

Madam Speaker, very briefly, the last three speakers, including my good friend from Oklahoma, have mentioned the ongoing impeachment inquiry here in the House of Representatives, and they speak of it as being a lack of transparency. It is almost as if the Republicans are not in the hearings that are going on in this inquiry.

In my understanding, although I am not a member of either of the committees of jurisdiction, I have spoken with and have heard publicly the person who is the responsible person for ongoing matters at this time say that the other side is there. Their lawyers are asking questions. Members, if they choose, are asking questions.

So I don't understand what they are talking about about a lack of transparency, particularly when the previous impeachments that were done were done by special prosecutors. This is a solemn process.

And while I agree with my colleagues about the National Defense Authorization measure, the simple fact of the matter is that we also have a constitutional responsibility to ensure that the executive branch of this government functions in an appropriate manner and does not do as they are doing: failing to respond to the oversight responsibilities of the Article I House of Representatives.

I rather suspect that that is just talk when they say that there is no transparency. I suggest to them to stick around. They are going to see some transparency real soon.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to begin by thanking my very good friend from Florida for what we always get, which is always a thoughtful debate, always professional, always civil. And even when we disagree, I always enjoy the exchange, so I thank my friend for that.

I will disagree vehemently, though, that the process in terms of impeachment that we are going through right now is remotely transparent. The American people can't get in there. And, frankly, I can tell you, Members, under the rules of the Intelligence Committee, all of us, as long as it is not classified, are supposed to be able to get transcripts. We haven't been able to get those things. So we will watch as this unfolds.

But my friends would have been far better to do what has been done in previous impeachments; that is, to hold a formal vote, to set up a process.

I do remind my friend, when we went through this during the Clinton years, the President, President Clinton, had the right to have counsel there, the right to cross-examine witnesses, the right to subpoena witnesses. Our friends who were then in the minority had the right to subpoena witnesses.

None of that exists now. There is no process. It is very one-sided, very opaque, very obscure, and extremely partisan.

But back to the legislation at hand.

The tragedy here is that we could work together on a variety of things that we both agree would make good law. My good friend, the ranking—excuse me—the chairwoman on the House Administration Committee, Ms. LOfGREN, mentioned that last night.

There are actually elements in this bill which, I agree with my friend, are things we could work on together. There are other things that, whether we are right or wrong, my friend knows we will disagree with and we will not accept and, frankly, the United States Senate will not accept and the President will not accept.

So it is a classic legislative dilemma: What do you want to do? Do you want to make a point or do you want to make law?

If you want to make law, you get to the things that you agree on and that can pass the other Chamber and be signed by the President. So far in this area of election security, I think my friends have been more interested in making a point than actually in making law.

So I urge opposition to the rule on H.R. 4617 because it is deeply flawed and a partisan bill that will not solve the underlying problems. It will not prevent foreign interference in our elections. It will only make it harder for Americans to participate in their own democracy.

It applies inappropriate regulatory schemes to online advertisement. It applies overly inclusive definitions that could make almost any advertisement a political advertisement and expands the power of the Attorney General at the expense of the States.

My friends seemed, over and over, to want to federalize State elections. We don't want to do that. That is a big mistake. One of the best securities we have is that we have multiple jurisdictions, and the people close to the people make the laws under which our elections occur.

We can work together in a bipartisan manner and find real solutions to real problems, and I hope and I believe some day we will, Madam Speaker. But in the interim, I urge the House to reject both this rule and this bill so that we can actually advance, together, on something that can pass and become law.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, "no" on the rule, and "no" on the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I do agree with my good friend from Oklahoma that our exchanges are civil; and although we have respectable disagreement, the simple fact of the matter is that each of us discharges our responsibilities in a responsible way.

Madam Speaker, after exiting the Constitutional Convention in 1787, Ben-

jamin Franklin, when approached, was asked what form of government had been agreed upon; his response: "A Republic, if you can keep it."

We come here today to keep it, to not only keep it, but make more perfect that Union which we have all taken an oath to protect, not just for us and our children, but for generations unborn, so that they may know and benefit from the greatest experiment ever known to humankind, the democratic Republic we call the United States of America.

To do this, to protect our democracy from enemies foreign and domestic, we must put country over party. Indeed, there have been more than a few times in our history when it was imperative that the partisan give way to the patriotic. This is undoubtedly one of those times and one of those paramount issues.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and a "yes" vote on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 650

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution, the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, and Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence shall suspend pursuing matters referred to by the Speaker in her announcement of September 24, 2019, until such time as the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 and the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2020 are signed into law.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHRIER). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

DEBBIE SMITH REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 777) to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 777

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 40701) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “including” and inserting “prioritizing, to the extent practicable consistent with public safety considerations”; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking “including” and inserting “in particular,”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) provide assurances that the DNA section of the laboratory to be used to conduct DNA analyses has a written policy that prioritizes the analysis of, to the extent practicable consistent with public safety considerations, samples from homicides and sexual assaults.”;

(3) in subsection (c)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “2014 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “2014 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”; and

(4) in subsection (j), by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

SEC. 3. TRAINING AND EDUCATION.

Section 303(b) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40722(b)) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

SEC. 4. SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAM GRANTS.

Section 304(d) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40723(d)) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2019 through 2024”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 777, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019.

The Debbie Smith Act, named for a courageous woman who has fought for

the rights of survivors of sexual assault, is critical to helping States process DNA evidence and reduce the Nation’s large backlog of untested DNA samples.

The law, which I helped author and enact in its original form in 2004, was developed in response to a crisis of untested DNA samples, a problem that we have helped to reduce but which, unfortunately, still requires our urgent attention today.

Over the past several decades, evidence from DNA samples has helped us solve an increasing number of criminal cases and has been particularly valuable in identifying the perpetrators of the horrible and all-too-common crime of sexual assault.

The use of DNA evidence kits in sexual assault cases is critical, and it is imperative that the evidence that is collected is analyzed as soon as possible. When the evidence is collected and processed, the DNA profile is added to the Combined DNA Index System so that matches against other DNA profiles can be sought, increasing the scope of the database.

By testing the DNA evidence left at the scene of a rape or sexual assault, we can increase the likelihood of identifying the perpetrators, making it more likely that they will be captured, punished, and prevented from doing it again. This, in turn, allows victims to obtain some measure of justice and society to take violent criminals off the streets. DNA evidence also allows us, definitively, to exonerate the falsely accused.

Over time, however, crime labs across the country, regrettably, developed a large backlog of DNA samples that they had not tested, an intolerable situation calling out for Federal action.

In response, in 2000, I cosponsored the passage of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act, which provided \$40 million to help States analyze DNA evidence; and in 2002, I introduced the Rape Kit DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act. This legislation authorized funding to help police departments finance the testing of rape kits to reduce the backlog. Working with my colleagues and with advocates, we maintained the pressure to address this problem.

Then, in 2004, I was the original cosponsor of the Justice for All Act, introduced by our colleague JIM SENSENBRENNER. That bill included many of the provisions of my 2002 bill.

Title II of that bill, named the Debbie Smith Act by Congresswoman MALONEY, authorized substantial funding for DNA testing and strengthened the ability of State and local law enforcement specifically to test rape kits. We subsequently reauthorized the Debbie Smith Act in 2008 and again in 2014.

In recent years, the grants we have reauthorized under the Debbie Smith Act have supported the work of crime labs to build capacity and process DNA

evidence, including evidence collected in rape kits, with greater percentages of funding allocated to testing these kits provided in subsequent amendments.

□ 1315

The act also supports audits of evidence awaiting analysis at law enforcement agencies and charges the Department of Justice with the task of maintaining national testing guidelines.

Despite these efforts, the rape kit backlog continues to be a major concern, with a large volume of kits still untested in this country, harming the survivors of sexual assault and jeopardizing public safety. Therefore, we must continue the valuable programs authorized by this important law.

That is why we included the reauthorization of this program in the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA reauthorization bill, developed by the Judiciary Committee and passed by the House earlier this year. Unfortunately, VAWA is languishing in the Senate.

While we take steps to separately pass the reauthorization of the Debbie Smith program today, I again call on the Senate to fulfill their responsibility to pass the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization without needless additional delay. Therefore, I support H.R. 777.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I was actually on the Arizona task force to look into Arizona’s backlog on these rape kits, and so it is something that I am very passionate about doing. I am pleased that after months of inaction and after the authorization for the program had already expired, my colleagues in the majority have finally brought a Debbie Smith reauthorization bill to the House floor.

Unfortunately, I think it is the wrong one.

Senator CORNYN’s bill, S. 820, passed the Senate in May by unanimous consent. It has been sitting here in the House waiting to be acted upon for more than 5 months. But my colleagues have been too busy chasing impeachment conspiracies to notice or care. I offered an amendment right here at this desk previously on the floor to move forward the Debbie Smith Act, but the Democrats voted it down at that time. The program expired at the end of September without so much as a glance from my fellow Democratic colleagues. Finally, House Republicans had to file a discharge petition to force consideration of this important legislation.

Let me repeat that, Madam Speaker. Democrats were too busy on their crusade against the duly-elected President to engage in their efforts to nullify the will and vote of the American people to take up and pass a bipartisan bill to help rape survivors and victims and law enforcement.

Even today, all we are doing is ensuring there will be more delay in the reauthorization of this vital program. That is because rather than pass the bipartisan bill the Senate passed 5 months ago, the majority is bringing an alternative bill to the floor.

In the ultimate act of hubris and partisanship, the majority is insisting that this body pass a bill with an H.R. number instead of the Senate bill that has sat idle here for 5 months.

What would happen if we passed the Senate bill? It would go immediately 16 blocks down Pennsylvania Avenue and be signed by the President today. Instead, unfortunately, the majority is engaging, I believe, in a game of political brinksmanship and holding their authorization of these precious grant dollars hostage, grant dollars that provide closure and solace to countless survivors of rape and the family members of victims of rape.

The majority's actions are putting an unnecessary delay in getting this program reauthorized. And for what reason? I can't think of a single good reason. Perhaps someone on the other side of the aisle can provide one. Is that what they want? They want the credit for the bill, a House bill instead of a Senate bill?

As Debbie Smith herself was recently quoted, "Don't punish the victims." Not acting on the Senate bill is doing just that.

Madam Speaker, I will support this bill today. I believe these programs and the survivors they serve are too critical to be the subject of partisan games. I am disappointed, however, that my colleagues do not feel the same way, otherwise they would put forward the Senate bill. I expect and hope we will be back on this floor in the very near future to pass a bill to actually authorize this vital program.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I remind my colleagues that the reauthorization of this bill has been sitting in the VAWA reauthorization bill passed by this House many months ago, it has been sitting in the Senate since then.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman from the great State of New York for yielding and for his outstanding leadership on the Judiciary Committee.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 777, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act, as amended. I was pleased to introduce this bill with my colleague and good friend ANN WAGNER of Missouri.

I first passed this bill in 2004. This critical State backlog grant program provides funding for forensic labs and local law enforcement to process DNA evidence, including rape kits.

In 2001, I invited a woman named Debbie Smith to testify before the Oversight and Government Reform

Committee. Debbie was a rape survivor, and I remember being struck by her story of waiting more than 6 years for her rape kit to be processed. And Debbie's story is not unique.

Across this country, DNA evidence collected at crime scenes sits in a backlog, because forensic labs have limited capacity or resources to process it in a timely manner.

So I wrote and passed the Debbie Smith Act, which at the time was called the most important antirape legislation ever signed into law.

The results of the grant program speak for themselves. The National Institute of Justice reports that since 2005 Debbie Smith funding is responsible for 192,000, or about 42 percent, of DNA matches in the FBI database.

So when it can match and convict a rapist, it prevents future rapes. The FBI says rapists will attack roughly seven times, so if you catch that person and put them in jail, you protect other women from being hurt.

And as improved technology enables collection of DNA evidence, demand for grant funding has dramatically increased. We need this funding. This funding keeps rapists and other criminals off the street, and perhaps more importantly, the program can deliver some measure of justice to survivors of violence.

Unfortunately, this Debbie Smith Act authorization expired on September 30. And the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act passed by this House that included an extension of the Debbie Smith program has not been passed in the Senate.

I truly want to thank not only Chairman NADLER, but also Speaker PELOSI, Leader HOYER, the entire Democratic Caucus for recognizing the importance of this grant program and moving H.R. 777 forward.

Despite its lapse in authorization, we have an opportunity to make sure that this successful program continues to help solve and prevent violent rape and protect survivors.

The Debbie Smith Act has always enjoyed broad bipartisan support, and I hope we continue that tradition today. I urge all of my colleagues to support the reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act. It protects women from sexual violence. It is important.

And, again, I thank all of my colleagues that have supported this legislation in the past, particularly ANN WAGNER, who has championed fighting sex trafficking and protecting women in other areas.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, the chairman said he wanted to remind me and others that the Debbie Smith Act was included in the VAWA Act that was passed out of the House. You didn't have to remind me. Unfortunately, as he knows and others know, the VAWA Act was loaded with liberal poison pills knowing that Republicans wouldn't vote for it, and it was a political act.

And so, to me, it was a political act to also include it in the VAWA bill,

knowing the VAWA bill was so controversial and it wouldn't be heard in the Senate. So, in fact, never in the history of the Violence Against Women Act has the Debbie Smith Act been included in that bill. And, in fact, I have been told that Debbie Smith herself did not want it included in the Violence Against Women Act, because she knew it was controversial.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, Debbie Smith's courage to share her story with the world has changed the lives of millions, and the law bearing her name has helped countless victims of sexual assault see their attackers face the justice they deserve.

The importance of DNA evidence in criminal investigations and prosecutions is unquestionable. Since this program was first enacted, incredible progress has been made to reduce DNA backlogs. In my home State of Virginia, the FBI's National DNA Index contains more than 447,000 offender profiles and has aided in more than 11,000 criminal investigations.

This legislation will reauthorize this vital program and will continue to support State and local law enforcement agencies' efforts to reduce DNA backlogs and analyze DNA evidence collected from crimes.

As a former prosecutor, I know all too well how critical DNA evidence is to achieving justice for victims of sexual violence. I have been a strong advocate to reauthorize this program. I signed the discharge petition and spoke on this bill last month.

With passage of this bill today, we move a step closer to protecting people from violent sexual predators and allow justice to be served through our legal system.

It would have been better if we had taken up the Senate bill instead of pointing fingers and casting blame, but I hope that we will pass legislation quickly to get this grant money to the States and to those agencies that need it to make sure that justice is served.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding, and I express my appreciation to the manager of our friends on the other side of the aisle, my colleague from Arizona, and my colleague on the Judiciary Committee.

Let me say, first of all, to CAROLYN MALONEY, if we go down memory lane, we have been together on this issue from the very start. We know when you had Debbie Smith come when she was willing to speak at a time that, I would say, was most concerning in the early stages of this. She was willing to come to the United States Congress and to share her story.

And, Congresswoman MALONEY, let me thank you for crafting the legislation, working with any number of bipartisan cosponsors, some of whom are no longer in the United States Congress, but I remember as a member of the Judiciary Committee being very closely aligned and supporting this bill. And so we have made great strides. And the over 140,000 cases that have been solved is a testament to the great need of this legislation. There is no doubt.

And, of course, as we know from 2004—that is 15 years ago—that at that time, and continuing to a certain extent, the enormity of the backlog. Those of us who interact with law enforcement and interact with our district attorneys, we know that that has been an atrocious Achilles heel in providing comfort and justice to those who have been violated.

I am reminded of the forensic lab that we had in Houston; we had to do a completely massive overhaul for the Harris County lab to ensure that we were in compliance or that we were going after the backlog. That is the word that we should be focused on, the “backlog.” Backlog means injustice or no justice.

And certainly, as I have heard stories—just as recently as last night, I was on the phone with a constituent with a story that was just overwhelming, and she was trying to craft her next direction.

And so this legislation is answering the pain of individuals who have come forward—and even those who are not able to identify a person immediately, and the DNA provides that opportunity—and it reauthorizes the bill. It ensures that grantee states and localities prioritize DNA analysis of crime scene samples, rape kits, other sexual assault evidence, and also carries cases without an identified suspect.

I am glad that this bill is on the floor. But let me be very clear, we wrote a Violence Against Women Act starting in 2017 that was a monumental tribute to this month, in fact, which is Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

□ 1330

We know that there are many around the Nation who have experienced and suffered this. In fact, there was a recent trial in Houston with a family that was killed in totality, except one member, because of domestic violence.

We need the Violence Against Women Act. And I might take an exception to the fact that this bill is a holistic bill. It is a law enforcement bill. It is a bill of improving services to victims of domestic violence and dating violence and sexual assault.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, we have some very unique aspects in that legislation. We have counseling

for men and boys, something very unique. I can't view that as controversial.

We, likewise, have extended the protection of the arm of justice to Native American women.

And, let me just speak to law enforcement, because I speak to them almost every weekend that I am at home: \$291 million; and the creativity of prosecutors, local prosecutors, and law enforcement is amazing with those dollars.

So I believe that we can do both. We can continue to affirm and complement the enormity of the work of CAROLYN MALONEY, the years of work that we have worked with her and attacked the backlog, which none of us ever want to hear or see. We want no backlog.

We hope that this bill moves in the Senate, but it is not accurate that this bill, the Violence Against Women Act—there are active supporters of this legislation in the Senate, and I am looking forward to what we do best, working in a bipartisan manner to pass the Debbie Smith DNA bill and pass, to give relief to victims of domestic violence and others, the Violence Against Women Act.

Madam Speaker, I ask Members to vote for Debbie Smith.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), my friend.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my friend, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 777, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act.

Along with my friend CAROLYN MALONEY, I introduced the Debbie Smith Act with the support of the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network, RAINN.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY for her untiring work to end and prevent sex trafficking and other forms of violence against women, which I also support, and for her willingness to reach across the aisle to get things done. She is a warrior for vulnerable women and children, and I am so proud to work with her on this important legislation.

Debbie Smith programs provide much-needed funding for crime labs to process DNA evidence and strengthen the national DNA database, which has over 17 million profiles in it. It provides justice to victims. Under Debbie Smith, Congress provides \$151 million, annually, to State and local labs for DNA and rape kit testing.

Better technology has improved our ability to test and track DNA samples from crime scenes, and this data is making a real difference in the efforts to bring rapists and other sexual predators of sexual violence to justice. The FBI DNA database has been used in more than—are you ready for this, Madam Speaker?—465,270 investigations.

One in five rape kits entered into the national database generates a DNA match pointing to a serial rapist.

Since the Debbie Smith program was created back in 2005, nearly 200,000 DNA matches have been made in criminal cases, providing justice to victims in cases that may have otherwise gone unsolved.

But law enforcement can't keep up. Untested DNA cases have increased by 85 percent since 2011. In my own home State of Missouri alone, more than 5,400 untested rape kits are sitting in labs and in storerooms. We need the Debbie Smith programs now more than ever.

This legislation authorizes \$151 million for Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant programs, \$4.5 million for grants to State and local governments for training programs, and \$30 million for State and local governments to create programs to collect and use DNA evidence related to sexual assault.

The Senate unanimously sent their version of this legislation over to the House in May, but the House leadership did not bring it to the floor, allowing it to expire on September 30.

Both Democrats and Republicans on the Judiciary Committee, along with Congresswoman MALONEY, have led the charge on this reauthorization. It saddens me that the Judiciary members had to file a discharge petition to get Speaker PELOSI to put this bill on the floor.

This is not about personal ownership or asserting the House's authority. This is about getting something signed into law.

I worry that the Senate version of this bill includes accountability and performance measures that are not in the House bill. If the Senate bill were being voted upon today, the President could sign it into law tomorrow.

Looking forward, I implore both parties, House and Senate, to ensure the Debbie Smith Reauthorization gets to the President's desk as soon as possible.

Madam Speaker, I thank Leader MCCARTHY, Ranking Member COLLINS, Chairman NADLER very, very much, and Congresswoman MALONEY most of all.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in reauthorizing these programs that convict dangerous predators and help victims to get the justice that they deserve.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), my friend.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, only in Congress can we fight about something that I think we all generally agree on.

The bill the House is considering today will reauthorize the Debbie Smith grant program. I strongly support reauthorization.

But this law has a 15-year history of nearly unanimous support in Congress under both Republican and Democratic majorities and Presidents, but more importantly, it has a 15-year history as a standalone bill.

So my question is: What changed? When did it become so essential to become a part of VAWA? And if it is essential to be a part of VAWA, then why did we pull it out, and why are we voting on it again as a standalone bill?

On May 16, the Senate continued the bipartisan tradition and they passed a standalone reauthorization. We sat on that bill for months in the House.

House Republicans—I know; I was part of it. I was on the floor arguing for it before the last break, before the September 30 authorization lapsed. We tried twice to get it voted on.

As stated by the founder of the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network, the House is using the Debbie Smith Act as leverage to get the Senate to pass other things that have nothing to do with DNA testing.

So, finally, today we brought the Debbie Smith Act to the floor, but even today, it is the wrong bill. The bill we are considering today has some serious flaws, but, more importantly, it is making changes to the Senate bill that nobody ever asked for.

Just like the Senate, it extends the program to 2024. However, for some reason, we have inexplicably omitted accountability provisions that Congress has required for these grant programs for nearly a decade.

These accountability measures are important. They include mandating a report on the effectiveness of the grant program to reduce the backlog of unanalyzed DNA evidence in sexual assault cases. They require recommendations to enhance the grant program, and they require the National Institute of Justice to define goals of the DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction program and develop performance measures for each one of these goals. All of these are worthy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from North Dakota an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, I can't think of an issue where accountability matters more than when we are collecting DNA evidence to get convictions of violent sexual offenders and to give some semblance of justice.

I am going to support the bill. I hope we get it back quickly. I hope we get to some resolution with the Senate. This needs to be done as quickly as possible.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 8½ minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, I am a little puzzled by what I am hearing on the floor today and, frankly, what I heard in committee this morning on a different bill.

The gist of that is, well, we passed a bill, but we know it is not exactly the way the Senate wants it; therefore, we

shouldn't pass it. We should only pass a bill exactly the way the Senate wants it; otherwise, it is only for show.

On this bill, look what happened. This reauthorization was included in the VAWA reauthorization, which we passed and sent to the Senate.

Ah, but that was political, we are told, because the Senate doesn't agree in every respect with the VAWA reauthorization we passed, so they won't touch it.

Well, I don't understand that. I always thought, from the time I was in third grade, that they should pass their own version of the VAWA bill. If it is different from ours, we go to conference.

But, no. No, we can't rely on them to do that. They have to have a bill that they agree with totally, or they won't look at the subject no matter how important.

Ah, but they introduced their own. They took it out of VAWA, and they did their own Debbie Smith bill.

Fine. We are doing a Debbie Smith bill because we don't agree exactly with what they did. They put in some new accountability provisions. We have always had accountability provisions in the bill, still there. It has always been the law. They are adding some new ones which we judge to be unduly burdensome on small providers. It is a judgment.

We should pass this bill. They have passed a different version of the bill. We can go to conference, iron it out. That is the way the process is supposed to work.

My Republican colleagues seem to think that we should never talk to the Senate; we should only pass a bill exactly the way they passed it. Or if they haven't passed it exactly the way we know they will want it and if we pass a bill differently, then it is just political posturing. That is nonsense.

This reauthorization bill is a good bill. It is the way we think it ought to be. If we pass it—they have already passed a different reauthorization bill. I regret that they didn't pass the entire VAWA reauthorization bill, but we can go to conference. We can iron it out.

If someone wants to argue that the provisions in that bill are better, let them offer it here, but not be heard to say we should only do exactly what the Senate wants. That doesn't make sense.

We are our own independent body. We were elected to do our job. This is the way we want to do it. This is the way we think the bill ought to be. We put it in the VAWA reauthorization bill. We have given up waiting for the Senate on that one.

They passed a Debbie Smith bill in a version we don't entirely approve of. We will pass our own version. We will get together. We will see if we can agree on it. That is the way the process ought to work.

If we pass this bill, that is the way the process will work, and we are more likely to get a reauthorization bill

than by standing here and saying: Don't pass this bill. Only pass a bill—which we won't do—exactly in a form that we don't like, exactly the way the Senate wanted it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I don't think that anybody said that we have to do exactly what the Senate asks all the time, but it does make sense that, if a Senate bill has been sitting here for 5 months and it extends it, what we are doing in the House bill, plus it has accountability measures, that it would get done sooner and it would get signed into law sooner, and then the States and the local law enforcement would have the money sooner to get rid of the backlog of the rape kits. That is all we are saying.

So I don't understand the reason we are just not doing that bill, except maybe that they want an H.R. name, some House Member's name on it instead of a Senate Member's name on it. That is all I can think of.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), my friend.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 777, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank our colleagues, CAROLYN MALONEY and DEBBIE LESKO and others, for their leadership on this important legislation to reauthorize the DNA Backlog Elimination grant program for another 5 years.

Madam Speaker, there are over 400,000 victims of sexual assault in this country each and every year. That equates to approximately one sexual assault per minute.

Debbie Smith was one of those victims; and although she underwent forensic examination, her kit went unanalyzed for over 5 years. The purpose of this legislation is to ensure that no other victim ever has to wait that long for justice again.

DNA analysis is an invaluable tool in identifying and convicting criminal suspects. The increased use of DNA evidence in criminal prosecutions has led to an increase in the collection and processing of DNA kits, which has led to a substantial backlog in the processing of DNA evidence, really, all across the country.

□ 1345

Fortunately, last year, after a 7-year effort, my home State of Ohio was able to clear its backlog of nearly 14,000 of these kits, but many other States haven't been so successful. In March, the GAO estimated that the number of backlog requests for crime scene evidence nearly doubled to nearly 170,000. Unfortunately, at the end of September, the funding authorization for this program expired.

While the legislation offered by Congresswoman MALONEY is an important

step in the right direction, this body really should have already considered the Senate-passed reauthorization so as to get it to the President's desk.

Continued funding will ensure that law enforcement nationwide will have the resources they need to process DNA evidence, prosecute, and punish those who commit these heinous acts of violence.

Again, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY and Congresswoman LESKO for their leadership on this, and I urge its passage.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I will support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. While this is not the most expeditious manner to get this vital program reauthorized, it is the one that our Democratic majority has put before us.

I am not in the habit of holding rape victims and survivors hostage to play political games, and it really deeply saddens me that it appears that our majority may be doing this.

We had the opportunity to pass the Senate bill, and it has been sitting here for 5 months. We had the opportunity to show rape victims and survivors that we care about their plight. We had the opportunity to send the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019 to the President's desk today. Instead, our majority has decided to squander these opportunities.

It was bad enough that the Democratic majority allowed this authorization to elapse last month. It is even worse that we are placing this reauthorization into the realm of uncertainty.

There is no timetable or guarantee that the Senate will act on this bill. The one thing we know is that if we were voting on the Senate bill, it would pass today. It could have been signed by the President immediately. Unfortunately, we are now only marginally better off than we were this morning with regards to this reauthorization.

In the rush to impeach our President, our majority appears to have forgotten what we were sent here to do. Despite the petty motives sometimes of our majority, I will vote for the bill before us today and show support for the victims and survivors of rape. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, it is critical that we do all that we can to prevent sexual assault and that we ensure survivors receive the essential services they need, which is why we passed the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act earlier this year.

And I would remind my colleagues that the VAWA Act, which included the authorization for the Debbie Smith

Reauthorization Act, expired last September 30, 2018, when the Republicans had the majority in the House, the majority in the Senate, and the President. So the fact that it lapsed was unfortunate, but it was also the responsibility of the Republican Party, which then had control of the Senate, the House, and the Presidency to get its continuation, which they neglected to do.

We continue to urge the Senate to do the right thing and pass the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, which includes the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act.

And we will also, again, today pass provisions to reauthorize the Debbie Smith Act by advancing this bill today. In doing so, we reaffirm our commitment to this important program.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support this bill, and to continue to fight to support the more comprehensive measures in the Violence Against Women Act.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of both the Judiciary Committee and a co-sponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 777, the "Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019," which reauthorizes the Debbie Smith Act and the Debbie Smith Backlog Grant program for an additional five years, through FY 2024.

These grant programs to address DNA backlogs and provide DNA training and technical assistance on local, state, and federal levels.

It is essential that these programs be reauthorized so that the backlog of unprocessed rape kits can be reduced and then eliminated, and perpetrators of sexual assault crimes can be prosecuted and convicted.

There is an ever-present need to continue robust funding for programs such as the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program in order to make sure victims do not fall through the cracks of the system.

Women who have been raped have a right to expect police to thoroughly investigate the case and prosecute the offenders; however, many rape kits across the country are never even tested, and the perpetrators never face justice.

Under the Debbie Smith Act, not less than 40 percent of the total amount awarded in grants must be used for DNA analyses of samples from crime scenes, rape kits and other sexual assault evidence, and in cases that do not have an identified suspect.

Madam Speaker, the number of backlogged DNA samples was in excess of 100,000 nationwide as recently as January 2014.

H.R. 777 reauthorizes for five years (until the end of fiscal year 2024) the following programs:

1. "Debbie Smith Reauthorization" grants for state and local DNA crime laboratories to address DNA backlogs and enhance their capacity.

2. DNA training and technical directed to law enforcement, courts, forensic scientists, and corrections.

3. DNA training and technical assistance directed to sexual assault nurse examiner/("SANE") programs.

In my congressional district, these grant programs have resulted in forensic laboratories being hired to clear much of the Houston Police Department's backlog of untested DNA benefit from this type of legislation.

Just within the past year, decades-old rape kits that sat untested in Houston have identified at least one-third of potential offenders in cases where there was sufficient DNA, according to the Houston Police Department.

In my district more than 6,600 rape kits have been cleared because of the funding made possible by the grant programs that H.R. 777 will reauthorize.

This record of success highlights the importance and continuing need to provide adequate funding so law enforcement agencies can conduct necessary DNA testing and training.

Madam Speaker, when enacted in 2004, the Debbie Smith Act was the first piece of legislation aimed at ending the backlog of untested rape kits and other unanalyzed DNA evidence.

Debbie Smith grants have played a critical role in states across the country.

The importance of the Debbie Smith Act is highlighted by the fact that delays in processing DNA evidence can result in delays apprehending or prosecuting violent or serial offenders or it can result in wrongfully convicted individuals serving time in prison for crimes they did not commit.

Law enforcement has increasingly recognized that the backlog of DNA evidence awaiting entry in state databases can prevent law enforcement officials from solving many heinous crimes—which has made the Debbie Smith Act recognized as such a crucial program.

Madam Speaker, the DNA Initiative is an invaluable tool for law enforcement today, and it will continue to be a legislative priority of mine. That is why I am pleased to co-sponsor H.R. 777 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting to approve this critically important legislation.

Why We Also Need the Enactment of the Entire Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act

Although the country needs the provisions of the Debbie Smith Act, survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault need and deserve more.

The Senate must pass the full VAWA Reauthorization, which includes:

- Improving services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

- Giving law enforcement enhanced tools to combat domestic violence and sexual assault;

- Making vital new investments in prevention;

- Helping to better protect Native American women;

- Preserving and improving housing protections for survivors;

- Strengthening the health care system's response to domestic violence and sexual assault.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 777, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 650; and

Adoption of House Resolution 650, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4617, STOPPING HARM- FUL INTERFERENCE IN ELEC- TIONS FOR A LASTING DEMOC- RACY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 650) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4617) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 180, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

YEAS—223

Adams	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Aguilar	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Allred	Chu, Judy	DeBene
Axne	Cicilline	Delgado
Barragán	Cisneros	Demings
Bass	Clark (MA)	DeSaulnier
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Deutch
Bera	Clay	Dingell
Beyer	Cleaver	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Doyle, Michael
Blumenauer	Cohen	F.
Blunt Rochester	Connolly	Engel
Bonamici	Cooper	Escobar
Boyle, Brendan	Correa	Españillat
F.	Costa	Finkenauer
Brindisi	Courtney	Fletcher
Brown (MD)	Cox (CA)	Foster
Brownley (CA)	Craig	Frankel
Bustos	Crist	Gallego
Butterfield	Crow	Garamendi
Carbajal	Cuellar	Garcia (IL)
Cárdenas	Cunningham	Garcia (TX)
Carson (IN)	Davids (KS)	Golden
Cartwright	Davis (CA)	Gomez
Case	Dean	Gonzalez (TX)
Casten (IL)	DeFazio	Gottheimer

Green, Al (TX)	Lynch	Sarbanes	Scalise	Stewart	Weber (TX)
Grijalva	Malinowski	Scanlon	Schweikert	Taylor	Webster (FL)
Haaland	Maloney,	Schakowsky	Scott, Austin	Thornberry	Wenstrup
Harder (CA)	Carolyn B.	Schiff	Sensenbrenner	Tipton	Westerman
Hastings	Maloney, Sean	Schneider	Shimkus	Turner	Williams
Hayes	Matsui	Schrader	Simpson	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Heck	McAdams	Schrier	Smith (MO)	Wagner	Wittman
Higgins (NY)	McBath	Scott (VA)	Smith (NE)	Walberg	Womack
Hill (CA)	McCollum	Scott, David	Smith (NJ)	Walden	Woodall
Himes	McGovern	Serrano	Spano	Walker	Wright
Horn, Kendra S.	McNerney	Sewell (AL)	Stauber	Walorski	Yoho
Horsford	Meeks	Shalala	Stefanik	Waltz	Young
Houlihan	Meng	Sherman	Steube	Watkins	Zeldin
Hoyer	Moore	Sherrill			
Huffman	Moulton	Sires			
Jackson Lee	Mucarsel-Powell	Slotkin			
Jayapal	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)			
Jeffries	Nadler	Soto			
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Spanberger			
Johnson (TX)	Neal	Speier			
Kaptur	Neguse	Stanton			
Keating	Norcross	Stevens			
Kelly (IL)	O'Halleran	Suozzi			
Kennedy	Ocasio-Cortez	Swalwell (CA)			
Khanna	Omar	Thompson (CA)			
Kildee	Pallone	Thompson (MS)			
Kilmer	Panetta	Titus			
Kim	Pappas	Tlaib			
Kind	Pascarell	Tonko			
Kirkpatrick	Payne	Torres (CA)			
Krishnamoorthi	Perlmutter	Torres Small			
Kuster (NH)	Peterson	(NM)			
Lamb	Phillips	Trahan			
Langevin	Pingree	Trone			
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Underwood			
Larson (CT)	Porter	Van Drew			
Lawrence	Pressley	Vargas			
Lawson (FL)	Price (NC)	Veasey			
Lee (CA)	Quigley	Vela			
Lee (NV)	Raskin	Velázquez			
Levin (CA)	Rice (NY)	Visclosky			
Levin (MI)	Richmond	Wasserman			
Lewis	Rose (NY)	Schultz			
Lieu, Ted	Rouda	Waters			
Lipinski	Roybal-Allard	Watson Coleman			
Loebach	Ruiz	Welch			
Lofgren	Ruppersberger	Wexton			
Lowenthal	Rush	Wild			
Lujan	Ryan	Wilson (FL)			
Luria	Sanchez	Yarmuth			

NAYS—180

Abraham	Fitzpatrick	LaHood
Aderholt	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Allen	Flores	Lamborn
Amash	Fortenberry	Latta
Armstrong	Fox (NC)	Lesko
Arrington	Fulcher	Long
Babin	Gaetz	Loudermilk
Bacon	Gallagher	Lucas
Baird	Gianforte	Luetkemeyer
Balderson	Gibbs	Marchant
Banks	Gohmert	Marshall
Barr	Gonzalez (OH)	Massie
Biggs	Gooden	Mast
Bishop (UT)	Gosar	McCarthy
Bost	Granger	McCaul
Brady	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Brooks (AL)	Graves (LA)	McHenry
Brooks (IN)	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Buchanan	Green (TN)	Meadows
Buck	Griffith	Miller
Bucshon	Guest	Mitchell
Budd	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Burchett	Hagedorn	Mooney (WV)
Burgess	Harris	Mullin
Byrne	Hartzler	Murphy (NC)
Calvert	Hern, Kevin	Newhouse
Carter (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Norman
Carter (TX)	Hice (GA)	Nunes
Chabot	Higgins (LA)	Olson
Cheney	Hill (AR)	Palazzo
Cline	Holding	Palmer
Cloud	Hollingsworth	Pence
Cole	Hudson	Perry
Comer	Huizenga	Posey
Conaway	Hunter	Ratcliffe
Cook	Hurd (TX)	Reed
Crawford	Johnson (LA)	Rice (SC)
Crenshaw	Johnson (OH)	Riggleman
Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Roby
Davidson (OH)	Jordan	Rodgers (WA)
Davis, Rodney	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)
DesJarlais	Katko	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Rooney (FL)
Duncan	King (IA)	Rose, John W.
Dunn	King (NY)	Rouzer
Emmer	Kinzing	Roy
Ferguson	Kustoff (TN)	Rutherford

Amodei	Gabbard	Reschenthaler
Bergman	Grothman	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Bishop (NC)	Keller	Steil
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Stivers
Davis, Danny K.	Lowey	Takano
Eshoo	McEachin	Thompson (PA)
Estes	Meuser	Timmons
Evans	Morelle	
Fudge	Peters	

NOT VOTING—28

□ 1419

Messrs. LUCAS and GUEST changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. HECK and Ms. WILD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 579.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 180, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

YEAS—226

Adams	Cooper	Golden
Aguilar	Correa	Gomez
Allred	Costa	Gonzalez (TX)
Axne	Courtney	Gottheimer
Barragán	Cox (CA)	Green, Al (TX)
Bass	Craig	Grijalva
Beatty	Crist	Haaland
Bera	Crow	Harder (CA)
Beyer	Cuellar	Hastings
Bishop (GA)	Cunningham	Hayes
Blumenauer	Davids (KS)	Heck
Blunt Rochester	Davis (CA)	Higgins (NY)
Bonamici	Davis, Danny K.	Hill (CA)
Boyle, Brendan	Dean	Himes
F.	DeFazio	Horn, Kendra S.
Brindisi	DeGette	Horsford
Brown (MD)	DeLauro	Houlihan
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Hoyer
Bustos	Delgado	Huffman
Butterfield	Demings	Jackson Lee
Carbajal	DeSaulnier	Jayapal
Cárdenas	Deutch	Jeffries
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Doggett	Johnson (TX)
Case	Doyle, Michael	Kaptur
Casten (IL)	F.	Keating
Castor (FL)	Engel	Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX)	Escobar	Kennedy
Chu, Judy	Españillat	Khanna
Cicilline	Evans	Kildee
Cisneros	Finkenauer	Kilmer
Clark (MA)	Fletcher	Kim
Clarke (NY)	Foster	Kind
Clay	Frankel	Kirkpatrick
Cleaver	Gallego	Krishnamoorthi
Clyburn	Garamendi	Kuster (NH)
Cohen	Garcia (IL)	Lamb
Connolly	Garcia (TX)	Langevin