

The feeble argument of proponents of this resolution that "under God" is not overtly religious is only undermined by their holy crusade to make darn sure that the phrase stays in the Pledge. This will be the sixth time this House has voted on this issue—hardly a sign of the phrase's unimportance to religious conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want my children or any child to have a compulsory, religious recitation in this supposedly free society, and seeing the vehemence of those who think otherwise only strengthens my opposition to the Pledge.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 245.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3402, the bill to be considered shortly.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Pursuant to House Resolution 462 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3402.

□ 1414

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3402) to authorize appropriations for the Department of Justice for fiscal years 2006 through 2009, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and

the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

□ 1415

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3402, the Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2006 through 2009. The authorization of executive agencies fulfills Congress' fundamental constitutional obligation to maintain an active and continuing role in organizing the priorities and overseeing the operation of the executive branch. With an annual budget of over \$20 billion and 100,000 employees, the Department of Justice is one of the most important agencies of the Federal Government and the world's premier law enforcement organization. Like other legislation reauthorizing the Department of Justice approved by the House in both the 107th and 108th Congresses, I am proud that this bill is the product of extensive bipartisan deliberation.

In addition to serving as a broad statement by the House of Representatives regarding the priorities of the DOJ over the next several years, this bill addresses the administration of grant programs by the Office of Justice Programs and the Office on Violence Against Women.

By providing grants to State and local governments to focus on current crime issues affecting cities and towns across the country, these grant programs can serve an important role in the fight against crime in America. However, given the finite Federal resources available, it is the responsibility of this body, both through the authorizing process and continuous oversight, to review and evaluate these programs to ensure that the taxpayers' money is used effectively.

This legislation contains a number of important provisions that will strengthen congressional oversight of the Department's law enforcement activities and financial management. Among the new provisions included are: The creation of an office of audit, assessment and management within OJP to monitor grants; a privacy officer to protect personally identifiable information; a directive to the Assistant Attorney General of the Office of Justice Programs to establish a single financial management system and a single procurement system.

In addition to the important oversight tools provided in the bill, there are a number of commonsense provisions designed to improve the administration of programs within the department. H.R. 3402 eliminates duplication by consolidating the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program and the Byrne grant program into one program with the same purposes and simplified administration. The bill also preserves the COPS program, but modi-

fies it to allow grantees greater flexibility to seek grants for a number of purposes, including but not limited to hiring.

Other provisions contained in this legislation authorize programs to combat domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking. Titles 4 through 10 of the bill focus on reauthorizing, expanding and improving programs that were established in the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, or VAWA, and reauthorized in 2000. The bill reauthorizes some important core programs, such as "STOP" grants and grants to reduce campus violence. These programs have been successful in combating family and domestic violence.

The reauthorization of VAWA will continue the tradition of changing attitudes towards domestic violence, and will expand its focus to change attitude toward other violent crimes, including dating violence, sexual assault and stalking. Because these crimes affect both men and women, it is important to note that this legislation specifies that programs addressing these programs should serve both male and female victims.

Furthermore, the legislation specifies that the same rules apply to these funds as to other Federal grant programs. The funds devoted to these programs are not to be used for political activities or lobbying. This money is and always was intended to be used to provide services to victims and to train personnel who deal with these violent crimes. The Department of Justice is expected to enforce that provision for all its grants and to monitor grant activities to ensure compliance not only with this condition but all conditions of the grants.

Mr. Chairman, prior to the enactment of the "21st Century Department of Justice Authorization of Appropriations Act" in 2002, Congress had not formally authorized the operations of the Department of Justice in nearly a quarter of a century.

During floor consideration of that legislation, I expressed my desire that its passage would lead to a regular authorization process that permits Congress to more rigorously oversee the organization, structure, and priorities of DOJ. While the House unanimously passed legislation reauthorizing the Department last Congress, the legislation was not taken up by the other body.

H.R. 3402 contains important bipartisan provisions to ensure that the Department of Justice is better equipped to promote the purposes for which it was established. The legislation also reauthorizes critical programs necessary to help protect the safety and security of Americans while enabling Congress to properly exercise the vigorous oversight that the Constitution requires. I urge my colleagues to support this important and bipartisan legislation.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation beginning by commending the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary who has worked very hard with me on the bill. In the past few years, we have dealt with the Department of Justice, which has oftentimes become increasingly resistant to congressional oversight, either refusing to answer questions or answering them so vaguely that we are not sure what the answer really is. Fortunately, together we worked to address our concerns with the Department of Justice and arrived at the bill before us today.

The bill provides funding for the various offices within the department. In this regard, I would like to note that it gives the Office of the Inspector General over \$70 million for its responsibilities. Why is that important? Because in the past few years, the Office of Inspector General has been particularly diligent in overseeing the Department's war on terrorism, issuing reports on the 9/11 detainees and pushing the Department to change how its procedures are used for handling terrorism suspects.

In addition, the bill reauthorizes the COPS office. That is the Community Oriented Policing Services. Now, we all know that this Clinton administration program has been increasingly vital in crime prevention and crime solving, and that is why COPS has received the praise of the Fraternal Order of the Police, the largest law enforcement organization in the country. Local policing is the backbone in our war on terrorism as community offices are more likely to know the witnesses and more likely to be trusted by the community residents who have information about potential attacks. This bill provides them over \$1 billion per year for this program.

An important piece of legislation before us is the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. I am particularly proud of it for this is the third time we have worked on this bill and each time we make dramatic improvements by using new vehicles to tackle the issue. Building on the work from previous years, the Act reauthorizes some of the most current programs that have been enormously effective, including the "STOP" program, which provides State formula grants that help fund collaboration efforts between police and prosecutors and victims services providers, including legal assistance for victims.

However, there is a grave concern about this measure before us that I must speak to. We worked very hard during negotiations on this bill to recognize the obstacles that some racial and ethnic minorities and their organizations face in the mainstream system. We specifically included language that allows programs to target communities of color. This language does not give

any preferences to minorities nor does it impose any quotas. And we have all been there on quotas. It does not do that. It simply requires the Department of Justice to describe how they will address the needs of racial and ethnic minorities and other underserved populations, and to recognize and meaningfully respond to the needs of these racial and ethnic minorities and other underserved populations. That is all, and to ensure each gets their fair share.

The bill that passed the Committee on the Judiciary had this language included. However, late last night I was informed that the majority had decided to strike this important language in a manager's amendment. I am very sorry to learn of this news. For while I support the underlying bill and stress the importance of reauthorizing the Department of Justice programs contained in it, I seriously regret this advance that was included in the language that has been stricken. I think it is a tragedy. I think it is a serious misunderstanding of what the law is now. Everybody on the Committee on the Judiciary knows how to avoid quotas and certainly not to give preferences to minorities. This measure was included in our bill because it was important that they begin to get a fair share of proceeds that were being allotted under the bill. It was not to secure anything like a quota, and the bill to me deserves our support. I stress the importance of reauthorizing the Department of Justice programs contained in it. I have a very serious problem with the manager's amendment, and will not support that effort.

I rise in support of this legislation. I first would like to commend Chairman SENSENBRENNER for reasserting the Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction over the Department of Justice with this bill. In the past few years, the Department has become increasingly resistant to congressional oversight, either refusing to answer questions or answering them vaguely at best. Fortunately, we worked together to address our concerns with the Department and arrived at the bill before us today.

In general, the bill provides funding for the various offices within the Department. In this regard, I would like to note that it gives the Office of the Inspector General over \$70 million for its responsibilities. In the past few years, the OIG has been diligent in overseeing the Department's war on terrorism, issuing reports on 9/11 detainees and pushing the Department to change how its procedures for handling terrorism suspects.

The bill reauthorizes the Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS, office. We all know that this Clinton Administration program has been increasingly vital in crime prevention and crime solving. That is why COPS has received the praise of the Fraternal Order of Police, the largest law enforcement organization in the country. Local policing also is the backbone in our war on terrorism, as community officers are more likely to know the witnesses and more likely to be trusted by community residents who have information about potential attacks. This bill provides over \$1 billion per year for this program.

An important piece of the bill is the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. This is the third time we have worked on this bill, and each time we make dramatic improvements by using new vehicles to tackle the issue. Building on work from previous years, the Act reauthorizes some of the current programs that have proven enormously effective, including the STOP program—which provides State formula grants that help fund collaboration efforts between police and prosecutors and victim services providers—and legal assistance for victims.

I do have one grave concern about this bill that must be addressed. We worked very hard during negotiations on this bill to recognize the obstacles that some racial and ethnic minorities face in the mainstream system. We specifically included language that allows programs to target communities of color. This language does not give any preferences to minorities, nor does it impose any quotas. It simply requires the Department of Justice to "describe how they will address the needs of racial and ethnic minorities and other underserved populations" and "to recognize and meaningfully respond to the needs of racial and ethnic minorities and other underserved populations" and to ensure that each gets their fair share.

The bill passed the Judiciary Committee with this language included. However, late last night I was informed that the majority had decided to strike this important language in a Managers' Amendment. While I support the underlying bill and stress the importance of reauthorizing the Department of Justice programs contained in it, I have serious problems with the Managers' Amendment and will not support that effort.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to hear what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has just said. Let me reassure the gentleman that the language to have grants go to underserved racial and ethnic populations is still in the manager's amendment. The reason the language had to be changed was to avoid a potential court challenge because language in grant programs have strict scrutiny by the courts.

Let me just quote what is contained on page 8 in the manager's amendment which provides an amendment to lines 1 and 2 of page 126 of the bill. The new language says, "Populations underserved because of geographic locations, underserved racial and ethnic populations, populations underserved because of special needs (such as language barriers, disabilities, alien age status, or age) and any other population determined to be underserved by the Attorney General." This new language, which is proposed in the manager's amendment I believe will do what the gentleman from Michigan wishes to accomplish, and that is to make sure that underserved racial and ethnic populations are on the radar screen when the attorney general makes up his mind on who will be able to get grants to provide services to deal with this subject.

What it does do is it prevents this money from being tied up in a court challenge that will probably last through most of the life of this authorization bill, which is through September 30, 2009, or just a few days more than 4 years from now.

I would encourage the gentleman from Michigan to be sensitive to the fact that the language in the original bill would have been subject to a court challenge, and in the manager's amendment we attempt to get rid of that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

□ 1430

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that included in the Department of Justice reauthorization are measures that will ease the administrative burdens that exist for State and local governments and provide them greater flexibility to spend the money they have been awarded from the various grant programs. Is that correct?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, there are many areas throughout the country that have extremely high tourism rates. The local law enforcement agencies of these areas have the difficult task of providing services to these tourists on top of their responsibility to the base population. For example, the city of Las Vegas has a population of over 534,000 people; however, over 40 million tourists a year visit Las Vegas. Local law enforcement is responsible for the safety of these visitors, which places a huge financial strain on the various police departments.

With that in mind, would the chairman agree that one factor in awarding grant money should be the disproportionate amount of tourists an area has related to that area's base population?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would agree and would work with the gentleman from Nevada to address this problem as the bill moves to conference.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his offer and look forward to working with him.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank him for yielding to me because the position that we have adopted that we are being set back by the manager's amendment is agreed to by the women against violence organizations, the civil rights organizations. And we have numerous letters, one from the chair of the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, which plainly go into the details of the fact that in no way are we trying to establish quotas or favoritism to any one particular group whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it has been said that society's humanity is judged by the way it handles the problems and the protection of those who are least able to take care of themselves. And having watched television for the last few weeks about the issues around Katrina, one clearly understands that sometimes people on the bottom do not get handled very well. Somehow, the things do not happen that should happen for them. That gave us an ugly glimpse at that part of our society.

And then as the country began to come out of that, the President walked out of the White House and said, we are not going to give prevailing wage to the people who work on the reconstruction of their own houses and their own countryside, that we were going to put them down at the minimum. We are going to take away the set-asides for minority and small business. Now, it is no wonder that these organizations would be concerned when they see this kind of manager's amendment.

I am not a lawyer. We could stand out here and argue about all the lawyer technicalities inside and outside. And I will enter into the RECORD a letter dated September 28, 2005, from Hilary Shelton. When the NAACP and all the women's organizations come out and say we oppose this manager's amendment, it is understandable why they might be a little concerned, because every time we turn around, the safety net is being ripped.

The language that is being taken out here that has been in the bill before is requiring the States to "describe how they will address the needs of racial and ethnic minorities and other underserved populations" and "to recognize and meaningfully respond to the needs of racial and ethnic minorities and other underserved populations."

Now, for us not to be able to put that in the law because somebody says on the fringe that this is some kind of affirmative action or anything else, we have to take care of people who are not served in this society. If they happen to be in underserved areas, they do not necessarily have to be black or brown or red or yellow. They could be white. The question is, how are we going to deal with the underserved people in this country no matter who they are? And this amendment does not need to

be made so that those groups can say, well, we are going to take you to court and fight you for 3 years.

That is what the chairman just said. He said if we put that in there, they are going to go into court and say this is a quota and we want to fight it, and they will stretch it out for 3 years or 5 years or however long, a typical tactic of the right to do unto those who are least able to do for themselves.

I urge the rejection of the manager's amendment.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
Washington, DC, September 28, 2005.

Re NAACP opposition to the Managers amendment to H.R. 3402, Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2006 through 2009.

MEMBERS,

U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), our nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots civil rights organization, I am writing to express our strong opposition to the Manager's amendment to H.R. 3402, the Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2006 through 2009. The Manager's amendment, which is meant to be non-controversial, strips out a key provision that is currently in the bill that ensures that racial and ethnic minorities who are victims of domestic violence would receive adequate services.

Specifically, the bill that was passed out of the Judiciary Committee requires states to ["describe how they will address the needs of racial and ethnic minorities and other underserved populations" and "to recognize and meaningfully respond to the needs of racial and ethnic minorities and other underserved population"] and to ensure that each gets their fair share. Unfortunately, this provision is sorely needed as domestic violence is still a serious—and largely untreated—problem in too many of our communities.

I urge you again, in the strongest terms possible, to oppose the Manager's amendment and to retain the language that is in the bill. Please help to address the problem of domestic violence in racial and ethnic minority communities as well as those areas that are currently underserved. Thank you in advance for your attention to the concerns of the NAACP; should you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at (202) 463-2940.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
Director.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Department of Justice Reauthorization Act. Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It has many great programs. But there is one I would like to focus on today, one that I authored and worked on extensively as a separate bill, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. I am proud to say it is part of the bill before us, and I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Michigan for their support to make this happen. I am pleased, and I think it is an important day for all of us.

As the Members know, VAWA was originally passed 10 years ago; and since that time, it has helped us make remarkable gains in fighting domestic and sexual violence. During that decade, VAWA, quite simply, has saved lives. It has helped millions of women and children find safety, security, and self-sufficiency.

Because of the Violence Against Women Act, victims have found help to escape violence and get treatment. Law enforcement and the judicial system have learned how to better help these victims through what can be a very daunting and difficult legal process, and more people recognize the signs of abuse because of our public awareness campaigns.

Every step we take in fighting domestic violence helps not only save the immediate victim but it can help break the cycle of abuse that lasts, sadly, all too often generation after generation. In this bill we are building on the successes of the Violence Against Women Act not only by reauthorizing effective programs but also by including innovative, cost-effective new programs that will continue the great work of those who have come before me and others, work that will help the criminal justice and legal systems better help and protect victims.

This law was first created 10 years ago. When it was reauthorized 5 years ago, it was improved; and I am hoping that we are doing the same thing here today.

We are doing this improvement through training grants; providing direct services for victims; providing services to children, teens, and young adults who have experienced violence in their lives, and educating young people about domestic violence and sexual assault.

By strengthening the health care system's response to violence against women and investing in broad remedies and services for victims, we will continue to make progress in preventing these crimes and ensuring that future generations are safe from domestic and sexual violence.

We have made great strides, but I think everyone here would be quick to admit that we have a long way to go. Any law enforcement agency will tell us that a huge portion of the violent crime they encounter is, sadly, domestic violence. If we give law enforcement better tools and training, if we go further to raise public awareness through campaigns, then we can break the cycle of violence and abuse that does seem to slide too easily from generation to generation.

I recently had the opportunity to visit the courts in Milwaukee and saw some of the groundbreaking work that they are doing. What we need to do as Members of Congress is stand shoulder to shoulder with our domestic violence leaders and organizations all around this country, make sure that they have the tools and the resources they need

to be effective, that they need to be compassionate. I think this legislation does just that.

Again, I want to thank Members of both sides of the aisle who have worked so hard to make this legislation come forward today. It is a good day, and I am proud to be involved.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the Violence Against Women Act has rescued countless women from the vicious cycle of family violence, and it remains the cornerstone of our country's efforts to put an end to domestic abuse and sexual assault. Now is not the time to abandon our commitment to women around the world. It is time to strengthen our resolve and to protect these women.

We must also teach our youngest citizens, our children, that bullying, intimidation, and physical abuse are unacceptable behavior. That is why I fully support strengthening VAWA.

The Sensenbrenner amendment, on the other hand, offered today would weaken the very core of this legislation. If racial and ethnic minority language is struck from the STOP grants, which specifically target women of color and immigrant women who have experienced domestic violence, these populations will continue to be underserved.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of VAWA in the Department of Justice bill and oppose the Sensenbrenner amendment so we can ensure these protections and resources remain available to all women.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for the Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act, and specifically title IV, the VAWA reauthorization.

I want to thank and recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Michigan for their efforts drafting this bill and for including legislative provisions from my bill, the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act.

This bill would protect the thousands of so-called "mail-order brides" who come to the U.S. each year through international marriage brokers. And although it is not a practice I particularly endorse, it is a practice that is largely unregulated.

In December 2000, this issue hit close to home when Anastasia King, a mail-order bride in Washington State, was murdered and buried in a shallow grave by her husband. It was later discovered that her husband had abused a former wife whom he had also met through a marriage broker.

Each year hundreds of Internet bride services recruit thousands of women, mostly from Eastern Europe, South-

east Asia, and other economically depressed parts of the globe, to marry their American clients. These marriage broker Web sites play off old stereotypes of foreign women as subservient wives.

A 1999 report by the INS estimated that there were at least 200 marriage broker companies operating in the United States and that each year as many as 4,000 to 6,000 individuals in U.S., almost all male, found foreign spouses through for-profit international marriage brokers.

My International Marriage Broker Regulation Act, and this DOJ authorization bill, will give these foreign women knowledge to protect themselves. They will know if their American fiance has a history of violence, and they will know their rights should they find themselves in an abusive relationship.

This bill will also stop what I call the "wife lottery," where men apply for several fiancee visas at the same time and marry the woman whose visa is approved first.

This legislation is a giant step towards protecting women who use the services of marriage brokers. I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for including it in this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the language contained in the Justice Department Authorization Act that reauthorizes the Violence Against Women Act.

Scratch the surface of any of our Nation's most challenging social problems, from crime in schools to gang violence and homelessness, and we are likely to find the root cause is domestic violence, which disproportionately affects women and girls.

Law enforcement officers report that domestic violence calls are among their most frequent. Judges find that children first seen in their courts as victims of domestic violence return later as adult criminal defendants. Schools report that children with emotional problems often come from environments where violence is the norm.

This is why, while it is extremely important to combat violence against women, it is just as important to combat domestic violence involving the youngest of victims. This year's VAWA reauthorization bill takes that necessary step by clarifying that programs contained in VAWA can serve youth as well. It also adds programs that specifically target children and youth and their unique needs. Among these are the authorization of grants for services designed for young people who are victims of domestic and dating violence, sexual assault and stalking, and prevention programs that work with children and teens to stop the cycle of violence.

□ 1445

Helping the young victims of domestic violence has always been an important issue to me. In the 107th Congress, I introduced the Legal Assistance for Victims of Dating Violence Act, which amended VAWA to allow legal assistance grants to be used to help the victims of dating violence. I am pleased to say that this language was included in VAWA when it was reauthorized in 2000, and is maintained in the VAWA language included in the DOJ Authorization Act today.

I commend the Committee on the Judiciary for providing additional services to victims of dating violence through this legislation. Violence begets violence, and it is incumbent on us to try to break the cycle. This is done by helping victims of domestic violence, especially our youngest victims before they become perpetrators of domestic violence later in life.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of provisions of my bill, H.R. 3188, the Immigrant Victims of Violence Protection Act, which are included in the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization. These immigrant provisions reflect hard, bipartisan work of many Members of Congress, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for his leadership on this issue.

This bill is a good start. It would help immigrant women who need to leave their abusive spouses by preventing their deportation while their application is being considered. It would provide them access to work permits, so that they can get a job on their own and gain economic security independent of their abusers. In addition to spouses, this bill would also protect battered children, as well as parents, from abusive family members.

However, we can do more. For example, this bill does not include provisions which would allow battered victims access to health insurance, food and other benefits required to escape their abuser. I will work hard to include these provisions in the final bill enacted.

As a first generation American and someone who represents an immigrant rich community in Chicago, I understand the unique challenges immigrant women face. "My neighbor called the police, but I did not sign the report out of fear," said a Mexican immigrant and mother of four at a press conference I held in Chicago. She said she stayed with her abusive husband for 13 years to be with her children.

This is the voice of women across the country that need our help to get out of the cycle of abuse. This Congress must remain vigilant in its fight to protect one of the most vulnerable populations in this country. I challenge my colleagues to make the fight

against domestic violence a top priority.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

It has been my intent today to join with my colleagues from Washington State to offer two amendments to this bill. Two years ago, a terrible murder-homicide was committed in a parking lot in my district. This crime was particularly unusual in that it was committed by the chief of the Tacoma Police Department who murdered his wife, Crystal Judson Brame, while their two children sat in another car just a few yards away.

The investigation that ensued found serious problems with the Tacoma Police Department, which had led to the hiring and continued promotion of an individual with a history of domestic violence. Upon promotion to chief, violence committed by Chief Brame against his wife was not addressed by the department, even when police units had responded to a call.

The bottom line in this case is that the Tacoma Police Department did not have a strong and enforceable policy to address domestic violence committed by a member of the police force, and this was not a deficiency exclusive to Tacoma. Because of this, the Washington State legislature passed a law establishing strong standards for law enforcement agencies within the State to prevent and punish future incidents of domestic violence committed by law enforcement officers.

Our law enforcement officers work very hard to protect us and to keep our streets safe. All too often, our law enforcement officers are called upon to put their lives on the line to protect us and keep us safe. The strain this puts on individual officers is enormous, and I am deeply concerned by the anecdotal evidence indicating the possibility of a higher incidence of domestic violence among law enforcement officers than among the public.

To this end, I and my colleagues, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), sought to offer an amendment to establish a Federal study to determine if there is a direct link between the nature of the job and domestic violence.

I understand the majority had concerns with this proposal, and I look forward to working with the majority to try and devise a solution that can answer these questions. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that there may be a possibility of it being included in a GAO study that the committee is going to ask for, and this may be one way to find out the information.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to have the

GAO do a study on this issue. I am hopeful that we will be able to speed it up so that we can get it in a timely manner.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I just want to point out the STOP Grants Program is available, and we believe that police departments and local governments can apply today for grants, and I would urge all of them to do so.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the bill as passed by the Committee on the Judiciary makes important improvements on the Department of Justice authorization. It was approved on a bipartisan basis. It deals with the Violence Against Women Act, especially as it applies to immigrants, the COPS authorization, fighting drug abuse. It adds administrative efficiencies, and, as I indicated, it came out of committee on a bipartisan basis. Unfortunately, the manager's amendment will ruin this bipartisan cooperation.

Reference has been made to the letter we have received from the NAACP that points out that the bill as passed out by the Committee on the Judiciary was much better than the manager's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there were no hearings on this amendment, there is no public comment, it is just a manager's amendment which is supposed to be uncontroversial. It would have been helpful if we could have had committee consideration and agreed on bipartisan language.

I am sensitive to the concerns of the chairman that the Constitution may jeopardize the language that is in the bill, but I think we should have worked it out, and, in the absence of an agreement, I would hope that we would defeat the manager's amendment. If we are expected to appropriately address and relieve racial tensions in our communities, the only way I think we can do this appropriately at this point would be to defeat the manager's amendment and come back and try to work out language that everyone can agree on.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I wish there were time to have committee consideration of this. However, there are certain legislative provisions in the Violence Against Women Act that expire on September 30, and, if we keep on talking and talking and talking, you are going to see a good part of the VAWA end up disappearing. That is why we have to deal with this issue today.

I would urge adoption of the manager's amendment to remove the cloud of the constitutional challenge over the money that is to be sent to underserved racial and ethnic minorities.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and giving me this opportunity to be heard.

I would like to say specifically to the gentleman from Wisconsin, time sometimes is of the essence, but the reality is that minority women and immigrant women, for them time is of the essence, and it is important that we have programming that focuses in on issues that involve cultural sensitivities.

In many of the ethnic and minority communities, it is taboo to bring a lawsuit or to bring a charge against your husband, and we, therefore, need to give States the opportunity to have the ability to craft programs that would allow them and encourage them to come forward, and that was the sense of the legislation as it came out of the committee.

I would encourage the gentleman to consider removing his manager's amendment in the interest of the racial and ethnic minority women who are out here suffering daily from domestic violence charges. It is so important that we understand that domestic violence cases continue to be on the rise. It is important that we understand in fact that racial and ethnic minority women are often not willing to come forward and bring charges.

I don't know about the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), but I was a prosecutor for 8 years, heading the Cuyahoga County prosecutor's office, and that was always one of the challenges we had dealing with racial and ethnic minorities. I think it is such a wonderful opportunity for us to say to them, just as we are talking about what is happening with Hurricane Katrina, have we not thought about racial and ethnic issues, that we ought to pay attention to that, right now, today in this legislation.

I would encourage the gentleman, as he has encouraged us, to reconsider his decision to remove that important provision from the manager's amendment, and we could continue to have some bipartisan support.

As the House considers H.R. 3402, the DOJ/Violence against Women Reauthorization Act, VAWA, today, I rise to express my disappointment and strong opposition to a manager's amendment submitted late last night, by the majority staff of the Judiciary Committee. This amendment seeks to strike "racial and ethnic minorities" from the definition of underserved populations in the STOP grants section of VAWA. Mr. Chairman, my initial reaction to hearing about this proposed amendment was give me a break! Why? What is the majority looking to accomplish by striking this language from the legislation. What is the goal! Somebody help me understand this!

STOP grants are the heart of VAWA funding. By striking this language from the legislation, domestic violence prevention and treatment services specifically targeting women of color and immigrant victims of domestic violence will continue to be compromised.

Mr. Chairman, many racial and ethnic minority women and immigrant women are less likely to report instances of domestic violence than Caucasian women because they face institutional barriers to reporting abuse or seeking help for domestic violence. These women often face restrictions on public assistance, limited access to immigration relief, lack of translators or bilingual professionals, little educational material in the woman's native language, treatment programs that do not take into account ethnic and cultural differences, and prohibitive fee structures. The VAWA Reauthorization provisions in H.R. 3402 establish grants that will provide these women with information to get the assistance they need.

Violence against women and children is a serious, widespread problem in America. Each year, close to 1 million incidents of violence are reported against a current or former spouse, boyfriend, or girlfriend. On average, more than 3 women are murdered by their husbands or boyfriends in this country every day, and approximately 1 in 5 female high school students reports being physically and/or sexually abused by a dating partner. Last year, in the State of Ohio, 129 fatalities occurred as a result of domestic violence. In addition, there were over 100,000 domestic calls and arrests as well as over 17,000 new civil protection orders issued. It is important to understand that violence against women and children not only devastates families but it devastates entire communities. Reauthorization of VAWA '05 is integral to providing practical solutions to improving the response of the criminal justice and legal systems by expanding funding for local groups working with underserved communities, strengthening the criminal justice response to sexual assault, providing services for children and youth, and advocating for effective prevention programs.

The manager's amendment seeking to strike this language from the legislation would be a slap in the face to minority women across the country. I urge my colleagues to oppose the manager's amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN), a very vital participant in crafting this legislation.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I have been on the Committee on the Judiciary for 11 years, and I have concerns that the committee is not fulfilling completely its responsibility. There have been no oversight hearings in the full committee of either the FBI or the Bureau of Prisons in the whole 11 years I served. The last general oversight hearing on the FBI was at the subcommittee level in 1997.

The lack of committee oversight has created real problems in the way the FBI fails to conduct its business properly. Last February, in an appropriations subcommittee, we found out that the FBI had invested about \$170 million on its Virtual Case File computer system and they admitted that \$104 million of that spending was a loss to taxpayers. Then in March, the whole projects was scrapped and we learned from news reports that the new Sentinel system will cost an additional \$792 million.

Meanwhile, the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Inspector General tells us in the July report that the FBI's backlog of untranslated FISA material continues to grow. This means that material that is vital to our national defense is not getting looked at in a timely manner. It often gets discarded before it is looked at, and that is unacceptable.

Earlier this year, I worked with many of my colleagues to introduce the Violence Against Women Act, which is in this bill. My bill would have included provisions that established grant programs to protect child victims of domestic violence, grant programs for housing needs, to protect immigrants who are victims of domestic violence and to protect victims of domestic violence on tribal lands. Not all of these measures made it into the bill, and I am hopeful in conference those provisions that were left out can be added in.

I want to mention one issue which has recently come to my attention, which is the issue of tribal victims of domestic violence who are not receiving VAWA's protections. I was going to offer an amendment today to allow the Attorney General to appoint prosecutors designated by tribal governments as special assistant U.S. Attorneys to bring VAWA prosecutions in Federal Court. However, when I looked into it, it turns out the Attorney General already has this authority through his general authority to appoint special prosecutors. So I would like to urge the Attorney General to address this issue and to use his authority to make sure that perpetrators of domestic violence on tribal lands do not escape prosecution.

We do not always need to change the law, we just need accomplishment and accountability in the administration, and I hope we can use our oversight authority to make sure we have the kind of accomplishment and accountability in the FBI that we are currently lacking.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

□ 1500

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for yielding me this time; and let me thank the chairman, first of all, for his willingness to include, or to continue to include, an important amendment dealing with early release for Federal prisoners.

That is why I rise, because I believe we can work this issue out. I would ask the chairman and the ranking member, as we move toward this legislative finality of the authorization bill that we take a second look at this language that was included that has to do with racial ethnic minorities.

Let me join my colleague, or allow me to join my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) in the work that she has done on the Violence Against Women Act. I have also included language in the omnibus immigration bill dealing with racial ethnic minorities, and this language is key to be reincluded. Why? Because too often, racial and ethnic minorities have lacked access to services and their safety has been compromised.

I want to compromise, frankly, Mr. Chairman, with all of those individuals who, for some reason or another, believe that this is a preference, a quota. It is not. It is an outreach mechanism to ensure that States who receive Federal monies, and we have done this often before, we have done this with the issue dealing with procurement. We have insisted on it not being quotas. This is only to say that ethnic and racial minorities many times are not able to access the questions of dealing with domestic violence. We know that that is not an occurring incident in high numbers in these communities, language barriers that do not allow individuals to access resources.

This is where the Congress can intervene, because VAWA intended for all underserved communities to have a fair chance of addressing these crimes in holding perpetrators accountable. Even when these women will go to court, we need culturally sensitive individuals, whether it is individuals from Southeast Asia, whether it is individuals from Africa or the Caribbean, whether it is individuals from the poor areas of America.

This is a viable amendment, language that should be reincluded; and I ask my colleagues, let us work together. Let us not misinterpret and make this a racial issue when it is not. It is an outreach issue. It is an aspiration issue. It is a goal issue. And I would ask my colleagues to support the language being reinstated at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the underlying legislation that has been introduced by my colleague on the Committee, Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, Jr. The spirit of bipartisanship that went into crafting H.R. 3402, the "Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2006 through 2009" is to be commended.

H.R. 3402 will reauthorize the Justice Department and its various offices and components. While the Appropriations Committee is responsible for issuing funds to government bodies, it is the purview of authorizing committees to permit the agencies to spend those funds. Congress last authorized the Justice Department in 2002, through the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act. While the House passed authorization legislation in the 108th Congress, the Senate failed to act before adjournment.

I am particularly pleased that this bill contains provisions from my bill entitled "Save Our Children: Stop the Violent Predators Against Children DNA Act of 2005 (H.R. 244)" and the "Enhanced Protections for Trafficked Persons Act of 2005."

Furthermore, I would like to highlight the fact that the Violence Against Women Act of 2005 that is part of the legislation we are considering today, contains important provisions that will enhance protections to immigrant victims of domestic violence, sexual assault and trafficking. I am happy that these provisions resulted from bipartisan efforts of members of this committee. They will significantly improve safety for immigrant victims. I thank Congresswomen LOFGREN and SOLIS for their leadership.

While VAWA 1994 and 2000 made significant progress in reducing violence against immigrant women, there are still many women and children whose lives are in danger today. Many VAWA eligible victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse or trafficking are still being deported. This bill will implement VAWA's original intent by stopping the deportation of immigrant victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and trafficking who qualify for VAWA immigration benefits. Very importantly the bill contains provisions designed to deter Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers from arresting immigrant victims seeking help from domestic violence shelters, rape crisis centers and protection orders. It also removes obstacles in immigration law that cut victims off from VAWA cancellation of removal and adjustment of status including improved rules for VAWA motions to reopen. VAWA 2005 will extend immigration relief to all victims of family violence by preventing victims of incest and child abuse perpetrated by a U.S. citizen or permanent resident parent from being cut off from VAWA's immigration protections when they turn 21; by protecting non-citizen parents abused by their adult U.S. citizen sons or daughters; by protecting adopted and abused children; and by securing protection for children of immigrant victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and trafficking. Very importantly this bill contains provisions that will guarantee economic security for immigrant victims and their children by granting employment authorization to adult victims who have filed valid immigration cases. Yet I am very opposed to the Manager's amendment that eliminates the outreach to racial and ethnic women who are victims of domestic abuse. We must add that language back into the underlying bill and I will vigorously oppose the Manager's amendment.

The trafficking provisions in this bill are of particular importance to me and I am very pleased that additional protections for trafficking victims and tools to help prosecute traffickers have been included in the bill. These VAWA 2005 provisions will extend the statute of limitations on bringing charges for trafficking, slavery, and involuntary servitude to 10 years. This legislation will protect family members of trafficking victims from retaliation by traffickers abroad by helping family members reunite with trafficking victims in the United States, including the use of parole. It will also allow for extension of duration of T visas when needed to facilitate prosecution of traffickers. We will also require reports to Congress on the number of law enforcement officers trained on identifying trafficking victims and on the T and U visa protections and law enforcement certification process. Finally the bill will shorten the time T visa victims have to wait before filing for lawful permanent residency, particularly in cases in which the prosecution against the traffickers has been completed.

In addition, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their cooperation in incorporating the language of an amendment that I offered that expresses a commitment of Congress to continue exploring the benefits of granting "good time release" to non-violent Federal incarcerated persons. This is an initiative that I have pursued for a long time and will continue until we make real progress. The language of my amendment to this effect was passed in the 108th Congress as part of H.R. 1829 and in the Subcommittee on Crime this Congress as H.R. 2965.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this legislation will pass into law retaining all of the beneficial provisions that I have enumerated above.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the ranking member's work and his yielding me this time, and the work of the chairman. I much appreciate that the gentlemen have come forward, both of them, before the deadline on their portions of the bill. I am particularly appreciative of the dating violence, because since the last bill, we have infected young people down to the high school age, so the way in which we enlarge that section is very important.

I do want everybody to know that all you could do was the sections falling under your jurisdictions. Before this is all done, we have to deal with the other sections of the bill, like the housing sections of the bill, for example. That, of course, is not with you; you are just trying to get the part that is with you so that the deadline would be reached.

But my city is typical. Twenty to 40 women come to court every year, we have 48 emergency beds, a thousand women in motels. The major reason that these women say, no, I love him, that is why I am staying with him, is that they do not have anyplace to go. In fact, what you have is women facing homelessness or staying with an abuser. So before this process is all over, I hope we will bear in mind that the other sections of this bill that cannot be before us now are part and parcel of all we are trying to do here.

I salute the Committee on the Judiciary, the chairman and the ranking member, for doing all they could at this point; and let us get to work on the rest of the bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), the head of the Women's Caucus.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

While I am supportive of the underlying bill, the manager's amendment that we will soon consider creates a serious problem for women of color who are victims of domestic violence. The manager's amendment will weaken the definition of "underserved communities," so that groups that work specifically to help women of color who

are victims of domestic violence would continue to be ignored by the grants process through the Department of Justice.

After all the bipartisan work that we have done throughout the years to work on this to reach a balanced approach, just this morning we heard that the Republican leadership was shortchanging the women of color and were taking out this very key language.

When considering VAWA, we must recognize the conflicts and problems facing women of color, particularly immigrant women, who are victims of domestic violence. Women of color are less likely to report incidents of domestic violence, which means that studies of domestic violence among communities of color do not reflect the reality of these women's lives. Women of color who are victims of violence are at even greater risk when their spouses control their immigration status.

Women of color also face institutional barriers to reporting abuse and seeking help, partly because they do not have access to individuals who understand their language. It is important to have translators available. It is important to have outreach literature available to them in their native language.

By addressing domestic violence in these communities in a way that understands their culture and honors their values, we greatly increase the chances of making a difference for women of color who are being abused. It is my hope that the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act is comprehensive and meets the needs of all women.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the manager's amendment and to join those national domestic violence groups in opposing the manager's amendment: the National Network to End Domestic Violence, Family Violence Prevention Fund, National Coalition to End Domestic Violence, Sisters of Color Ending Sexual Assault, Legal Momentum, and lastly, the NAACP.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret a minor change that was made to ensure that the money for underserved communities is not tied up in litigation is being turned into a partisan issue. There is no malevolent thought on the part of the majority to do so.

Now, let me say that the language in the base bill presumes that racial and ethnic minorities are underserved. That was the presumption for which there are no congressional findings. And because grant language is construed with strict scrutiny by the courts, setting up a preference based on racial and ethnic minorities is going to end up at minimum tying up the money that the people on the other side of the aisle who are complaining about the manager's amendment want

to get into society to help solve these problems.

Now, the manager's amendment ensures that attention is paid to whatever community is underserved, not simply assuming that a community is underserved, even though there is no evidence on the table to back up that assumption.

Now, the manager's amendment uses the words "underserved racial and ethnic populations," together with other types of underserved populations. So the words "underserved," "racial," and "ethnic populations" is contained in the manager's amendment. I think this is a small price to pay to prevent the money that is to be sent out in grants under this section of the Violence Against Women Act to be tied up for weeks and months and years.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to recognize that there is a legal problem in this, rather than making political points.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. The Violence Against Women Act has been instrumental in protecting women from domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. Domestic violence often has devastating consequences for women, their families and society as a whole.

The Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization provides essential grants including educational programs for the prevention of domestic violence in schools, battered women's shelters, a national domestic violence hotline, grants to improve law enforcement and prosecution of violent crimes against women, among others. It also provides much needed services for the protection of children from maltreatment, sexual assault, and domestic violence.

I believe it is important to provide preventative domestic violence programs as well as help those who have been affected by domestic violence with programs that can help them recover and protect them in the future. Many of the domestic violence programs that we have today would not be able to continue without the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. I urge all my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation and allow these much needed programs and services to continue so that we may continue to work to stop domestic violence.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, earlier today, during debate on the rule for this bill, the gentleman from Georgia who was managing the floor for the majority stated that my amendments to this bill were not germane.

I would like the RECORD to show that the Parliamentarian has advised me that both amendments are in fact germane.

Just to be clear, the rules committee did not reject this amendment because it was not germane—it certainly is— They rejected it, I believe, because they were simply trying to shield Members of Congress from having to go on the record against offering information to rape victims that could help prevent pregnancy or abortion.

Again, please let the RECORD show that my amendments were germane.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of H.R. 3402, the reauthoriza-

tion of the Department of Justice. I applaud the authors of the Violence Against Women Act for addressing the far reaching problems associated with domestic abuse. I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of this legislation.

Domestic violence is a tragedy. It affects far too many women all over America.

Earlier this year, a body was found in my district in Cherry Hill that was thought to be the body of a woman who had been reported missing. She had left for her job in Towson that morning but never arrived at work. She had not made contact with friends or relatives, and after her boyfriend led police to the body it was decided to keep him in custody. This kind of tragedy needs to stop.

There is no profile for being a battered woman. Any woman is at risk of being abused. The highest risk factor is simply being born a woman.

Victims may experience many different forms of abuse. They include physical harm as well as mental dangers that are just as damaging. Both physical and mental abuse destroy self-esteem and independence and cause damage which cannot be undone. Many women lack the courage or ability to leave abusive relationships and even more frightening is that abuses nearly always escalate in frequency and degree over time.

Children witnessing domestic abuse also suffer. Children who live in an abusive home may become withdrawn, anxious, depressed, confused and angry. They also are at risk for learning dangerous behavior and continuing in an abusive cycle.

The Violence Against Women Act was originally passed in 1994. It made huge progress in the way domestic violence was viewed. Since 1994 the VAWA has provided resources and protections for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. The VAWA has saved lives and helped millions of victims find safety, security and self-sufficiency.

The VAWA was reauthorized in 2000. Since that time over \$14 billion dollars in social costs, prevented medical and mental health care and enforcement costs have been saved.

The VAWA provides practical solutions for criminal justice and legal systems. It develops standards for protecting the confidentiality of victims, and allows for the enforcement of protective orders across state lines.

We must take this critical step in preventing and addressing abuse. We must solve the problem of domestic violence. I fully support the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3402 which reauthorizes the Violence Against Women Act. Domestic violence is an issue throughout our Nation and in my district. Federal funding of the Violence Against Women Act has helped decrease domestic violence on Guam, and the reauthorization of these programs will ensure that the progress we have achieved in reducing domestic violence will continue. In reauthorizing this Act, Congress sends the message that domestic violence will not be tolerated and we stand with women on this issue.

Statistics show that in 2001 alone, more than half a million women were victims of nonfatal violence by a partner. But these women were more than statistics—they were someone's mother, daughter, sister, or friend. Their voices have been heard and that is why

I support H.R. 3402 and the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3402, the Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act, which contains an amendment that I proposed during the consideration of the bill by the House Judiciary Committee to address the rising threat of Organized Retail Theft, ORT.

ORT poses a serious threat to our Nation's consumers and businesses. It is estimated that professional organized retail theft rings are responsible for pilfering up to \$30 billion in merchandise from retail stores annually.

Organized retail theft groups typically target everyday household commodities and consumer items that can be easily sold through fencing operations, flea markets, swap meets and shady store-front operations. Items that are routinely stolen include over-the-counter drug products, such as analgesics and cold medications, razor blades, camera film, batteries, videos, DVDs, CDs, smoking cessation products, infant formula and computer software items. Thieves often travel from retail store to retail store, and from state to state, stealing relatively small amounts of goods from each store, but cumulatively stealing significant amounts of goods. Once stolen, these products can be sold back to fencing operations, which can dilute, alter and repackage the goods and then resell them, sometimes back to the same stores from which the products were originally stolen.

When a product does not travel through the authorized channels of distribution, there is an increased risk that the product has been altered, diluted, reproduced and/or repackaged. These so-called "diverted products" pose significant health risks to the public, especially the diverted medications and food products. Diverted products also cause considerable financial losses for legitimate manufacturers and retailers. Ultimately, the consumers bear the brunt of these losses as retail establishments are forced to raise prices to cover the additional costs of security and theft prevention measures.

At the State level, organized retail theft crimes are normally prosecuted under state shoplifting statutes as mere misdemeanors. As a result, the thieves that participate in organized retail theft rings typically receive the same punishment as common shoplifters. The thieves who are convicted usually see very limited jail time or are placed on probation. I believe that the punishment does not fit the crime in these situations. Mere slaps on the wrists of these criminals has practically no deterrent effect. In addition, criminals who are involved in organized retail theft rings pose greater risks to the public because their intent is for the goods to be resold. Because the routes of these diverted products are extremely difficult to trace, there is a greater risk that these goods will be faulty, outdated and dangerous for consumer use. The punishment for these interstate crimes should be greater than that for common shoplifters.

In December 2003, in response to growth of ORT crimes, the FBI established an organized retail theft initiative. While this is a good start, much work needs to be done to combat this problem.

The amendment incorporated into H.R. 3402 will earmark resources for DOJ to address ORT crimes to ensure that these crimes receive the appropriate attention. Specifically,

this amendment creates a Federal definition of organized retail theft crimes, and authorizes \$5 million for each of the next three fiscal years for educating and training Federal law enforcement regarding these crimes, as well as for investigating, apprehending and prosecuting individuals engaged in these crimes. In addition, this amendment directs the FBI to consult with the private sector in order to construct a database, housed in the private sector, where retail establishments, as well as Federal, State, and local law enforcement can compile evidence on specific organized retail theft crimes to aid investigations and prosecutions. Often, a lack of information about the interstate nature of these crimes prevents federal law enforcement from getting involved in these cases. This database will help put the pieces together to show the organized and multi-state nature of these crimes, as well as provide important evidence for prosecutions.

I want to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER for his willingness to address organized retail theft crimes in this important authorizing legislation, and I look forward to continuing to work to combat these serious crimes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3402, the Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2006 through 2009, particularly the sections which re-authorizes portions of the Violence Against Women Act that are under the jurisdiction of the House Judiciary Committee.

I am a long-time supporter of programs authorized by the Violence Against Women Act. I believe Congress must proactively work to combat violence against women including domestic violence, rape and other sex crimes.

In 1994, I voted for the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, which incorporated VAWA. This legislation established a number of grant programs designed to aid law enforcement officers and prosecutors, encourage arrest policies, stem domestic violence and child abuse, and establish training programs for victim advocates and counselors.

I am deeply concerned about the scourge of domestic violence and other crimes against women, and recognize the need for support services and tough prosecution guidelines. Each year, approximately 2 million women are physically or sexually assaulted or stalked by an intimate partner in the United States. Perpetrators of these reprehensible crimes must be punished, and victims must have the services available to help transition to a normal life.

Passing H.R. 3402 will ensure the development and continuation of programs that work to prevent violence and assist survivors and their families regain their safety and self-sufficiency. I strongly support these programs and encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank the bipartisan leadership of the Judiciary Committee for its hard work shepherding through this powerful reauthorization of Department of Justice activities, a bill that I strongly support. The bill authorizes a total of \$95 billion, including \$24.4 billion for the FBI, \$7.25 billion for the Drug Enforcement Administration, and \$6.85 billion for U.S. Attorneys. It is a true victory that the committee leadership included reauthorization of the landmark Violence Against Women Act in this bill. It is essential that Congress stands strong and protects victims of domestic violence and other crimes against women. The bill's new

\$15 million a year grant program will help colleges and universities prevent dating violence, sexual assault and stalking on campuses.

Mr. Chairman, as this bill moves to conference, I want to highlight two provisions that was included in the original text of H.R. 3402 at my request. Section 321 will close loopholes that have allowed those impersonating police officers to evade conviction, while section 253 reauthorizes the Community Oriented Policing Services grant program, and makes it easier for local police departments to apply for and win grants by consolidating it into a single grant program. Whereas cities used to submit different application for hiring, and one for overtime and one for technology and one for training—this language allows them to only have to submit one application.

Section 321, language inserted in the original bill at my request and based upon the Badge Security Enhancement Act of 2003, amends criminal prohibitions on the use of a false badge to close loopholes used by many to evade prosecution and conviction. No longer will criminals be able to claim that they badges the use to impersonate police officers are just souvenirs or collectors items. Instead, my language amends the criminal code so that the only acceptable defense for possessing a counterfeit police badge is for use in a dramatic production or for a legitimate law enforcement purpose. There are countless website where one can purchase a very convincing NYPD police badge and then use it to commit a crime. It is common sense that we close these loopholes in order to protect the public and our law enforcement personnel. Also, language offered by Mrs. SLAUGHTER expands the criminal ban on counterfeit police badges to also include the misuse of uniforms, identification, and all other insignia of all public officials, but maintains my language that limits acceptable defenses in the case of counterfeit badges.

Mr. Chairman, I consider reauthorization of the COPS program to be a singular triumph of this bill. By reauthorizing the program at \$1.05 billion a year for 4 years, we are providing a valuable resource to local law enforcement as they fight crime and protect the homeland from terrorist threats. Throughout its history, the COPS program has put more than 118,000 cops on the beat in more than 12,000 communities, and added 7,407 officers to the force in New York City. This is the ultimate democratic program, with a small "d," as it benefits small towns and big cities alike throughout our country. The reauthorization amount in the bill will pay for an estimated 13,000 new cops on the beat nationally each year, and 3,640 NYFD officers over the length of this authorization.

The reauthorization will also allow Federal funds for the first time to flow to hiring officers to perform intelligence, anti-terror and homeland security duties. These are federal responsibilities and this language will help special terrorism units throughout the country, such as those at the NYFD and the LAPD.

I have also worked with Mr. ROTHMAN to ensure that \$30 million a year of the COPS reauthorization goes to the Secure our Schools Program to make grants for school security, including installing metal detectors, personnel and student training, and coordination with local law enforcement.

Authorities across the country agree that COPS works. A GAG report issued this summer that found a 13 percent drop in violent

crime because of COPS. Former Attorney General Ashcroft once said of COPS in June 2003 that, "Let me just say that I think the COPS program has been successful. The purpose of the COPS program was to demonstrate to local police departments that if you put additional people, feet on the street, that crime could be affected and that people would be safer and more secure. We believe that the COPS program demonstrated that conclusively."

I would like to thank advocates both in this House and in the law enforcement community who have stood with me and fought for COPS reauthorization. The COPS program is endorsed by the Fraternal Order of Police, International Association of Chiefs of Police, International Brotherhood of Police Officers, National Association of Police Organizations, National Sheriffs' Association, U.S. Conference of Mayors. The PROTECTION Act, offered to reauthorize COPS for 6 years in 2004 had 224 cosponsors. I would like to thank Ms. LINDA SÁNCHEZ and Mr. KELLER for their support, and commend our committee's leaders, Mr. CONYERS and Chairman SENSENBRENNER for agreeing to include COPS reauthorization in this very important piece of legislation.

In particular, I would like to thank both the Democratic and Republican staff of the Judiciary Committee, both of whom worked tirelessly on this piece of legislation, and who deserve the entire House's thanks. I would like to extend my gratitude to Sampak Garg, Perry Apelbaum and Ted Kalo of Mr. CONYERS' staff and Beth Sokul, Katy Crooks, Sean McLaughlin and Michael Volkov of Mr. SENSENBRENNER's staff, who all worked with me on these important provisions in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) that is a part of today's Department of Justice Authorization Act. Enacted in 1994, this law provides access to programs and services for many victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. Since VAWA was first passed, domestic violence has decreased by almost 50 percent and incidents of rape have decreased by 60 percent. More than one million women have used the judicial system to obtain domestic violence protective orders.

During my time as a former King County Prosecutor I saw how VAWA successfully helped many people. The criminal justice system was improved by training police and prosecutors to respond more effectively to incidences of domestic violence or sexual assaults. The Act also provided legal aid so victims may seek justice to their crimes. It provided the tools in order to protect the victims and provide them with the services they need to escape this horrible situation.

But there is still more work to be done. Each year, 960,000 incidents of violence are reported in which the offender has acted against a current or former spouse, boyfriend or girlfriend. It is unacceptable that women are still being abused. It is unacceptable that high school students are sexually harassed. It is unacceptable that these victims face the fear and embarrassment of telling others about their situation.

Unfortunately, some victims are faced with the situation where their abuser is a law enforcement officer. I recognize that law enforcement officers are faced with many complex situations and a great deal of work-related

stress. I recognize that law enforcement officers are faced with complex situations on a day to day basis while trying to make our communities safer. However, these situations can push many to their limits and cause hardships in their jobs and personal lives.

I would like to bring to your attention the case of Crystal Judson. On April 26, 2003, Tacoma Police Chief David Brame shot his wife, Crystal Judson Brame, before he killed himself in a parking lot in Gig Harbor, a community near my district. Their two young children, ages 8 and 5, sat nearby in their father's car. Crystal had been the victim of abuse for many years prior to this incident, but she was unable to obtain help for herself and her children in part because she lacked the tools and resources she needed.

Unfortunately, there was no policy in place for the City of Tacoma or the Tacoma Police to address this issue.

In response to this incident, the Washington State Legislature passed a law in 2004 establishing standards for law enforcement agencies within the state to prevent and punish future incidents of domestic violence committed by law enforcement officers. I am pleased to see law enforcement agencies taking this matter seriously and implementing policies that help them address these situations.

I am disappointed that I—along with several of my colleagues from Washington State—were not able to offer two amendments that sought to address this issue. The first amendment would have simply clarified that Services, Training, Officers, and Prosecution (STOP) program grants were available to law enforcement agencies to develop policies to address law enforcement officer domestic abuse. STOP grants promotes a coordinated, multidisciplinary approach to improving the criminal justice system's response to violent crimes against women by encouraging the development and strengthening of effective law enforcement and prosecution strategies to address violent crimes against women and the development and strengthening of victim services in cases involving violent crimes against women.

The second amendment would initiate a study conducted by the Department of Justice to investigate the incidence of domestic violence involving law enforcement officers. Little research has been done on this specific issue in over a decade. A study conducted by the Justice Department could provide policymakers with critical facts and information as we seek to undertake a federal effort to address the issue. While I am pleased that Chairman SENSENBRENNER agreed to conduct a GAO Report on law enforcement-officer-involved domestic violence, I hope this study will be conducted in a speedy manner to ensure other victims like Crystal Brame are not left without a voice.

I am committed to working with my colleagues to ensure ample funding for VAWA and STOP grants. I look forward to supporting the Chairman in his request and look forward to the results so we can do more to assist victims of domestic abuse.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the provisions contained in the Justice Department authorization bill that relate to the Violence Against Women Act. It is fitting that we are considering this measure today, as yesterday this body passed H. Con. Res. 209, which will designate Octo-

ber as National Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

The Violence Against Women Act was first authorized in 1994. Since that time, the rate of family violence has dropped from 5.4 to 2.1 victims per 1,000 U.S. residents over the age of 12. These provisions expand upon the many successes of the Violence Against Women Act since its inception. They will enhance the civil and criminal response to violence against women, will improve services and outreach to victims, and will provide additional resources for sexual assault victims through rape crisis centers and State coalitions.

I am also pleased that provisions in this Act will address the needs of victims from communities of color, and which aid immigrant and tribal victims have been strengthened. However, I am concerned that the manager's amendment will strike the phrase "ethnic and racial" from several sections in the bill, which will have the effect of specific racial and ethnic communities not having their specific concerns addressed.

This amendment should be rejected, thereby helping to ensure that racial and ethnic minority women will have their safety needs met through culturally-appropriate services.

By leaving the language as it stands, the Violence Against Women Act will ensure that racial and ethnic minority women will have their safety needs met through culturally appropriate services.

Rejecting the amendment also will ensure that culturally specific, community-based organizations will have the opportunity to access Federal funds that address domestic violence, sexual violence and other social ills.

Two years ago, I was pleased to support a Federal earmark for Communities Against Domestic Violence, a worthwhile organization in Northern Virginia which provides public awareness and education programs designed to discourage domestic violence in the Hispanic, Vietnamese and Korean communities.

Finally, I would like to pay tribute to my constituents from the local offices on Women in the city of Alexandria and Fairfax County, Arlington County's Domestic Violence Services and Violence Intervention Program and the numerous non-profit organizations which work to address domestic violence issues and break this devastating and destructive cycle of violence.

I urge all my colleagues to oppose the manager's amendment, and to support the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. Particularly, I am a strong supporter of the section renewing the Violence Against Women Act, and a new program I've worked on, the Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistance Program, to better enforce protective orders. Today, together, we are making a big leap forward in protecting women who are victims.

For many years domestic violence has been viewed as a woman's problem, but that is not the case. Domestic violence is a woman's problem, a man's problem, the community's problem. The time is long overdue for men to take a stand and say that domestic violence is unacceptable.

On June 27, in *Castle Rock v. Gonzales*, the Supreme Court held that the police did not have a mandatory duty to make an arrest under a court-issued protective order to protect a woman from a violent husband. The ruling ended a lawsuit by a Colorado woman

who claimed the police did not do enough to prevent her violent husband from killing their 3 young daughters. The ruling said Jessica Gonzales did not have a constitutional right to police enforcement of the protective court order against her husband.

The heartbreaking details of this case show the desperate need for legislation. That's why I have drafted the Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistance Program, which will restore some of the effectiveness of protective orders.

The Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistance Program would place special victim assistants in local law enforcement agencies to serve as liaisons between the agencies and victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking in order to improve the enforcement of protection orders.

I support the underlying bill and the renewal of the Violence Against Women Act.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3402, a measure that reauthorizes most Justice Department programs through FY 2009, with some extended through FY 2010. I support this measure because it provides crucial funding for Justice Department programs. The bill authorizes \$95 billion through FY 2010, including \$5.8 billion for the FBI in FY 2006, and \$5 billion for Federal prisons.

I am especially glad to see that this bill reauthorizes programs funded under the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) which is designed to combat crimes often targeted toward women, such as stalking, domestic violence, and sexual assault. During the past decade, VAWA of 1994 and 2000 have provided tremendous protections and support for victims of domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault. VAWA funding has provided law enforcement agencies, the judicial system, rape crisis centers, and domestic violence shelters with the expertise and services they need to do the work of prevention and protection of those affected by violence. The reauthorization of VAWA will allow us to continue to fund crucial and successful programs and expand on 10 years of progress to further provide safety and stability for survivors of gender-based violence.

I am disappointed that late last night, Judiciary Majority staff submitted a manager's amendment which strikes "racial and ethnic minorities" from the definition of underserved populations in the STOP grants section of VAWA. STOP grants are the heart of VAWA funding. Without this language, domestic violence prevention and treatment services specifically targeting women of color and immigrant victims of domestic violence will continue to be shortchanged. This language change is a major flaw in the Manager's Amendment and I oppose the amendment.

H.R. 3402 also merges the Byrne Grant Program and the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program, and renames it the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program. It authorizes \$1.1 billion for this program in FY 2006 and such sums as are necessary for fiscal years 2007 through 2009. Finally, the bill re-organizes the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program by consolidating all the different grant programs into a single block grant program. The bill authorizes \$1 billion in each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009 for this important crime fighting program.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very good bill overall and I am glad to see Republicans working

with Democrats on such an important measure.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of several important programs that will be reauthorized in H.R. 3402, The Department of Justice Authorization Act. The two programs that I'd like to highlight are the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program and the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP). Both COPS and SCAAP provide critical resources that help local law enforcement do their job.

The COPS program consists of Federal grants to provide assistance to eligible police departments to help improve community policing efforts and law enforcement support activities including: hiring or rehiring police officers, purchasing equipment; paying overtime; and building support systems.

The COPS program has long had bipartisan support in Congress, even in the face of repeated proposed budget cuts from this Administration. Despite these budget proposals Congress worked in a bipartisan way to appropriate funding for the COPS program and ensure that our local law enforcement agencies continued to receive these valuable grants. I hope that the formal reauthorization of the COPS program through H.R. 3402 clarifies the Congressional recognition of the significance of the COPS programs to local law enforcement, and the importance of the COPS program now and in the future.

The SCAAP reimburses states and localities for the cost of detaining criminal aliens. These funds are critical for local law enforcement agencies; especially those in border states like California, that routinely cover the cost of incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens. Between FY2001 and FY2005, SCAAP funding decreased by \$265 million. This is unacceptable and places a significant burden on cash-strapped States that desperately need reimbursement.

I supported the Kolbe/Dreier/Lewis amendment to increase the authorized funding for SCAAP to \$750 million for FY06, \$850 million for FY07, and \$950 million for FY08–11. I am pleased that this amendment was accepted as it will provide much needed funds to the states and improve their ability to work with the Federal government on border security and immigration issues.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, for 10 years, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) has strengthened communities and provided critical, life-saving support to victims of violence. VAWA has meant that no victim of violence has to suffer in silence. This legislation has been a tremendous success in addressing an appalling problem: since VAWA was enacted in 1994, states have passed more than 660 laws to combat domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking. The National Domestic Violence Hotline has answered more than 1 million calls. VAWA has strengthened communities across the country and saved countless lives. But we can and must do more.

Women should feel safe whether in public or private: In their workplace, in their homes, and walking on the street. Yet many women continue to live in fear. One in three American women report being physically or sexually abused by a partner at some point in their lives, and more than three women are murdered by their husbands or boyfriends in this

country every day. We cannot tolerate the violence, abuse, and sexual assault that pervade our communities. As a nation, we must fight this epidemic in every way possible.

Today, the House reauthorized VAWA, making dramatic improvements to the existing law by establishing new rape crisis centers and increasing grants for community organizations that work to prevent and eliminate domestic violence. The reauthorization of VAWA is a critical step and a national commitment to keep future generations of women and children safe.

Unfortunately, the spirit of VAWA came under attack today by the House Republicans. Judiciary Committee Chairman SENSENBRENNER offered an amendment that eliminated carefully crafted provisions of the bipartisan bill that recognized that racial and ethnic minorities face unique challenges in reporting and getting help for domestic violence, sexual assault, trafficking and stalking. With this change, domestic violence prevention and treatment services specifically targeting women of color and immigrant victims of domestic violence and sexual assault will continue to be shortchanged.

VAWA is one of the crowning achievements of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues and a truly bipartisan success. I urge the Senate to reject the Sensenbrenner amendment and return the bill to its original, bipartisan version.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3402) to authorize appropriations for the Department of Justice for fiscal years 2006 through 2009, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1604

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER) at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.