual assault.

(3) Procedures for the minimization of the risk of revictimization of members undergoing treatment.

(4) Such other responsibilities, procedures, and elements as the Under Secretary considers appropriate to address the deficiencies described in subsection (b).

(d) COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR ANNUAL TRAINING REFRESHER ON SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE.—The Under Secretary shall, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, take appropriate actions to ensure that all members of the Armed Forces comply with requirements to undergo on an annual basis refresher training on the prevention and response to sexual assault in the Armed Forces.

SA 19. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 904 and insert the following:

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

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of Public Law 90–284 (25 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) (commonly known as the ''Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968'') is amended by adding at the end the following:

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

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

''(2) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—The term 'domestic violence' means violence committed by a current or former spouse or intimate partner of the victim, by a person with whom the victim shares a child in common, by a person who is cohabitating with or has cohabitated with the victim as a spouse or intimate partner, or by a person similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the domestic- or family-violence laws of an Indian tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violence occurs.

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

''(4) PARTICIPATING TRIBE.—The term 'participating tribe' means an Indian tribe that—

''(A) elects to exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over the Indian country of that Indian tribe; and

''(B) on request of the Indian tribe, is certified by the Attorney General to be a participating tribe for purposes of this section.

''(5) PROTECTION ORDER.—The term 'protection order'—

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

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

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

''(7) SPOUSE OR INTIMATE PARTNER.—The term 'spouse or intimate partner' has the meaning given the term in section 2266 of title 18, United States Code.

''(b) CERTIFICATION OF PARTICIPATING TRIBES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after receiving a request from an Indian tribe requesting designation as a participating tribe, the Attorney General shall—

''(A) certify the Indian tribe as a participating tribe if the Attorney General determines that the Indian tribe is capable of providing all the rights afforded a defendant under subsection (e); and

''(B) deny certification of the Indian tribe as a participating tribe if the Attorney General determines that the Indian tribe is not capable of providing all the rights afforded a defendant under subsection (e).

''(2) NOTICE.—If the Attorney General denies certification to an Indian tribe under paragraph (1)(B), the Attorney General shall provide the Indian tribe with written notice of the determination, including the reasons of the Attorney General for not issuing the certification and guidance on how the Indian tribe could be certification.

''(c) NATURE OF THE CRIMINAL JURISDICTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a participating tribe may exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over all persons.

''(2) CONCURRENT JURISDICTION.—Subject to subsection (e)(2), the exercise of special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction by a participating tribe shall be concurrent with the jurisdiction of the United States, of a State, or of both.

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

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

''(B) subject to paragraph (2), affects the authority of the United States or any State government that has been delegated authority by the United States to investigate and prosecute a criminal violation in Indian country.

''(4) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(A) VICTIM AND DEFENDANT ARE BOTH NONINDIANS.—

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

''(ii) DEFINITION OF VICTIM.—In this subparagraph, with respect to a criminal proceeding in which a participating tribe exercises special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction based on a violation of a protection order, the term 'victim' means a person specifically protected by a protection order that the defendant allegedly violated.

''(B) DEFENDANT LACKS TIES TO THE INDIAN TRIBE.—A participating tribe may exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over a defendant only if the defendant—

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

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

''(iii) is a spouse, intimate partner, or dating partner of—

''(I) a member of the participating tribe; or

''(II) an Indian who resides in the Indian country of the participating tribe.

''(d) CRIMINAL CONDUCT.—A participating tribe may exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over a defendant for criminal conduct that—

''(1) is punishable by the laws of the participating tribe by a term of imprisonment not to exceed 1 year; and

''(2) is covered by 1 or more of the following categories:

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

''(B) VIOLATIONS OF PROTECTION ORDERS.—An act that—

''(i) occurs in the Indian country of the participating tribe; and

''(ii) violates the portion of a protection order that—

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

''(II) was issued against the defendant;

''(III) is enforceable by the participating tribe; and

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

''(e) RIGHTS OF DEFENDANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In a criminal proceeding in which a participating tribe exercises special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction, the participating tribe shall provide to the defendant—

''(A) all applicable rights under this Act;

''(B) except as provided in subparagraph (C), all rights described in section 202(c); and

''(C) all rights under the Constitution of the United States afforded criminal defendants in State courts, as those rights are interpreted by the courts of the United States.

''(2) OTHER RIGHTS.—In addition to rights described in paragraph (1), a defendant over whom a participating tribe exercises special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction shall have all other rights the protection of which is necessary under the Constitution of the United States in order for the participating tribe to exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over the defendant.

''(3) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF JUDGMENT AND SENTENCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a tribal court enters a final judgment against a defendant in a criminal proceeding in which a participating tribe exercises special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction, the defendant may petition the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the tribal court is located for review of the judgment and sentence against the defendant.

''(B) ISSUES FOR REVIEW.—The issues for review in a proceeding initiated by a defendant under subparagraph (A) are limited to violations of any right of a defendant secured by this Act, including any right or privilege secured by this section and subsection.

''(C) NOTICE TO DEFENDANT.—At the time of imposition of judgment and sentence, the court in a criminal proceeding in which the participating tribe is exercising special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction shall inform the defendant of the right to petition for review of the judgment and sentence under this paragraph.

''(f) PETITIONS TO STAY DETENTION.—

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

''(2) GRANT OF STAY.—A court shall grant a stay described in paragraph (1) if the court—

''(A) finds that there is a substantial likelihood that the habeas corpus petition will be granted; and

''(B) after giving each alleged victim in the matter an opportunity to be heard, finds by clear and convincing evidence that under conditions imposed by the court, the petitioner is not likely to flee or pose a danger to any person or the community if released.

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

''(g) SUBJECT TO REMOVAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A defendant charged with a crime under this section may petition the appropriate district court of the United States for removal pursuant to section 3245 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) NOTICE.—Not later than the time at which the defendant makes an initial appearance before the court of the participating tribe or 48 hours after the time of arrest, whichever is earlier, the defendant shall be notified of the right of removal under this subsection.

''(h) GRANTS TO TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—The Attorney General may award grants to the governments of Indian tribes—

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

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

''(B) prosecution;

''(C) trial and appellate courts;

''(D) probation systems;

''(E) detention and correctional facilities;

''(F) alternative rehabilitation centers;

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

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

''(2) to provide indigent criminal defendants with the effective assistance of licensed defense counsel, at no cost to the defendant, in criminal proceedings in which a participating tribe prosecutes a crime of domestic violence or dating violence or a criminal violation of a protection order;

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

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

''(i) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts made available under this section shall supplement and not supplant any other Federal, State, tribal, or local government amounts made available to carry out activities described in this section.

''(j) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this section may not be used by any grant recipient to—

''(1) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding under this section; or

''(2) lobby any representative of a Federal, State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding under this section.

''(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 to carry out subsection (h) and to provide training, technical assistance, data collection, and evaluation of the criminal justice systems of participating tribes.''.

(b) REMOVAL OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS.—Chapter 211 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 3245. Removal of criminal prosecutions brought under the Indian Civil Rights Act

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) COVERED CASE.—The term 'covered case' means any tribal domestic violence criminal proceeding brought under section 204 of Public Law 90–284 (commonly known as the 'Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968') over which the United States has concurrent jurisdiction under subsection (b)(2) of that section.

''(2) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—The term 'domestic violence' has the meaning given the term in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925).

''(b) REMOVAL BROUGHT BY DEFENDANT IN TRIBAL COURT.—

''(1) NOTICE OF REMOVAL.—A defendant charged with a crime pursuant to section 204 of Public Law 90–284 (commonly known as the 'Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968') who seeks removal of the case from a tribal court to a district court of the United States shall file in the district court of the United States for the district and division within which the prosecution is pending—

''(A) a notice of removal signed pursuant to Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that contains a short and plain statement of the grounds for removal under paragraph (2); and

''(B) a copy of all processes, pleadings, and orders served upon the defendant in that action.

''(2) GROUNDS FOR REMOVAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), no case shall be removed unless the defendant has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that a right guaranteed to the defendant under section 204 of Public Law 90–284 (commonly known as the 'Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968') has been or is likely to be violated.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a past violation if the participating tribe can prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the participating tribe has adequately remedied the violation.

''(3) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) FILING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), a defendant seeking removal from a tribal court of a criminal prosecution for domestic violence shall file a notice of removal described in paragraph (1) not later than the time at which a trial begins in the tribal court.

''(ii) RELIEF FOR GOOD CAUSE.—On the request of a defendant seeking removal from a tribal court of a criminal prosecution for domestic violence, the district court of the United States with jurisdiction may, for good cause, enter an order granting the defendant leave to file after the time period described in clause (i) has expired.

''(B) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A notice of removal filed under subparagraph (A) shall include all grounds for the removal.

''(ii) EFFECT.—A failure to state any grounds for removal that exist at the time of the filing of the notice shall constitute a waiver of those grounds.

''(iii) SECOND NOTICE FILING.—A defendant may only file a second notice for removal on grounds that did not exist at the time on which the defendant submitted the original notice.

''(iv) RELIEF FOR GOOD CAUSE.—On the request of a defendant seeking removal from a tribal court of a criminal prosecution for domestic violence, the district court of the United States with jurisdiction may, for good cause, waive the requirements of clauses (i) through (iii).

''(C) EFFECT ON TRIBAL COURT PROCEEDINGS.—Unless otherwise ordered by the relevant district court of the United States, the filing of a notice of removal under this subsection shall not prevent a tribal court in which the prosecution is pending from proceeding further, except that a judgment of conviction shall not be entered in the case unless the prosecution has been remanded.

''(D) DISTRICT COURT DUTIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The district court of the United States in which a notice is filed under this subsection shall—

''(I) examine the notice promptly; and

''(II) if the district court of the United States determines, based on the notice and any exhibits annexed to the notice, that removal should not be permitted, the district court shall make an order for summary remand of the prosecution.

''(ii) SUMMARY REMAND.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—If, after a review of the notice under clause (i), the district court of the United States in which the notice is filed determines not to order a summary remand of the prosecution, the district court of the United States shall—

''(aa) order an evidentiary hearing to be held promptly; and

''(bb) after the evidentiary hearing, dispose of the prosecution as justice requires.

''(iii) NOTIFICATION TO TRIBAL COURT.—If the district court of the United States in which the notice is filed determines to grant the removal of the prosecution—

''(I) the district court of the United States shall notify the tribal court in which prosecution is pending of that decision; and

''(II) the tribal court shall proceed no further with the prosecution.

''(E) TRIBAL COURT DUTIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 96 hours after a tribal court receives a notice of removal under this subsection, the tribal court shall—

''(I) transfer custody of the defendant to Federal authorities; or

''(II) release the defendant from custody.

''(ii) ORDERS.—On the transfer or release of a defendant under clause (i), the tribal court may issue a protection order (as defined in section 204 of Public Law 90–284) or an order excluding the defendant from the Indian country of the participating tribe.

''(c) REMOVAL BROUGHT BY THE UNITED STATES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States attorney for the district and division within which a covered case is pending may remove that covered case to the relevant district court of the United States by filing a notice of removal in the district court of the United States and in the tribal court in which the covered case is pending.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A United States attorney shall file a notice of removal under this subsection not later than the time at which a trial begins in the tribal court.

''(B) ADMINISTRATION.—A notice of removal filed under this subsection shall identify the covered case and state that the tribal court proceeding is being removed to the district court of the United States on the grounds that the United States has commenced or intends to commence a criminal proceeding against the defendant based on some or all of the same acts of domestic violence that gave rise to the tribal court proceeding.

''(3) EFFECT OF NOTICE.—Upon receipt of a notice under paragraph (1), the tribal court shall proceed no further with the covered case.

''(d) WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS.—If a defendant is in actual custody on process issued by the tribal court—

''(1) the district court of the United States with jurisdiction over a proceeding under subsections (b) and (c) shall issue a writ of habeas corpus for the defendant; and

''(2) the marshal of the district court of the United States described in paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) take the defendant into custody; and

''(B) deliver a copy of the writ of habeas corpus to the clerk of the applicable tribal court.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 211 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3244 the following:

''Sec. 3245. Removal of criminal prosecutions brought under the Indian Civil Rights Act.''.

SA 20. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CAMPUS SAFETY ACT OF 2013.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Center to Advance, Monitor, and Preserve University Security Safety Act of 2013'' or the ''CAMPUS Safety Act of 2013''.

(b) NATIONAL CENTER FOR CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY.—Subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 501 (42 U.S.C. 3751)—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or purposes'' after ''one or more of the following programs''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) Making subawards to institutions of higher education and other nonprofit organizations to assist the National Center for Campus Public Safety in carrying out the functions of the Center required under section 509(b).''; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) institutions of higher education and other nonprofit organizations, for purposes of carrying out section 509.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 509. NATIONAL CENTER FOR CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY.

''(a) 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) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH AND OPERATE CENTER.—The Attorney General may establish and operate a National Center for Campus Public Safety (referred to in this section as the 'Center').

''(c) FUNCTIONS OF THE CENTER.—The Center shall—

''(1) provide quality education and training for public safety personnel of institutions of higher education and their 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, protocols, 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) coordinate with 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 develop protocols and best practices to prevent, protect against and respond to dangerous and violent situations involving an immediate threat to the safety of the campus community;

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

''(6) identify campus safety information (including ways to increase off-campus housing safety) and identify 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) promote cooperation, collaboration, and consistency in prevention, response, and problem-solving methods among public safety and emergency management personnel of institutions of higher education and their campus- and non-campus-based collaborative partners, including law enforcement, emergency management, mental health services, and other relevant agencies;

''(8) disseminate 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 on activities performed by the Center during the previous 12 months.

''(d) COORDINATION WITH AVAILABLE RESOURCES.—In establishing the Center, the Attorney General shall—

''(1) coordinate with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Education, and appropriate State or territory officials;

''(2) ensure coordination with campus public safety resources within the Department of Homeland Security, including within the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Department of Education; and

''(3) coordinate within the Department of Justice and existing grant programs to ensure against duplication with the program authorized by this section.

''(e) REPORTING AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—At the end of each fiscal year, the Attorney General shall—

''(1) issue a report that assesses the impacts, outcomes and effectiveness of the grants distributed to carry out this section;

''(2) in compiling such report, assess instances of duplicative activity, if any, performed through grants distributed to carry out this section and other grant programs maintained by the Department of Justice, the Department of Education, and the Department of Homeland Security; and

''(3) make such report available on the Department of Justice website and submit such report to the Senate and House Judiciary Committees and the Senate and House Appropriations Committees.''.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall preclude public elementary and secondary schools or their larger governing agencies from receiving the informational and training benefits of the National Center for Campus Public Safety authorized under section 509 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by this Act.

SA 21. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE XII—TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION

Subtitle A—Combating International Trafficking in Persons

SEC. 1201. REGIONAL STRATEGIES FOR COMBATING TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

Section 105 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(7)(J), by striking ''section 105(f) of this division'' and inserting ''subsection (g)'';

(2) in subsection (e)(2)—

(A) by striking ''(2) COORDINATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.—'' and all that follows through ''exploitation.'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as paragraph (2), and moving such paragraph, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the left; and

(C) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the left;

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f) REGIONAL STRATEGIES FOR COMBATING TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.—Each regional bureau in the Department of State shall contribute to the realization of the anti-trafficking goals and objectives of the Secretary of State. By June 30 of each year, in cooperation with the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, each regional bureau shall submit a list of anti-trafficking goals and objectives for each country in its geographic area of responsibility. Host governments shall be informed of the goals and objectives for their particular country by June 30 and, to the extent possible, host government officials should contribute to the drafting of the goals and objectives.''.

SEC. 1202. REGIONAL ANTI-TRAFFICKING OFFICERS.

Section 106 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7104) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d), the following:

''(e) REGIONAL ANTI-TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS OFFICERS.—Under the authority, direction, and control of the President, the Secretary of State, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, and in order to promote effective bilateral and regional anti-trafficking diplomacy, public diplomacy initiatives, and coordination of programs, is authorized—

''(1) to appoint, at United States embassies, anti-trafficking in persons officers, who shall collaborate with other countries to eliminate human trafficking; and

''(2) to assign the officers appointed under paragraph (1) to fulfill tasks such as—

''(A) expanding the anti-trafficking efforts of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons of the Department of State, including—

''(i) maintaining direct contact with the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons; and

''(ii) undertaking tasks recommended by the Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons;

''(B) monitoring trafficking trends in the region;

''(C) assessing compliance with the provisions of this Act;

''(D) determining and furthering effective anti-trafficking programs and partnerships with foreign governments and foreign nongovernmental organizations;

''(E) strengthening diplomatic outreach on trafficking in persons; and

''(F) assisting and advising United States embassies overseas on their input to the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons for the preparation of the annual Trafficking in Persons Report.''.

SEC. 1203. PARTNERSHIPS AGAINST SIGNIFICANT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 is amended by inserting after section 105 (22 U.S.C. 7103) the following:

''SEC. 105A. CREATING, BUILDING, AND STRENGTHENING PARTNERSHIPS AGAINST SIGNIFICANT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

''(a) DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to promote collaboration and cooperation—

''(1) between the United States Government and governments listed on the annual Trafficking in Persons Report;

''(2) between foreign governments and civil society actors; and

''(3) between the United States Government and private sector entities.

''(b) PARTNERSHIPS.—The Director, in coordination and cooperation with other officials at the Department of State involved in corporate responsibility and global partnerships, the Deputy Under Secretary for International Affairs of the Department of Labor, and other relevant officials of the United States Government, shall promote, build, and sustain partnerships between the United States Government and private entities, including foundations, universities, corporations, community-based organizations, and other nongovernmental organizations, to ensure that—

''(1) United States citizens do not use any item, product, or material produced or extracted with the use and labor from victims of severe forms of trafficking; and

''(2) such entities do not contribute to trafficking in persons involving sexual exploitation.

''(c) ADDITIONAL MEASURES TO ENHANCE ANTI-TRAFFICKING RESPONSE AND CAPACITY.—The President shall establish and carry out programs with foreign governments and civil society to enhance anti-trafficking response and capacity, including—

''(1) technical assistance and other support to improve the capacity of foreign governments to investigate, identify, and carry out inspections of private entities, including labor recruitment centers, at which trafficking victims may be exploited, particularly exploitation involving forced and child labor;

''(2) technical assistance and other support for foreign governments and nongovernmental organizations to provide immigrant populations with information, in the native languages of the major immigrant groups of such populations, regarding the rights of such populations in the foreign country and local in-country nongovernmental organization-operated hotlines;

''(3) technical assistance to provide legal frameworks and other programs to foreign governments and nongovernmental organizations to ensure that—

''(A) foreign migrant workers are provided the same protection as nationals of the foreign country;

''(B) labor recruitment firms are regulated; and

''(C) workers providing domestic services in households are provided protection under labor rights laws; and

''(4) assistance to foreign governments to register vulnerable populations as citizens or nationals of the country to reduce the ability of traffickers to exploit such populations, where possible under domestic law.

''(d) PROGRAM TO ADDRESS EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.—The Secretary of State, acting through the Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, is authorized to establish a fund to assist foreign governments in meeting unexpected, urgent needs in prevention of trafficking in persons, protection of victims, and prosecution of trafficking offenders.

''(e) CHILD PROTECTION COMPACTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, acting through the Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and in consultation with the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, the Bureau of International Labor Affairs of the Department of Labor, the United States Agency for International Development, and other relevant agencies, is authorized to provide assistance under this section for each country that enters into a child protection compact with the United States to support policies and programs that—

''(A) prevent and respond to violence, exploitation, and abuse against children; and

''(B) measurably reduce severe forms of trafficking in children by building sustainable and effective systems of justice and protection.

''(2) ELEMENTS.—A child protection compact under this subsection shall establish a multi-year plan for achieving shared objectives in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, and shall describe—

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

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

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

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

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

''(3) FORM OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance under this subsection may be provided in the form of grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts to or with national governments, regional or local governmental units, or nongovernmental organizations or private entities with expertise in the protection of victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons.

''(4) ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of State, acting through the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, and in consultation with the agencies set forth in paragraph (1) and relevant officers of the Department of Justice, shall select countries with which to enter into child protection compacts. The selection of countries under this paragraph shall be based on—

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

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

''(5) SELECTION CRITERIA.—A country shall be selected under paragraph (4) on the basis of—

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

''(B) demonstrated political will and sustained commitment by the government of such country to undertake meaningful measures to address severe forms of trafficking in persons, including protection of victims and the enactment and enforcement of anti-trafficking laws against perpetrators.

''(6) SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may suspend or terminate assistance provided under this subsection in whole or in part for a country or entity if the Secretary determines that—

''(i) the country or entity is engaged in activities that are contrary to the national security interests of the United States;

''(ii) the country or entity has engaged in a pattern of actions inconsistent with the criteria used to determine the eligibility of the country or entity, as the case may be; or

''(iii) the country or entity has failed to adhere to its responsibilities under the Compact.

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

SEC. 1204. PROTECTION AND ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

(a) TASK FORCE ACTIVITIES.—Section 105(d)(6) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(6)) is amended by inserting '', and make reasonable efforts to distribute information to enable all relevant Federal Government agencies to publicize the National Human Trafficking Resource Center Hotline on their websites, in all headquarters offices, and in all field offices throughout the United States'' before the period at the end.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING.—Section 107(a)(2) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(a)(2)) is amended by inserting ''and shall brief Congress annually on such efforts'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 1205. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 108(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7106(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''peacekeeping'' and inserting ''diplomatic, peacekeeping,'';

(B) by striking '', and measures'' and inserting '', a transparent system for remediating or punishing such public officials as a deterrent, measures''; and

(C) by inserting '', effective bilateral, multilateral, or regional information sharing and cooperation arrangements with source, transit, or destination countries in its trafficking route, and effective policies or laws regulating foreign labor recruiters and holding them civilly and criminally liable for fraudulent recruiting'' before the period at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting ''and has entered into bilateral, multilateral, or regional law enforcement cooperation and coordination arrangements with source, transit, and destination countries in its trafficking route'' before the period at the end;

(3) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by inserting '', including diplomats and soldiers,'' after ''public officials'';

(B) by striking ''peacekeeping'' and inserting ''diplomatic, peacekeeping,''; and

(C) by inserting ''A government's failure to appropriately address public allegations against such public officials, especially once such officials have returned to their home countries, shall be considered inaction under these criteria.'' after ''such trafficking.'';

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

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

''(9) Whether the government has entered into transparent partnerships, cooperative arrangements, or agreements with—

''(A) domestic civil society organizations or the private sector to assist the government's efforts to prevent trafficking, protect victims, and punish traffickers; or

''(B) the United States toward agreed goals and objectives in the collective fight against trafficking.''.

SEC. 1206. BEST PRACTICES IN TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS ERADICATION.

Section 110(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''with respect to the status of severe forms of trafficking in persons that shall include—'' and inserting ''describing the anti-trafficking efforts of governments according to the minimum standards and criteria enumerated in section 108, and the nature and scope of trafficking in persons in

each country and analysis of the trend lines for individual governmental efforts. The report should include—'';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''compliance;'' and inserting ''compliance, including the identification and mention of governments that—

''(A) are on such list and have demonstrated exemplary progress in their efforts to reach the minimum standards; or

''(B) have committed to the Secretary to accomplish certain actions before the subsequent year's annual report in an attempt to reach full compliance with the minimum standards;'';

(C) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''; and''; and inserting a semicolon;

(D) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(E) by inserting at the end the following:

''(G) a section entitled 'Exemplary Governments and Practices in the Eradication of Trafficking in Persons' to highlight—

''(i) effective practices and use of innovation and technology in prevention, protection, prosecution, and partnerships, including by foreign governments, the private sector, and domestic civil society actors; and

''(ii) governments that have shown exemplary overall efforts to combat trafficking in persons.'';

(2) by striking paragraph (2);

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(4) in paragraph (2), as redesignated, by adding at the end the following:

''(E) PUBLIC NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after notifying Congress of each country determined to have met the requirements under subclauses (I) through (III) of subparagraph (D)(ii), the Secretary of State shall provide a detailed description of the credible evidence supporting such determination on a publicly available website maintained by the Department of State.''.

SEC. 1207. PROTECTIONS FOR DOMESTIC WORKERS AND OTHER NONIMMIGRANTS.

Section 202 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1375b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting ''AND VIDEO FOR CONSULAR WAITING ROOMS'' after ''INFORMATION PAMPHLET''; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''and video'' after ''information pamphlet''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: ''The video shall be distributed and shown in consular waiting rooms in embassies and consulates determined to have the greatest concentration of employment or education-based non-immigrant visa applicants, and where sufficient video facilities exist in waiting or other rooms where applicants wait or convene. The Secretary of State is authorized to augment video facilities in such consulates or embassies in order to fulfill the purposes of this section.'';

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting ''and video'' after ''information pamphlet'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and produce or dub the video'' after ''information pamphlet''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''and the video produced or dubbed'' after ''translated''; and

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and video'' after ''information pamphlet'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''and video'' after ''information pamphlet''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) DEADLINE FOR VIDEO DEVELOPMENT AND DISTRIBUTION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Secretary of State shall make available the video developed under subsection (a) produced or dubbed in all the languages referred to in subsection (c).''.

SEC. 1208. PREVENTION OF CHILD TRAFFICKING THROUGH CHILD MARRIAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 106 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7104), as amended by section 1202, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) PREVENTION OF CHILD TRAFFICKING THROUGH CHILD MARRIAGE.—The Secretary of State shall establish and implement a multi-year, multi-sectoral strategy—

''(1) to prevent child marriage;

''(2) to promote the empowerment of girls at risk of child marriage in developing countries;

''(3) that should address the unique needs, vulnerabilities, and potential of girls younger than 18 years of age in developing countries;

''(4) that targets areas in developing countries with high prevalence of child marriage; and

''(5) that includes diplomatic and programmatic initiatives.''.

(b) INCLUSION OF CHILD MARRIAGE STATUS IN REPORTS.—The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 116 (22 U.S.C. 2151n), by adding at the end the following:

''(g) CHILD MARRIAGE STATUS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The report required under subsection (d) shall include, for each country in which child marriage is prevalent, a description of the status of the practice of child marriage in such country.

''(2) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection, the term 'child marriage' means the marriage of a girl or boy who is—

''(3) younger than the minimum age for marriage under the laws of the country in which such girl or boy is a resident; or

''(4) younger than 18 years of age, if no such law exists.''; and

(2) in section 502B (22 U.S.C. 2304), by adding at the end the following:

''(i) CHILD MARRIAGE STATUS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The report required under subsection (b) shall include, for each country in which child marriage is prevalent, a description of the status of the practice of child marriage in such country.

''(2) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection, the term 'child marriage' means the marriage of a girl or boy who is—

''(3) younger than the minimum age for marriage under the laws of the country in which such girl or boy is a resident; or

''(4) younger than 18 years of age, if no such law exists.''.

SEC. 1209. CHILD SOLDIERS.

Section 404 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (22 U.S.C. 2370c–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''(b), (c), and (d), the authorities contained in section 516 or 541 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j or 2347)'' and inserting ''(b) through (f), the authorities contained in sections 516, 541, and 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j, 2347, and 2348)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) EXCEPTION FOR PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.—The limitation set forth in subsection (a) that relates to section 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply to programs that support military professionalization, security sector reform, heightened respect for human rights, peacekeeping preparation, or the demobilization and reintegration of child soldiers.''.

SEC. 1209A. PRESIDENTIAL AWARD FOR TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

Section 112B(a) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7109b(a)) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**AND TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS**'' after ''**EXTRAORDINARY EFFORTS**'';

(2) by inserting ''and technological innovations'' after ''extraordinary efforts.'';

(3) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(4) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) private sector entities; and

''(4) national governments or regional and local governmental units.''.

Subtitle B—Combating Trafficking in Persons in the United States

PART I—PENALTIES AGAINST TRAFFICKERS AND OTHER CRIMES

SEC. 1211. CRIMINAL TRAFFICKING OFFENSES.

(a) RICO AMENDMENT.—Section 1961(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''section 1351 (relating to fraud in foreign labor contracting),'' before ''section 1425''.

(b) ENGAGING IN ILLICIT SEXUAL CONDUCT IN FOREIGN PLACES.—Section 2423(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or resides, either temporarily or permanently, in a foreign country'' after ''commerce''.

(c) UNLAWFUL CONDUCT WITH RESPECT TO DOCUMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1597. Unlawful conduct with respect to immigration documents

''(a) DESTRUCTION, CONCEALMENT, REMOVAL, CONFISCATION, OR POSSESSION OF IMMIGRATION DOCUMENTS.—It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly destroy, conceal, remove, confiscate, or possess, an actual or purported passport or other immigration document of another individual —

''(1) in the course of violating section 1351 of this title or section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324);

''(2) with intent to violate section 1351 of this title or section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324); or

''(3) in order to, without lawful authority, maintain, prevent, or restrict the labor of services of the individual.

''(b) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

''(c) OBSTRUCTION.—Any person who knowingly obstructs, attempts to obstruct, or in any way interferes with or prevents the enforcement of this section, shall be subject to the penalties described in subsection (b).''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''1597. Unlawful conduct with respect to immigration documents.''.

SEC. 1212. CIVIL REMEDIES; CLARIFYING DEFINITION.

(a) CIVIL REMEDY FOR PERSONAL INJURIES.—Section 2255 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''section 2241(c)'' and inserting ''section 1589, 1590, 1591, 2241(c)''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''six years'' and inserting ''10 years''.

(b) DEFINITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (14) as paragraphs (2) through (15), respectively;

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

''(1) ABUSE OR THREATENED ABUSE OF LAW OR LEGAL PROCESS.—The term 'abuse or threatened abuse of the legal process' means the use or threatened use of a law or legal process, whether administrative, civil, or criminal, in any manner or for any purpose for which the law was not designed, in order to exert pressure on another person to cause that person to take some action or refrain from taking some action.'';

(C) in paragraph (14), as redesignated, by striking ''paragraph (8)'' and inserting ''paragraph (9)''; and

(D) in paragraph (15), as redesignated, by striking ''paragraph (8) or (9)'' and inserting ''paragraph (9) or (10)''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000.—The Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et eq.) is amended—

(i) in section 110(e) (22 U.S.C. 7107(e))—

(I) by striking ''section 103(7)(A)'' and inserting ''section 103(8)(A)''; and

(II) by striking ''section 103(7)(B)'' and inserting ''section 103(8)(B)''; and

(ii) in section 113(g)(2) (22 U.S.C. 7110(g)(2)), by striking ''section 103(8)(A)'' and inserting ''section 103(9)(A)''.

(B) NORTH KOREAN HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 2004.—Section 203(b)(2) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7833(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''section 103(14)'' and inserting ''section 103(15)''.

(C) TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005.—Section 207 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044e) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''section 103(8)'' and inserting ''section 103(9)'';

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''section 103(9)'' and inserting ''section 103(10)''; and

(iii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''section 103(3)'' and inserting ''section 103(4)''.

(D) VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005.—Section 111(a)(1) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044f(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''paragraph (8)'' and inserting ''paragraph (9)''.

PART II—ENSURING AVAILABILITY OF POSSIBLE WITNESSES AND INFORMANTS

SEC. 1221. PROTECTIONS FOR TRAFFICKING VICTIMS WHO COOPERATE WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT.

Section 101(a)(15)(T)(ii)(III) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(T)(ii)(III) is amended by inserting '', or any adult or minor children of a derivative beneficiary of the alien, as'' after ''age''.

SEC. 1222. PROTECTION AGAINST FRAUD IN FOREIGN LABOR CONTRACTING.

Section 101(a)(15)(U)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)(iii)) is amended by inserting ''fraud in foreign labor contracting (as defined in section 1351 of title 18, United States Code);'' after ''perjury;''.

PART III—ENSURING INTERAGENCY COORDINATION AND EXPANDED REPORTING

SEC. 1231. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Section 105(d)(7) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(7)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (J) as subparagraphs (I) through (O);

(2) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting the following:

''(B) the number of persons who have been granted continued presence in the United States under section 107(c)(3) during the preceding fiscal year and the mean and median time taken to adjudicate applications submitted under such section, including the time from the receipt of an application by law enforcement to the issuance of continued presence, and a description of any efforts being taken to reduce the adjudication and processing time while ensuring the safe and competent processing of the applications;

''(C) the number of persons who have applied for, been granted, or been denied a visa or otherwise provided status under subparagraph (T)(i) or (U)(i) of section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)) during the preceding fiscal year;

''(D) the number of persons who have applied for, been granted, or been denied a visa or status under clause (ii) of section 101(a)(15)(T) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(T)) during the preceding fiscal year, broken down by the number of such persons described in subclauses (I), (II), and (III) of such clause (ii);

''(E) the amount of Federal funds expended in direct benefits paid to individuals described in subparagraph (D) in conjunction with T visa status;

''(F) the number of persons who have applied for, been granted, or been denied a visa or status under section 101(a)(15)(U)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)(i)) during the preceding fiscal year;

''(G) the mean and median time in which it takes to adjudicate applications submitted under the provisions of law set forth in subparagraph (C), including the time between the receipt of an application and the issuance of a visa and work authorization;

''(H) any efforts being taken to reduce the adjudication and processing time, while ensuring the safe and competent processing of the applications;'';

(3) in subparagraph (N)(iii), as redesignated, by striking ''and'' at the end;

(4) in subparagraph (O), as redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(P) the activities undertaken by Federal agencies to train appropriate State, tribal, and local government and law enforcement officials to identify victims of severe forms of trafficking, including both sex and labor trafficking;

''(Q) the activities undertaken by Federal agencies in cooperation with State, tribal, and local law enforcement officials to identify, investigate, and prosecute offenses under sections 1581, 1583, 1584, 1589, 1590, 1592, and 1594 of title 18, United States Code, or equivalent State offenses, including, in each fiscal year—

''(i) the number, age, gender, country of origin, and citizenship status of victims identified for each offense;

''(ii) the number of individuals charged, and the number of individuals convicted, under each offense;

''(iii) the number of individuals referred for prosecution for State offenses, including offenses relating to the purchasing of commercial sex acts;

''(iv) the number of victims granted continued presence in the United States under section 107(c)(3); and

''(v) the number of victims granted a visa or otherwise provided status under subparagraph (T)(i) or (U)(i) of section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)); and

''(R) the activities undertaken by the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services to meet the specific needs of minor victims of domestic trafficking, including actions taken pursuant to subsection (f) and section 202(a) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044(a)), and the steps taken to increase cooperation among Federal agencies to ensure the effective and efficient use of programs for which the victims are eligible.''.

SEC. 1232. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SECRETARY OF LABOR.

Section 105(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2005 (22 U.S.C. 7112(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than December 1, 2014, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of Labor shall submit the list developed under paragraph (2)(C) to Congress.''.

SEC. 1233. INFORMATION SHARING TO COMBAT CHILD LABOR AND SLAVE LABOR.

Section 105(a) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2005 (22 U.S.C. 7112(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Secretary of State shall, on a regular basis, provide information relating to child labor and forced labor in the production of goods in violation of international standards to the Department of Labor to be used in developing the list described in subsection (b)(2)(C).''.

SEC. 1234. GOVERNMENT TRAINING EFFORTS TO INCLUDE THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

Section 107(c)(4) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting ''the Department of Labor, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission,'' before ''and the Department''; and

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting '', in consultation with the Secretary of Labor,'' before ''shall provide''.

SEC. 1235. GAO REPORT ON THE USE OF FOREIGN LABOR CONTRACTORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report on the use of foreign labor contractors to—

(1) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report under subsection (a) should, to the extent possible—

(1) address the role and practices of United States employers in—

(A) the use of labor recruiters or brokers; or

(B) directly recruiting foreign workers;

(2) analyze the laws that protect such workers, both overseas and domestically;

(3) describe the oversight and enforcement mechanisms in Federal departments and agencies for such laws; and

(4) identify any gaps that may exist in these protections; and

(5) recommend possible actions for Federal departments and agencies to combat any abuses.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall—

(1) describe the role of labor recruiters or brokers working in countries that are sending workers and receiving funds, including any identified involvement in labor abuses;

(2) describe the role and practices of employers in the United States that commission labor recruiters or brokers or directly recruit foreign workers;

(3) describe the role of Federal departments and agencies in overseeing and regulating the foreign labor recruitment process,

including certifying and enforcing under existing regulations;

(4) describe the type of jobs and the numbers of positions in the United States that have been filled through foreign workers during each of the last 8 years, including positions within the Federal Government;

(5) describe any efforts or programs undertaken by Federal, State and local government entities to encourage employers, directly or indirectly, to use foreign workers or to reward employers for using foreign workers; and

(6) based on the information required under paragraphs (1) through (3), identify any common abuses of foreign workers and the employment system, including the use of fees and debts, and recommendations of actions that could be taken by Federal departments and agencies to combat any identified abuses.

SEC. 1236. ACCOUNTABILITY.

All grants awarded by the Attorney General under this title or an Act amended by this title shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ''unresolved audit finding'' means an audit report finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the grantee has used grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved during the 12-month period beginning on the date on which the final audit report is issued

(B) REQUIREMENT.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this title or an Act amended by this title to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this title or an Act amended by this title that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this title or an Act amended by this title during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this title or an Act amended by this title, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this title or an Act amended by this title.

(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this title or an Act amended by this title during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

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

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

(2) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

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

(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this title or an Act amended by this title to a nonprofit organization that 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.

(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under this title or an Act amended by this title and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this title or an Act amended by this title may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or entity awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this title or an Act amended by this title, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than $20,000 in funds made available to the Department of Justice, unless the Deputy Attorney General or the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, Director, or principal deputy (as designated by the Deputy Attorney General) provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference.

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

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

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

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

(B) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued;

(C) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

(D) includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

PART IV—ENHANCING STATE AND LOCAL EFFORTS TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS

SEC. 1241. ASSISTANCE FOR DOMESTIC MINOR SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044a) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 202. ESTABLISHMENT OF A GRANT PROGRAM TO DEVELOP, EXPAND, AND STRENGTHEN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS SUBJECT TO TRAFFICKING.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term 'Assistant Secretary' means the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services.

''(2) ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The term 'Assistant Attorney General' means the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs of the Department of Justice.

''(3) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term 'eligible entity' means a State or unit of local government that—

''(A) has significant criminal activity involving sex trafficking of minors;

''(B) has demonstrated cooperation between Federal, State, local, and, where applicable, tribal law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and social service providers in addressing sex trafficking of minors;

''(C) has developed a workable, multi-disciplinary plan to combat sex trafficking of minors, including—

''(i) building or establishing a residential care facility for minor victims of sex trafficking;

''(ii) the provision of rehabilitative care to minor victims of sex trafficking;

''(iii) the provision of specialized training for law enforcement officers and social service providers for all forms of sex trafficking, with a focus on sex trafficking of minors;

''(iv) prevention, deterrence, and prosecution of offenses involving sex trafficking of minors;

''(v) cooperation or referral agreements with organizations providing outreach or other related services to runaway and homeless youth; and

''(vi) law enforcement protocols or procedures to screen all individuals arrested for prostitution, whether adult or minor, for victimization by sex trafficking and by other crimes, such as sexual assault and domestic violence; and

''(D) provides assurance that a minor victim of sex trafficking shall not be required to collaborate with law enforcement to have access to residential care or services provided with a grant under this section.

''(4) MINOR VICTIM OF SEX TRAFFICKING.—The term 'minor victim of sex trafficking' means an individual who—

''(A) is younger than 18 years of age, and is a victim of an offense described in section 1591(a) of title 18, United States Code, or a comparable State law; or

''(B)(i) is not younger than 18 years of age nor older than 20 years of age;

''(ii) before the individual reached 18 years of age, was described in subparagraph (A); and

''(iii) was receiving shelter or services as a minor victim of sex trafficking.

''(5) QUALIFIED NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION.—The term 'qualified nongovernmental organization' means an organization that—

''(A) is not a State or unit of local government, or an agency of a State or unit of local government;

''(B) has demonstrated experience providing services to victims of sex trafficking or related populations (such as runaway and homeless youth), or employs staff specialized in the treatment of sex trafficking victims; and

''(C) demonstrates a plan to sustain the provision of services beyond the period of a grant awarded under this section.

''(6) SEX TRAFFICKING OF A MINOR.—The term 'sex trafficking of a minor' means an offense described in section 1591(a) of title 18,

United States Code, or a comparable State law, against a minor.

''(b) SEX TRAFFICKING BLOCK GRANTS.—

''(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Attorney General, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary, may make block grants to 4 eligible entities located in different regions of the United States to combat sex trafficking of minors.

''(B) REQUIREMENT.—Not fewer than 1 of the block grants made under subparagraph (A) shall be awarded to an eligible entity with a State population of less than 5,000,000.

''(C) GRANT AMOUNT.—Subject to the availability of appropriations under subsection (g) to carry out this section, each grant made under this section shall be for an amount not less than $1,500,000 and not greater than $2,000,000.

''(D) DURATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A grant made under this section shall be for a period of 1 year.

''(ii) RENEWAL.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Attorney General may renew a grant under this section for up to 3 1-year periods.

''(II) PRIORITY.—In making grants in any fiscal year after the first fiscal year in which grants are made under this section, the Assistant Attorney General shall give priority to an eligible entity that received a grant in the preceding fiscal year and is eligible for renewal under this subparagraph, taking into account any evaluation of the eligible entity conducted under paragraph (4), if available.

''(E) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Assistant Attorney General shall consult with the Assistant Secretary with respect to—

''(i) evaluations of grant recipients under paragraph (4);

''(ii) avoiding unintentional duplication of grants; and

''(iii) any other areas of shared concern.

''(2) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(A) ALLOCATION.—Not less than 67 percent of each grant made under paragraph (1) shall be used by the eligible entity to provide residential care and services (as described in clauses (i) through (iv) of subparagraph (B)) to minor victims of sex trafficking through qualified nongovernmental organizations.

''(B) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Grants awarded pursuant to paragraph (2) may be used for—

''(i) providing residential care to minor victims of sex trafficking, including temporary or long-term placement as appropriate;

''(ii) providing 24-hour emergency social services response for minor victims of sex trafficking;

''(iii) providing minor victims of sex trafficking with clothing and other daily necessities needed to keep such victims from returning to living on the street;

''(iv) case management services for minor victims of sex trafficking;

''(v) mental health counseling for minor victims of sex trafficking, including specialized counseling and substance abuse treatment;

''(vi) legal services for minor victims of sex trafficking;

''(vii) specialized training for social service providers, public sector personnel, and private sector personnel likely to encounter sex trafficking victims on issues related to the sex trafficking of minors and severe forms of trafficking in persons;

''(viii) outreach and education programs to provide information about deterrence and prevention of sex trafficking of minors;

''(ix) programs to provide treatment to individuals charged or cited with purchasing or attempting to purchase sex acts in cases where—

''(I) a treatment program can be mandated as a condition of a sentence, fine, suspended sentence, or probation, or is an appropriate alternative to criminal prosecution; and

''(II) the individual was not charged with purchasing or attempting to purchase sex acts with a minor; and

''(x) screening and referral of minor victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons.

''(3) APPLICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Assistant Attorney General at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Assistant Attorney General may reasonably require.

''(B) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall—

''(i) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought; and

''(ii) provide such additional assurances as the Assistant Attorney General determines to be essential to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section.

''(4) EVALUATION.—The Assistant Attorney General shall enter into a contract with an academic or non-profit organization that has experience in issues related to sex trafficking of minors and evaluation of grant programs to conduct an annual evaluation of each grant made under this section to determine the impact and effectiveness of programs funded with the grant.

''(c) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section that is found to have utilized grant funds for any unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost shall not be eligible for any grant funds awarded under the grant for 2 fiscal years following the year in which the unauthorized expenditure or unallowable cost is reported.

''(d) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section if, during the 5 fiscal years before the eligible entity submits an application for the grant, the eligible entity has been found to have violated the terms or conditions of a Government grant program by utilizing grant funds for unauthorized expenditures or otherwise unallowable costs.

''(e) ADMINISTRATIVE CAP.—The cost of administering the grants authorized by this section shall not exceed 3 percent of the total amount appropriated to carry out this section.

''(f) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—For fiscal years 2016 and 2017, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct an audit of all 4 eligible entities that receive block grants under this section.

''(g) MATCH REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall provide a non-Federal match in an amount equal to not less than—

''(1) 15 percent of the grant during the first year;

''(2) 25 percent of the grant during the first renewal period;

''(3) 40 percent of the grant during the second renewal period; and

''(4) 50 percent of the grant during the third renewal period.

''(h) NO LIMITATION ON SECTION 204 GRANTS.—An entity that applies for a grant under section 204 is not prohibited from also applying for a grant under this section.

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $8,000,000 to the Attorney General for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017 to carry out this section.

''(j) GAO EVALUATION.—Not later than 30 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains—

''(1) an evaluation of the impact of this section in aiding minor victims of sex trafficking in the jurisdiction of the entity receiving the grant; and

''(2) recommendations, if any, regarding any legislative or administrative action the Comptroller General determines appropriate.''.

(b) SUNSET PROVISION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective during the 4-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1242. EXPANDING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS FOR INVESTIGATIONS AND PROSECUTIONS OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 204 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking '', which involve United States citizens, or aliens admitted for permanent residence, and'';

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

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

''(B) to train law enforcement personnel how to identify victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons and related offenses;''; and

(D) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated, by inserting ''and prioritize the investigations and prosecutions of those cases involving minor victims'' after ''sex acts'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e);

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) NO LIMITATION ON SECTION 202 GRANT APPLICATIONS.—An entity that applies for a grant under section 202 is not prohibited from also applying for a grant under this section.'';

(4) in subsection (e), as redesignated, by striking ''$20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) GAO EVALUATION AND REPORT.—Not later than 30 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of and submit to Congress a report evaluating the impact of this section on—

''(1) the ability of law enforcement personnel to identify victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons and investigate and prosecute cases against offenders, including offenders who engage in the purchasing of commercial sex acts with a minor; and

''(2) recommendations, if any, regarding any legislative or administrative action the Comptroller General determines appropriate to improve the ability described in paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 1243. MODEL STATE CRIMINAL LAW PROTECTION FOR CHILD TRAFFICKING VICTIMS AND SURVIVORS.

Section 225(b) of the Trafficking Victims Reauthorization Act of 2008 (22 U.S.C. 7101 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

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

''(2) protects children exploited through prostitution by including safe harbor provisions that—

''(A) treat an individual under 18 years of age who has been arrested for engaging in, or

attempting to engage in, a sexual act with another person in exchange for monetary compensation as a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons;

''(B) prohibit the charging or prosecution of an individual described in subparagraph (A) for a prostitution offense;

''(C) require the referral of an individual described in subparagraph (A) to appropriate service providers, including comprehensive service or community-based programs that provide assistance to child victims of commercial sexual exploitation; and

''(D) provide that an individual described in subparagraph (A) shall not be required to prove fraud, force, or coercion in order to receive the protections described under this paragraph;''.

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 1251. ADJUSTMENT OF AUTHORIZATION LEVELS FOR THE TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 112A(b)(4) (22 U.S.C. 7109a(b)(4))—

(A) by striking ''$2,000,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000''; and

(B) by striking ''2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''2014 through 2017''; and

(2) in section 113 (22 U.S.C. 7110)—

(A) subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''$5,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011'' each place it appears and inserting ''$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017'';

(ii) by inserting '', including regional trafficking in persons officers,'' after ''for additional personnel,''; and

(iii) by striking '', and $3,000 for official reception and representation expenses'';

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''$12,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''$14,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''to the Secretary of Health and Human Services'' and all that follows and inserting ''$8,000,000 to the Secretary of Health and Human Services for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017.'';

(C) in subsection (c)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''2008 through 2011'' each place it appears and inserting ''2014 through 2017'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking ''$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2003 and $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017''; and

(II) by striking ''2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''2014 through 2017''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''2014 through 2017'';

(D) in subsection (d)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively, and moving such paragraphs 2 ems to the left;

(ii) in the paragraph (1), as redesignated, by striking ''$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''$11,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017''; and

(iii) in paragraph (3), as redesignated, by striking ''to the Attorney General'' and all that follows and inserting ''$11,000,000 to the Attorney General for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017.'';

(E) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''$15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''$7,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''$15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''$7,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017'';

(F) in subsection (f), by striking ''$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''$5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017''; and

(G) in subsection (i), by striking ''$18,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017''.

SEC. 1252. ADJUSTMENT OF AUTHORIZATION LEVELS FOR THE TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–164) is amended—

(1) by striking section 102(b)(7); and

(2) in section 201(c)(2), by striking ''$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2011'' and inserting ''$250,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017''.

Subtitle D—Unaccompanied Alien Children

SEC. 1261. APPROPRIATE CUSTODIAL SETTINGS FOR UNACCOMPANIED MINORS WHO REACH THE AGE OF MAJORITY WHILE IN FEDERAL CUSTODY.

Section 235(c)(2) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Subject to'' and inserting the following:

''(A) MINORS IN DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CUSTODY.—Subject to''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) ALIENS TRANSFERRED FROM DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES TO DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY CUSTODY.—If a minor described in subparagraph (A) reaches 18 years of age and is transferred to the custody of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary shall consider placement in the least restrictive setting available after taking into account the alien's danger to self, danger to the community, and risk of flight. Such aliens shall be eligible to participate in alternative to detention programs, utilizing a continuum of alternatives based on the alien's need for supervision, which may include placement of the alien with an individual or an organizational sponsor, or in a supervised group home.''.

SEC. 1262. APPOINTMENT OF CHILD ADVOCATES FOR UNACCOMPANIED MINORS.

Section 235(c)(6) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(c)(6)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(2) by striking ''and criminal''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) APPOINTMENT OF CHILD ADVOCATES.—

''(i) INITIAL SITES.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall appoint child advocates at 3 new immigration detention sites to provide independent child advocates for trafficking victims and vulnerable unaccompanied alien children.

''(ii) ADDITIONAL SITES.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Secretary shall appoint child advocates at not more than 3 additional immigration detention sites.

''(iii) SELECTION OF SITES.—Sites at which child advocate programs will be established under this subparagraph shall be located at immigration detention sites at which more than 50 children are held in immigration custody, and shall be selected sequentially, with priority given to locations with—

''(I) the largest number of unaccompanied alien children; and

''(II) the most vulnerable populations of unaccompanied children.

''(C) RESTRICTIONS.—

''(i) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—A child advocate program may not use more that 10 percent of the Federal funds received under this section for administrative expenses.

''(ii) NONEXCLUSIVITY.—Nothing in this section may be construed to restrict the ability of a child advocate program under this section to apply for or obtain funding from any other source to carry out the programs described in this section.

''(iii) CONTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—A child advocate program selected under this section shall contribute non-Federal funds, either directly or through in-kind contributions, to the costs of the child advocate program in an amount that is not less than 25 percent of the total amount of Federal funds received by the child advocate program under this section. In-kind contributions may not exceed 40 percent of the matching requirement under this clause.

''(D) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a report describing the activities undertaken by the Secretary to authorize the appointment of independent Child Advocates for trafficking victims and vulnerable unaccompanied alien children to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

''(E) ASSESSMENT OF CHILD ADVOCATE PROGRAM.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study regarding the effectiveness of the Child Advocate Program operated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

''(ii) MATTERS TO BE STUDIED.—In the study required under clause (i), the Comptroller General shall— collect information and analyze the following:

''(I) analyze the effectiveness of existing child advocate programs in improving outcomes for trafficking victims and other vulnerable unaccompanied alien children;

''(II) evaluate the implementation of child advocate programs in new sites pursuant to subparagraph (B);

''(III) evaluate the extent to which eligible trafficking victims and other vulnerable unaccompanied children are receiving child advocate services and assess the possible budgetary implications of increased participation in the program;

''(IV) evaluate the barriers to improving outcomes for trafficking victims and other vulnerable unaccompanied children; and

''(V) make recommendations on statutory changes to improve the Child Advocate Program in relation to the matters analyzed under subclauses (I) through (IV).

''(iii) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit the results of the study required under this subparagraph to—

''(I) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

''(II) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

''(III) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

''(IV) the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives.

''(F) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary and Human Services to carry out this subsection—

''(i) $1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 and 2015; and

''(ii) $2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2016 and 2017.''.

SEC. 1263. ACCESS TO FEDERAL FOSTER CARE AND UNACCOMPANIED REFUGEE MINOR PROTECTIONS FOR CERTAIN U VISA RECIPIENTS.

Section 235(d)(4) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(d)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A),

(A) by striking ''either'';

(B) by striking ''or who'' and inserting a comma; and

(C) by inserting '', or has been granted status under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)),'' before '', shall be eligible''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting '', or status under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)),'' after ''(8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(J))''.

SEC. 1264. GAO STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF BORDER SCREENINGS.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study examining the effectiveness of screenings conducted by Department of Homeland Security personnel in carrying out section 235(a)(4) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)(4)).

(2) STUDY.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall take into account—

(A) the degree to which Department of Homeland Security personnel are adequately ensuring that—

(i) all children are being screened to determine whether they are described in section 235(a)(2)(A) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act;

(ii) appropriate and reliable determinations are being made about whether children are described in section 235(a)(2)(A) of such Act, including determinations of the age of such children;

(iii) children are repatriated in an appropriate manner, consistent with clauses (i) through (iii) of section 235(a)(2)(C) of such Act;

(iv) children are appropriately being permitted to withdraw their applications for admission, in accordance with section 235(a)(2)(B)(i) of such Act;

(v) children are being properly cared for while they are in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security and awaiting repatriation or transfer to the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services; and

(vi) children are being transferred to the custody of the Secretary of Health and Human Services in a manner that is consistent with such Act; and

(B) the number of such children that have been transferred to the custody of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Federal funds expended to maintain custody of such children, and the Federal benefits available to such children, if any.

(3) ACCESS TO DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY OPERATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), for the purposes of conducting the study described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide the Comptroller General with unrestricted access to all stages of screenings and other interactions between Department of Homeland Security personnel and children encountered by the Comptroller General.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary shall not permit unrestricted access under subparagraph (A) if the Secretary determines that the security of a particular interaction would be threatened by such access.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the commencement of the study described in subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that contains the Commission's findings and recommendations.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this is to advise you that the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will hold a business meeting on Tuesday, February 12, 2013, at 9:45 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the business meeting is to approve the Committee's funding resolution for the 113th Congress, assign members to subcommittees, and approve changes to the Committee's rules and questionnaire for executive nominations.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224–7571.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 7, 2013, at 10:00 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 7, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate office building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Oversight Hearing on Implementation of Corps of Engineers Water Resources Policies.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled ''No Child Left Behind: Early Lessons from State Flexibility Waivers'' on February 7, 2013, at 10:00 am, in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 7, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., in SD–216 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 7, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Barrett Anderson, a fellow in my office, be granted privileges of the floor during the debate and votes concerning S. 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Rachelle Johnson:									
Honduras	Lempira		160.00						160.00
Guatemala	Quetzal		936.00						936.00
United States	Dollar				6,921.40				6,921.40
Elizabeth Schmid:									
Japan	Yen		2,053.22						2,053.22
United States	Dollar				12,524.50				12,524.50
Senator Daniel Inouye:.									
Japan	Yen		1,180.05						1,180.05
United States	Dollar				11,955.50				11,955.50
Michael Bain:									
Spain	Euro		676.01		37.00				713.01
United States	Dollar				10,640.04				10,640.04
Christina Evans:									
Belgium	Euro		898.88						898.88
Spain	Euro		676.01						676.01
United States	Dollar				10,780.60				10,780.60
Dennis Balkham:									
Belgium	Euro		898.88						898.88
Spain	Euro		676.01						676.01
United States	Dollar				10,700.00				10,700.00
Stacy McBride:									
South Africa	Rand		1,742.00						1,742.00
Mozambique	Metical		274.00						274.00
Italy	Euro		462.00						462.00
United States	Dollar				14,321.90				14,321.90
Carlisle Clarke:									
South Africa	Rand		1,742.00						1,742.00
Mozambique	Metical		274.00						274.00
Italy	Euro		462.00						462.00
United States	Dollar				17,945.90				17,945.90
Paul Grove:									
Tunisia	Dinar		393.22						393.22
Egypt	Pound		856.00						856.00
United States	Dollar				4,802.70				4,802.70
Delegation Expenses:*									
Belgium	Euro						1,157.62		1,157.62
Guatemala	Quetzal				170.00		1,972.00		2,142.00
Japan	Yen				12,000.98		752.82		12,753.80
South Africa	Rand				511.57				511.57
Tunisia	Dinar				56.43		379.10		435.53
Egypt	Pound				176.00				176.00
Total			14,360.28		113,544.52		4,261.54		132,166.34

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Feb. 4. 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Elisabeth Whitbeck:									
Guatemala	Quetzal		871.50						871.50
Senator Mary Landrieu:									
Guatemala	Quetzal		871.50						871.50
Rachelle Johnson:									
Dominican Republic	Peso		174.05						174.05
Haiti	Gourde		413.00						413.00
United States	Dollar				1,353.29				1,353.29
Paul Grove:									
Dominican Republic	Peso		174.05						174.05
Haiti	Gourde		413.00						413.00
United States	Dollar				1,353.29				1,353.29
Jennifer Santos:									
Germany	Euro		488.73						488.73
Italy	Euro		1,521.97		646.90		78.00		2,246.87
United States	Dollar				9,336.40				9,336.40
Alycia Farrell:									
Germany	Euro		488.73						488.73
Italy	Euro		1,521.98						1,521.98
United States	Dollar				10,119.30				10,119.30
Teri Spoutz:									
Germany	Euro		488.73						488.73
Italy	Euro		1,521.98						1,521.98
United States	Dollar				10,036.80				10,036.80
Charlie Houy:									
United Kingdom	Pound		5,352.00						5,352.00
Gabrielle Batkin:									
United Kingdom	Pound		5,352.00						5,352.00
Brian Potts:									
United Kingdom	Pound		5,352.00						5,352.00
Gary Myrick:									
United Kingdom	Pound		5,352.00						5,352.00
Dave Schiappa:									
United Kingdom	Pound		5,352.00						5,352.00
Brian Monahan:									
United Kingdom	Pound		5,352.00						5,352.00
Anne Caldwell:									
United Kingdom	Pound		5,352.00						5,352.00
Andrew King:									
United Kingdom	Pound		5,352.00						5,352.00
Senator Richard Shelby:									
United Kingdom	Pound		5,352.00						5,352.00
Senator Barbara Mikulski:									
United Kingdom	Pound		5,352.00						5,352.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2012—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
United Kingdom	Pound		5,352.00						5,352.00
Senator Roy Blunt:									
United Kingdom	Pound		5,352.00						5,352.00
Senator Jerry Moran:									
United Kingdom	Pound		5,352.00						5,352.00
Janet Stormes:									
Ghana	Cedi		583.08		200.00				783.08
Mali	Franc		366.48						366.48
Liberia	Dollar		377.00						377.00
United States	Dollar				10,204.20				10,204.20
Erik Raven:									
Australia	Dollar		1,231.00						1,231.00
Thailand	Baht		399.00						399.00
United States	Dollar				9,501.00				9,501.00
Terry Snell:									
Germany	Euro		819.63		36.00				855.63
Sweden	Krona		1,298.50						1,298.50
Norway	Krone		761.88						761.88
Senator Daniel Coats:									
Germany	Euro		794.91						794.91
Sweden	Krona		1,289.88						1,289.88
Norway	Krone		747.08						747.08
David Cleary:									
Germany	Euro		279.25						279.25
Sweden	Krona		483.00						483.00
Norway	Krone		352.00						352.00
Senator Lamar Alexander:									
Germany	Euro		279.25						279.25
Sweden	Krona		483.00						483.00
Norway	Krone		352.00						352.00
Laura Friedel:									
Guatemala	Quetzal		226.00						226.00
Brazil	Real		1,956.15						1,956.15
United States	Dollar				8,419.39				8,419.30
Jennifer Santos:									
Russia	Ruble		1,275.17						1,275.17
United States	Dollar				11,109.90		102.00		11,211.90
Alycia Farrell:									
Russia	Ruble		1,275.17						1,275.17
United States	Dollar				11,014.90		102.00		11,116.90
Paul Grove:									
Russia	Ruble		684.00						684.00
Tajikistan	Somoni		83.00						83.00
Azerbaijan	Manat		431.13						431.13
Georgia	Lari		146.41						146.41
United States	Dollar				6,190.35				6,190.35
Leland Cogliani:									
France	Euro		770.60						770.60
Switzerland	Franc		574.40		243.45				817.85
United States	Dollar				10,874.90				10,874.90
Kay Webber:									
Ireland	Euro		348.75						348.75
Greece	Euro		577.25						577.25
Italy	Euro		542.31						542.31
Spain	Euro		339.82						339.82
Portugal	Euro		234.94						234.94
Senator Thad Cochran:									
Ireland	Euro		348.75						348.75
Greece	Euro		577.25						577.25
Italy	Euro		542.31						542.31
Spain	Euro		339.82						339.82
Portugal	Euro		234.94						234.94
Delegation Expenses:*									
Brazil	Real				1,158.00		1,400.00		2,558.00
France	Euro						193.45		193.45
Germany	Euro						3,101.36		3,101.36
Greece	Euro						705.54		705.54
Guatemala	Quetzal						1,267.00		1,267.00
Ireland	Euro						899.70		899.70
Italy	Euro						1,886.76		1,886.76
Norway	Krone						3,101.36		3,101.36
Portugal	Euro						568.12		568.12
Spain	Euro						424.68		424.68
Sweden	Krona						3,101.36		3,101.36
Thailand	Bhat				61.24		100.66		161.90
United Kingdom	Pound						5,434.17		5,434.17
Total			100,930.33		101,859.31		22,466.16		225,255.80

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUYE,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Nov. 19, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED FORCES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Adam J. Barker:									
United States	Dollar				9,797.90				9,797.90
United Arab Emirates	Dollar		1,499.44						1,499.44
Afghanistan	Dollar		34.00						34.00
Daniel A. Lerner:									
United States	Dollar				8,761.00				8,761.00
Israel	Shekel		1,675.00						1,675.00
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				1,712.30				1,712.30

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED FORCES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Canada	Dollar		240.43						240.43
Lucian L. Niemeyer:									
United States	Dollar				9,790.90				9,790.90
United Arab Emirates	Dollar		1,393.44						1,393.44
Afghanistan	Dollar		34.00						34.00
Senator Mark Udall:									
Canada	Dollar		239.10						239.10
Christopher Howard:									
Canada	Dollar		92.51						92.51
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				15,090.00				15,090.00
Bahrain	Dollar		1,084.00						1,084.00
Christian D. Brose:									
Canada	Dollar		348.00						348.00
Bahrain	Dollar		302.92		14,218.00				14,520.92
Total			6,942.84		59,370.10				66,312.94

SENATOR CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Dec. 21, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Boozman:									
Czech Republic	Koruna		286.45						286.45
Paul Ordal:									
United States	Dollar				8,965.20				8,965.20
Qatar	Riyal		1,150.52						1,150.52
TOTAL			1,436.97		8,965.20				10,402.17

SENATOR BARBARA BOXER,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, Jan. 24, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ellen Doneski:									
United States	Dollar				12,772.70				12,772.70
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		1,051.78						1,051.78
John Branscome:									
United States	Dollar				12,772.70				12,772.70
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		987.78						987.78
Delegation Expenses:*									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham						213.80		213.80
Total			2,039.56		25,545.40		213.80		27,798.76

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,
Feb. 4, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012.

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Max Baucus:									
Spain	Euro		20.92						20.92
Germany	Euro		764.81						764.81
Belgium	Euro		632.90						632.90
United States	Dollar				15,268.30‘				15,268.30
Amber Cottle:									
Spain	Euro		67.44						67.44
Germany	Euro		751.14						751.14
Belgium	Euro		605.62						605.62
United States	Dollar				15,268.30				15,268.30
Jon Selib:									
Spain	Euro		42.42						42.42
Germany	Euro		738.77						738.77
Belgium	Euro		600.62						600.62
United States	Dollar				15,268.30				15,268.30
Bruce Hirsh:									
Spain	Euro		58.39						58.39
Germany	Euro		738.77						738.77
Belgium	Euro		733.50						733.50
United States	Dollar				15,268.30				15,268.30
Sean Neary:									
Spain	Euro		17.42						17.42

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012.—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Germany	Euro		772.12						772.12
Belgium	Euro		720.17						720.17
United States	Dollar				15,268.30				15,268.30
Chelsea Thomas:									
Spain	Euro		51.14						51.14
Germany	Euro		738.77						738.77
Belgium	Euro		749.84						749.84
United States	Dollar				15,268.30				15,268.30
Gabriel Adler:									
Spain	Euro		142.32						142.32
Germany	Euro		744.77						744.77
Belgium	Euro		778.67						778.67
United States	Dollar				15,268.30				15,268.30
Delegation Expenses:*									
Germany	Dollar						3,077.49		3,077.49
Belgium	Dollar						1,604.74		1,604.74
Joseph Adams:									
Canada	Dollar		1,117.96		230.80				1,348.76
Total			11,588.48		107,108.90		4,682.23		123,379.61

*Delegation expenses include transportation, embassy overtime, as well as other official expenses in accordance with the responsibilities of the host country.

SENATOR MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, Jan. 23, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012.

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Barrasso:									
Canada	Dollar		559.26						559.26
Delegation Expenses:*									
Canada	Dollar						400.00		400.00
Senator Bob Corker:									
Jordan	Dinar		790.08						790.08
Malta	Euro		148.21						148.21
United States	Dollar				14,329.10				14,329.10
Stacie Oliver:									
Jordan	Dinar		792.44						792.44
Malta	Euro		148.21						148.21
United States	Dollar				15,540.90				15,540.90
Delegation Expenses:*									
Jordan	Dinar						842.65		842.65
Malta	Euro						603.37		603.37
Senator John Kerry:									
United Kingdom	Euro		67.60						67.60
United States	Dollar				9,342.50				9,342.50
William Danvers:									
United Kingdom	Euro		775.85						775.85
United States	Dollar				8,140.70				8,140.70
Delegation Expenses:*									
United Kingdom	Euro						4,700.98		4,700.98
Senator Richard Lugar:									
Thailand	Baht		422.32						422.32
Philippines	Peso		775.01						775.01
Indonesia	Rupiah		651.95						651.95
Japan	Yen		134.20						134.20
Keith Luse:									
Thailand	Baht		508.27						508.27
Philippines	Peso		689.57						689.57
Indonesia	Rupiah		687.07						687.07
Japan	Yen		135.90						135.90
Kenneth Myers:									
Thailand	Baht		422.32						422.32
Philippines	Peso		718.36						718.36
Indonesia	Rupiah		683.07						683.07
Japan	Yen		136.76						136.76
Delegation Expenses:*									
Thailand	Baht						355.90		355.90
Philippines	Peso						37.25		37.25
Indonesia	Rupiah						755.00		755.00
Senator James Risch:									
Georgia	Lari		512.83						512.83
Turkey	Lira		511.63						511.63
United States	Dollar				11,796.80				11,796.80
John Sandy:									
Georgia	Lari		524.83						524.83
Turkey	Lira		523.63						523.63
United States	Dollar				2,088.30				2,088.30
Christopher Socha:									
Georgia	Lari		645.83						645.83
Turkey	Lira		643.63						643.63
Germany	Euro		383.00						383.00
United States	Dollar				3,525.60				3,525.60
Senator Jeanne Shaheen:									
Georgia	Lari		473.97						473.97
Turkey	Lira		861.94						861.94
United States	Dollar				10,174.90				10,174.90
Chad Kreikemeier:									
Georgia	Lari		562.69						562.69
Turkey	Lira		1,111.38						1,111.38
United States	Dollar				10,467.90				10,467.90
Delegation Expenses:*									
Georgia	Lari						750.00		750.00
Turkey	Lira						899.94		899.94
Neil Brown:									
Mexico	Peso		1,366.00						1,366.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012.—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
United States	Dollar				1,086.70				1,086.70
Carl Meacham:									
Mexico	Peso		1,407.00						1,407.00
United States	Dollar				1,086.70				1,086.70
Delegation Expenses:*									
Mexico	Peso						2,762.00		2,762.00
Neil Brown:									
Azerbaijan	Manat		735.37						735.37
Turkmenistan	Manat		1,132.00						1,132.00
Turkey	Lira		1,047.31						1,047.31
United States	Dollar				11,700.74				11,700.74
Marik String:									
Azerbaijan	Manat		735.37						735.37
Turkmenistan	Manat		1,132.00						1,132.00
Turkey	Lira		1,054.31						1,054.31
United States	Dollar				12,368.74				12,368.74
Delegation Expenses:*									
Turkmenistan	Manat						354.00		354.00
Turkey	Lira						113.75		113.75
Perry Cammack:									
Bahrain	Dollar		1,012.79						1,012.79
Jordan	Dinar		757.36		100.00				857.36
Israel	Dollar		916.00						916.00
United States	Dollar				6,138.60				6,138.60
Delegation Expenses:*									
Bahrain	Dollar						2,413.88		2,413.88
Jordan	Dollar						165.43		165.43
Israel	Dollar						546.31		546.31
Ilan Goldenberg:									
Jordan	Dinar		221.41						221.41
Iraq	Dollar				2,800.00				2,800.00
Egypt	Pound		1,130.88						1,130.88
Israel	Shekel		1,312.87						1,312.87
United States	Dollar						3,500.20		3,500.20
Delegation Expenses:*									
Egypt	Pound						184.00		184.00
Israel	Shekel						1,397.20		1,397.20
Christopher Homan:									
Mali	Franc		374.85						374.85
Russia	Ruble		455.00						455.00
Turkmenistan	Manat		464.25						464.25
United States	Dollar				16,224.84				16,224.84
Ann Norris;									
Mali	Franc		374.85						374.85
Russia	Ruble		455.00						455.00
Turkmenistan	Manat		472.00						472.00
United States	Dollar				10,305.75				10,305.75
Delegation Expenses:*									
Turkmenistan	Manat						477.00		477.00
Emily Mendrala:									
Colombia	Peso		1,701.72						1,701.72
United States	Dollar				874.90				874.90
Delegation Expenses:*									
Colombia	Peso						1,250.00		1,250.00
Melanie Nakagawa:									
Switzerland	CHF		2,036.50						2,036.50
United States	Dollar				1,995.80				1,995.80
Melanie Nakagawa:									
Qatar	Riyal		5,375.00		34.34				5,409.34
United States	Dollar				2,194.20				2,194.20
Rolfe Michael Schiffer:									
United Kingdom	Pound		2,874.00						2,874.00
United States	Dollar				1,509.20				1,509.20
Rolfe Michael Schiffer:									
China	Renminbi		578.00						578.00
United States	Dollar				10,538.30				10,538.30
Halie Soifer:									
France	Euro		515.00						515.00
Senegal	CFA		524.44						524.44
Mali	CFA		216.80		200.00				416.80
Burkina Faso	CFA		240.86						240.86
United States	Dollar				12,785.27				12,785.27
Delegation Expenses:*									
France	Euro						337.50		337.50
Senegal	CFA						237.00		237.00
Peter Wisner:									
Japan	Yen		2,364.00						2,364.00
China	Yuan		1,159.00						1,159.00
Philippines	Peso		710.00						710.00
United States	Dollar				3,640.10				3,640.10
Total			50,853.75		180,990.88		23,083.36		254,927.99

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JOHN F. KERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Jan. 25, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Vance Serchuk:									
United States	Dollar				1,350.00				1,350.00
France	Euro		1,440.00						1,440.00
Senegal	Francs		555.00						555.00
Mali	Francs		211.72						211.72
Burkina Faso	Francs		766.67						766.67

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Vance Serchuk:									
Canada	Dollar		758.00						758.00
Margaret Goodlander:									
Canada	Dollar		802.97						802.97
Delegation Expenses:*									
Senegal	Francs						237.00		237.00
Mali	Francs						1,400.00		1,400.00
Burkina Faso	Francs						1,426.03		1,426.03
Total			4,534.36		1,350.00		3,063.03		8,947.39

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR THOMAS R. CARPER,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs,
Jan. 31, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Patrick Leahy:									
United States	Dollar				11,018.20				11,018.20
France	Euro		824.51						824.51
Delegation Expenses:*									
France	Euro						1,968.31		1,968.31
Total			824.51		11,018.20		1,968.31		13,811.02

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Jan. 25, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Wallace Hsueh:									
United States	Dollar				4,826.15				4,826.15
Brazil	Real		2,422.00						2,422.00
Panama	Dollar		762.00						762.00
John Sandy:									
United States	Dollar				4,826.15				4,826.15
Brazil	Real		2,389.00						2,389.00
Panama	Dollar		762.00						762.00
Brian van Hook:									
United States	Dollar				4,826.15				4,826.15
Brazil	Real		2,464.00						2,464.00
Panama	Dollar		762.00						762.00
Claire O'Rourke:									
United States	Dollar				4,826.15				4,826.15
Brazil	Real		2,390.00						2,390.00
Panama	Dollar		762.00						762.00
Adam Reece:									
United States	Dollar				4,826.15				4,826.15
Brazil	Real		2,426.00						2,426.00
Panama	Dollar		762.00						762.00
Delegation Expenses:*									
Brazil	Real						3,426.00		3,426.00
Senator Mary L. Landrieu:									
United States	Dollar				8,441.00				8,441.00
Israel	Shekel		1,577.06						1,577.06
David Gillers:									
United States	Dollar				8,613.00				8,613.00
Israel	Shekel		2,357.00						2,357.00
Thomas Bradley Keith:									
United States	Dollar				8,675.00				8,675.00
Israel	Shekel		2,958.00						2,958.00
Delegation Expenses:*									
Israel	Shekel						13,288.00		13,288.00
Total			22,793.06		49,859.75		16,714.00		89,366.81

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR MARY L. LANDRIEU,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship,
Dec. 18, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ryan Tully			403.00						403.00
	Dollar				10,838.10				10,838.10
Jennifer Barrett			98.00						98.00
Tressa Guenov			100.00						100.00
Total			601.00		10,838.10				11,439.10

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, Dec. 20, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, ADDENDUM TO 2ND QUARTER 2012, FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Saxby Chambliss							700.50		700.50
Senator Mark Udall							3,360.10		3,360.10
Total							4,060.60		4,060.60

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, Dec. 20, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Fred Turner:									
Italy	Euro		1,598.00						1,598.00
United Kingdom	Pound		499.00						499.00
United States	Dollar				2,544.60				2,544.60
Total			2,097.00		2,544.60				4,641.60

SENATOR BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
Jan. 11, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), MAJORITY LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas Ross:									
United States	Dollar				19,512.37				19,512.37
France	Euro		477.61						477.61
Senegal	Dollar		491.44						491.44
Mali	Dollar		199.80						199.80
Burkina Faso	Dollar		293.86						293.86
Total			1,462.71		19,512.37				20,975.08

SENATOR HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, Dec. 31, 2012.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas Hawkins:									
United States	Dollar				9,762.90				9,762.90
Afghanistan	Dollar		112.00						112.00
United Arab Emirates	Dollar		1,353.44						1,353.44
United States	Dollar						35.00		35.00
Total			1,465.44		9,762.90		35.00		11,263.34

SENATOR MITCH McCONNELL,
Republican Leader, Jan. 11, 2013.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), SENATE CAUCUS ON INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2012

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Eric Jacobstein:									
Colombia	Peso		1,344.44		839.90				2,184.34
Total			1,344.44		839.90				2,184.34

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Chairman, Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, Jan. 2, 2013.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) was agreed to.

NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 27.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 27) designating the week of February 4 through 8, 2013, as ''National School Counseling Week.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before I ask unanimous consent to pass this, I would just say it is extremely important this be brought to the attention of the Senate. Around the country we have about 1 school counselor for every 1,400 students. The Presiding Officer and I attended a number of meetings in the last couple days and that is the information we got there.

That is terribly troubling, with all the problems we have with these boys and girls, to think they would have to win some kind of lottery before they could see a counselor. We know class sizes are too big, and we need to do something about that, but we truly should do something about mandating more counselors for our schools.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 27) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Republican leader, pursuant to Public Law 112–272, appoints the following individual to be a member of the World War I Centennial Commission: Jerry L. Hester of North Carolina.

The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 96–388, as amended by Public Law 97–84, and Public Law 106–292, reappoints and appoints the following Senators to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council: the Honorable FRANK R. LAUTENBERG of New Jersey (reappointment), the Honorable BERNARD SANDERS of Vermont (reappointment), and the Honorable AL FRANKEN of Minnesota.

The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, and after consultation with the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 106–286, and further amended by Public Law 106–292, reappoints the following Members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: the Honorable MAX BAUCUS of Montana, the Honorable CARL LEVIN of Michigan, the Honorable DIANNE FEINSTEIN of California, the Honorable SHERROD BROWN of Ohio (Chairman), and the Honorable JEFF MERKLEY of Oregon.

ORDER FOR PRINTING OF TRIBUTES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a Senate document a compilation of materials from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in tribute to the retiring Members of the 112th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., Monday, February 11, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Act, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I haven't had an opportunity to speak to the Republican leader, but we are going to have votes, and we could have as many as seven rollcall votes on Monday. I am of the mind, after speaking to the Republican leader, that we may have a couple of those votes and put the other votes over until sometime on Tuesday or some reasonable time. I think that would probably be better, with some of the things I can see on the horizon.

Everyone will need to be here for Monday votes, but we may not have all those votes Monday night. We may try to put some of them over until the next day.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2013, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that we adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:51 p.m., adjourned until Monday, February 11, 2013, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

RAYMOND T. CHEN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT, VICE RICHARD LINN, RETIRED.

TODD M. HUGHES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT, VICE WILLIAM C. BRYSON, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SARAH JEWELL, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, VICE KENNETH LEE SALAZAR.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

MARY JO WHITE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2014, VICE MARY L. SCHAPIRO, RESIGNED.

MARY JO WHITE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2019. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

MARILYN B. TAVENNER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES, VICE DONALD M. BERWICK, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 8069:

To be major general

COLONEL DOROTHY A. HOGG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JAMES M. HOLMES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROBIN RAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

ALAN S. FINE
PAUL R. NEWBOLD

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE VICE CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 3034:

To be general

LT. GEN. JOHN F. CAMPBELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. VINCENT K. BROOKS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. DAVID M. RODRIGUEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JASMINE T. N. DANIELS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

PAUL W. ROECKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

JAMES B. BARKLEY
JOHANNA P. CLYBORNE
BRADLEY C. FULLER
DAVID E. GUNDERSON
RICHARD F. JOHNSON
SCOTT M. MACLEOD
DALE E. PEPPER
MICHAEL E. SPRAGGINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

LENA M. FABIAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

YIMING A. CHING
JOSEPH B. GOLDEN
JOSEPH F. GOODMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

WILLIAM C. ALLEY
IVAN ARREGUIN
CHARLES K. BANKS
ERIC BEY
DEBORAH A. BROWN
JEREMIAH J. CATLIN
TODD A. CLAYPOOL
TERRY D. COBBAN, JR.
MARSHALL A. COEN
KENT S. COFFEY
RUBIN N. CRESPO
MICHAEL A. DERIENZO
PATRICK L. DEVINE
DAVID M. DITOLLA
ARCHIE N. DURHAM
RONALD R. EASTES
RODNEY P. GILLIAM
MARK A. GRESCHEL
MICHAEL J. GRIFFITH
ROY A. HAMILTON
REGINO R. HERNANDEZ
ALWYNE O. HUTCHINGS III
TRACY N. KERR
KISUKA C. KILUMBU
JONATHAN J. KNOEDLER
DAVID S. KO
GEUN H. LEE
KENNETH S. LEWIS
WILLIAM A. MARTIN
KARLYN K. MASCHHOFF
NATHAN P. MCLEAN
DAVID L. MONTGOMERY
RAY D. MOONEYHAM, JR.
TROY A. MORKEN
VINCENT T. MYERS
JASON B. PALMER
JUNGHUN PARK
STEVEN G. RINDAHL
JEFFREY B. ROBERSON
CHRISTOPHER S. RUSACK
GERALD A. SHERBOURNE
LIGHT K. SHIN
LEONARD R. SIEMS
JOHN P. H. SMITH, JR.
SOBANA D. SOMARATNA
JERRY S. SQUIRES
MYRON J. TEMKIN
STEVEN H. TOMPKINS
JORGE L. TORRES
JOHN C. VERDUGO
DAVID L. WARD
ALFRED W. WENDEL, JR.
BARRON K. WESTER
CHARLES S. WILLIAMS
GERALD W. WOODFORD, JR.
DOUGLAS A. YATES
CHEUN S. YOO
D010916

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

ALISON R. HUPPMAN
ALLEGRA E. LOBELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

THOMAS M. GREGO
VICTORIA H. OSHEA
MARSHALL J. ROBINSON
GEORGE J. ZECKLER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

ANDREW W. DELEY
FREDRICK S. VINCENZO

To be lieutenant commander

LESLIE A. HATTON
GREGORY E. RINGLER

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. DAVID G. BELLON
COL. RAYMOND R. DESCHENEAUX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL JAMES W. BIERMAN, JR.
COLONEL ROBERT F. CASTELLVI
COLONEL DAVID J. FURNESS
COLONEL MICHAEL S. GROEN
COLONEL KEVIN M. IIAMS
COLONEL JOHN M. JANSEN
COLONEL KEVIN J. KILLEA
COLONEL DAVID A. OTTIGNON
COLONEL THOMAS D. WEIDLEY
COLONEL TERRY V. WILLIAMS