

The aptly named Debbie Smith Act was originally signed into law in 2004 to provide State and local crime labs the resources they need to end the backlog of untested DNA evidence from unsolved crimes through additional funding and increased capacity. Under this law, Congress has provided more than \$1 billion since then in vital funding to forensic labs for analyzing crime scene DNA evidence, uploading the results into the CODIS database, which is what happens to the test after it is completed, and identifying violent fugitives and taking these violent criminals off the street.

Not only does this sort of testing provide relief for victims like Debbie and justice for their attackers, but the evidence is also effective in assisting investigations for other crimes. This is important because violent offenders will often commit many different types of crimes in many different jurisdictions. For example, if a criminal commits a burglary in one State, DNA evidence from that burglary case can be used later to connect this offender to an unsolved rape case in another State.

The States, thankfully, are following suit. Texas, I am proud to say, has led the Nation in passing mandatory rape kit testing laws, conducting audits of the backlog, and using Debbie Smith funds to analyze untested sexual assault evidence. I am proud to report that over the last 7 years we have reduced our statewide rape kit backlog from more than 20,000 to just over 2,000. This is an astounding achievement, and thankfully it is being replicated all across the Nation because of this important legislation and because of the courage of one woman, Debbie Smith.

By ensuring the Debbie Smith Act funds can be used to analyze evidence from all types of crime scenes, we can help forensic labs address their systemic backlogs and holistically target the cycle of violence. The Debbie Smith Act of 2019 will reauthorize the Debbie Smith Act program to continue the testing of DNA evidence from unsolved crimes nationwide, including rape kits. It will also reauthorize DNA training and education for law enforcement, correctional personnel, and court officers, as well as forensic nurses who take this DNA evidence during these rape kit collections to make sure that all of them are prepared to gather the evidence and to test it. Since 2005, Debbie Smith Act funding has led to the creation of 43 percent of all forensic CODIS profiles. Again, this is the FBI database, where the rape kit information can be entered to see if it matches previously entered DNA profiles.

Let me say that again. Since 2005, Debbie Smith Act funding has led to the creation of 43 percent of all forensic CODIS profiles as well as 20 percent of all offender samples in CODIS.

In total, Debbie Smith DNA grants are responsible for 45 percent of all matches made in CODIS, which is truly remarkable. Reauthorizing this legisla-

tion once again is a top priority for me as we work to continue chipping away at the nationwide rape kit backlog and provide these victims with the answers and relief they need.

Over the years, I have had the pleasure of meeting and working with Debbie several times, and we have been fortunate to have her share her perspective before the Judiciary Committee on multiple occasions.

I have also worked with two other inspiring victims from Texas—Lavinia Masters and Carol Bart, who, like Debbie, had the courage to come forward and talk about a very difficult event in their lives, but to use their pain as a way to help others. Lavinia and Carol have also lent their voices in advocating for reforms to reduce the rape kit backlog.

I am grateful to these and countless other survivors who bravely share their stories and ideas as we work together to eliminate the backlog once and for all. I hope the Debbie Smith Act of 2019 will soon be reported out of the Judiciary Committee and will quickly make its way to the Senate floor, pass in Congress, and make its way to the President for his signature without delay.

H.R. 1585

Mr. President, on another matter, earlier this week the House passed a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. Our Democratic colleagues keep saying how important it is to quickly pass this legislation to restore funding to VAWA as it is known, but I think it is important to back up for a moment and remember why that funding lapsed in the first place.

Earlier this year our Democratic colleagues allowed VAWA to get caught in the crosshairs of our funding debates, and they insisted we should not fund this vital program because it was overdue for updates. Their argument was this: We want to reform or update VAWA, so we are going to let funding for it lapse. It just didn't make any sense at all.

It is no secret that folks on the other side of the aisle think it is time we made some changes to the program. It is something I support, but we don't need to let the funding lapse in order to do it.

This is an issue that our friend and colleague Senator ERNST continues to champion here in the Senate. But the approach taken by our Democratic colleagues to get those changes is a head-scratcher, to say the least.

There were, as I see it, two options on how to solve the problem. One was to provide an extension for the previous funding to the end of the fiscal year. That would have allowed us to work on the long-term reauthorization under the regular processes in the Senate, which, in my experience, is always the preferred action to take.

The second option our Democratic colleagues chose was to do nothing and let this important legislation expire

without a plan to replace it. For whatever reason, that was the option that Democrats in the House chose.

In the nearly 2 months since, we have tried to negotiate a short-term extension to fund these vital programs. As recently as last week, our Democratic colleagues had a chance to support the restoration of funding while our negotiations continued.

The supplemental appropriations bill introduced by Senator SHELBY would have funded the Violence Against Women Act through the end of the fiscal year—again, giving us time to negotiate changes in the law that Democrats obviously want. But our Democratic colleagues simply refuse to support even a procedural vote that would have allowed us to get on the bill and debate it and then amend it. It seems increasingly clear to me that rather than providing the funding for victims of sexual assault and other violence, rather than finding solutions, what is happening here is that politics is creeping in and rearing its ugly head.

It is clear to me that this isn't about finding a solution; this is about political game playing. Now, rather than going through regular order to create a long-term reauthorization that includes feedback from both sides, House Democrats are trying to jam a one-sided piece of legislation through the House and then through the Senate. I think this is very shameful.

Our Democratic colleagues first refused to fund the Violence Against Women Act. They allowed it to expire, and now they are using victims of violence as leverage to push through their rushed, one-sided piece of legislation. Throwing a temper tantrum and holding the Violence Against Women's Act hostage until you get what you want is not a responsible way to legislate.

I would encourage our colleagues across the aisle to put politics aside for just a moment and work with us to pass a short-term extension for VAWA while we use the regular order to discuss long-term solutions.

There is a good way and a bad way to do this, and, unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues have chosen the bad way, but we would ask them to reconsider and work with us—not for us, but for the victims of domestic violence who are suffering as a result of their game playing.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Stanton nomination?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 70 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Peters	Whitehouse
Harris	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Booker Klobuchar

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Abizaid nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John P. Abizaid, of Nevada, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Abizaid nomination?

Mr. RISCH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 71 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Alexander	Fischer	Peters
Baldwin	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Reed
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Bennet	Hassan	Roberts
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Brown	Inhofe	Schatz
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	King	Sinema
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	McConnell	Tillis
Cramer	McSally	Toomey
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cruz	Moran	Warner
Daines	Murphy	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murray	Wicker
Durbin	Paul	Wyden
Enzi	Perdue	Young
Ernst		
Feinstein		

NAYS—7

Gillibrand	Merkley	Warren
Harris	Sanders	
Markey	Udall	

NOT VOTING—1

Booker

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Holly A. Brady, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Deb Fischer, David Perdue, Todd Young, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Holly A. Brady, of Indiana, to be

United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 72 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Sinema
Crapo	Manchin	Sullivan
Cruz	McConnell	Thune
Daines	McSally	Tillis
Enzi	Moran	Toomey
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Smith
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	
Harris	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—1

Booker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, and the nays are 43.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Holly A. Brady, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today marks the 30th anniversary of a very important law—the Whistleblower Protection Act. It is very important because people in government ought to listen to whistleblowers. They are very patriotic people.

The law is a critical foundation for the whistleblower protections we have in place today. The Whistleblower Protection Act has helped to usher in a