

processed, and 360,000 DNA profiles have been uploaded into the FBI's database. This accounts for 43 percent of all forensic profiles in the FBI's DNA database. The benefits of this law cannot be overstated. That is why the Debbie Smith Act was easily reauthorized in both 2008 and 2014.

Now it is time once again to reauthorize this important legislation. Earlier this year, Senator FEINSTEIN and I introduced the Debbie Smith Act of 2019, which reauthorizes the important funding that supports the testing of this DNA evidence. Things like training for law enforcement, correctional officers, training for forensic nurses and other professionals who assist victims of sexual assault are also included in this bill. When the Senate voted in May, not a single Senator voted against it—not one. It was unanimous. But here we are nearly 2 months later and the House of Representatives hasn't lifted a finger.

The bill isn't partisan. It is not divisive. It is not controversial. So why do they refuse to bring the bill up for a vote? Well, they are not holding this bill up because they are working on a different version or because they disagree with any of the provisions or because they simply don't like it. No, they are actually holding it hostage to try to force a vote on their ultrapartisan version of the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA, the second piece of legislation they are stopping. Actually, Democrats allowed the current Violence Against Women Act to expire over Republican objections so that they could maintain this leverage to pass their ultrapartisan version of VAWA sometime later.

Folks on both sides of the aisle can agree it is time to make some important improvements in VAWA, and our colleague Senator ERNST from Iowa has been working very hard to try to come up with a good bipartisan bill. It deserves to be reauthorized and strengthened to ensure victims have access to the services and protections they need.

Going through the regular order is something I support, and it is an effort that has been led by, as I said, Senator ERNST from Iowa. But the version of the bill that has passed in the House is a far cry from any kind of consensus legislation. It includes provisions that would never pass in the Senate, and that is why it passed the House, in order to create that conflict and that obstacle.

It is not fair to Debbie Smith and other victims of sexual assault for House Democrats to hold them hostage over a separate bill that is still being negotiated in good faith by Members on both sides of the aisle.

Despite repeated requests from advocates and victims' rights groups to pass the Debbie Smith Act freestanding, the House has, once again, chosen to play politics.

I understand Debbie has requested to meet with leadership in the House, and I strongly encourage them to take the

time to talk to Debbie and hear her perspective on why this legislation is so critical and why it must be passed now. House Democrats refuse to pass the Debbie Smith Act and help crime labs eliminate the rape kit backlog. They refuse to negotiate in good faith on VAWA, Violence Against Women Act, reauthorization and what that might look like. Unfortunately, they have succumbed to the temptation of playing partisan politics with pretty important legislation and hurting a lot of innocent people in the meantime. I find that absolutely unacceptable.

I would urge our colleague Speaker PELOSI to bring the Debbie Smith Act up for a vote and quit using sexual assault victims as a bargaining chip.

I yield the floor.

#### NOMINATION OF T. KENT WETHERELL II

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I proudly support the confirmation of Judge T. Kent Wetherell II to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida today. He earned his undergraduate and juris doctor degrees from the Florida State University and has committed himself to public service for the past 20 years. He has served as deputy solicitor general in the Office of the Florida Attorney General; an administrative law judge in Florida's division of administrative hearings; and, for the past decade, as an appellate judge on Florida's First District Court of Appeal. Judge Wetherell will continue to serve our State and Nation well, and I am proud to support his confirmation to the Federal bench.

#### VOTE ON WETHERELL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). All time has expired.

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

Mr. CORNYN. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 195 Ex.]

#### YEAS—78

Alexander	Ernst	Murray
Barraso	Feinstein	Paul
Bennet	Fischer	Perdue
Blackburn	Gardner	Peters
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Reed
Braun	Hassan	Risch
Brown	Hawley	Roberts
Burr	Hoeben	Romney
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Capito	Inhofe	Rounds
Cardin	Isakson	Rubio
Carper	Johnson	Sasse
Casey	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shaheen
Coons	King	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sinema
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Tester
Cramer	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Udall
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker

#### NAYS—15

Baldwin	Markey	Smith
Blumenthal	Menendez	Stabenow
Harris	Merkley	Van Hollen
Hirono	Schatz	Warren
Klobuchar	Schumer	Wyden

#### NOT VOTING—7

Booker	Heinrich	Young
Duckworth	Sanders	
Gillibrand	Warner	

The nomination was confirmed.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Nicholas Ranjan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. JOHNSON. 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 senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 196 Ex.]

YEAS—80

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

NAYS—14

Bennet	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Blumenthal	Markey	Udall
Cantwell	Merkley	Warren
Harris	Murray	Wyden
Hirono	Smith	

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Gillibrand	Sanders
Duckworth	Heinrich	Young

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The bill clerk read the nomination of Damon Ray Leichty, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

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

Mr. WICKER. 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 clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 197 Ex.]

YEAS—85

Alexander	Cantwell	Cotton
Baldwin	Capito	Cramer
Barrasso	Cardin	Crapo
Bennet	Carper	Cruz
Blackburn	Casey	Daines
Blunt	Cassidy	Enzi
Boozman	Collins	Ernst
Braun	Coons	Feinstein
Brown	Cornyn	Fischer
Burr	Cortez Masto	Gardner

Graham	McSally	Scott (FL)
Grassley	Menendez	Scott (SC)
Hassan	Merkley	Shaheen
Hawley	Moran	Shelby
Hirono	Murkowski	Sinema
Hoeven	Murphy	Sullivan
Hyde-Smith	Paul	Tester
Inhofe	Perdue	Thune
Isakson	Peters	Tillis
Johnson	Portman	Toomey
Jones	Reed	Udall
Kaine	Risch	Van Hollen
Kennedy	Roberts	Warner
King	Romney	Whitehouse
Lankford	Rosen	Wicker
Leahy	Rounds	Wyden
Lee	Rubio	Young
Manchin	Sasse	
McConnell	Schumer	

NAYS—10

Blumenthal	Markey	Stabenow
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Harris	Schatz	
Klobuchar	Smith	

NOT VOTING—5

Booker	Gillibrand	Sanders
Duckworth	Heinrich	

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of the King nomination.

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

The clerk will report the nomination. The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from 3 p.m. to 4 p.m. today.

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

The Senator from Wyoming.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor because Democrats out on the campaign trail continue to spin their one-size-fits-all healthcare plan that they call Medicare for All. The name itself is misleading. I will state that as a doctor who has practiced medicine in Wyoming for 24 years.

Even many Democrats in the first Presidential debate sounded confused about their own proposal. The candidates were asked a simple question. They were asked to raise their hands if they supported eliminating private health insurance. That is the health insurance people get from work. "Just four arms went up over the two nights," but "five candidates who kept their hands at their sides," the New York Times has now reported, "have signed onto bills in [this] Congress that

do exactly that"—take health insurance away from people who get it from work.

On one point, though, they all raised their hands. That was on the question that was asked of all 10 Democrats in round 2 of the debate. They all endorsed taxpayer-funded healthcare for illegal immigrants. Every hand went up.

It seems Democrats have actually been hiding their real, radical agenda. "Most Americans don't realize how dramatically Medicare-for-all would restructure the nation's health care system." That is not just me talking; that is according to the latest Kaiser Family Foundation poll. We need to set the record straight, and I am ready to do that right now.

The fact is, Democrats have taken a hard left turn, and they want to take away your health insurance if you get it from work. The proposal abolishes private health insurance, the insurance people get from work. In its place, they would have one expensive, new government-run system. Still, Democrats know most of us would rather keep our own coverage that we get from work. Even the people on Medicare Advantage—20 million people—would lose it under the Democrats' proposal. The Kaiser poll confirms Americans' top concern is, of course, lowering their costs or, as the Washington Post "Health" column put it, people simply want "to pay less for their own health care."

That is what we are committed to on this side of the aisle.

Many Democrats running for President continue to promote and support this radical scheme by Senator SANDERS. The Sanders legislation would take away healthcare insurance from 180 million people who get their insurance through work, through their jobs. In addition, 20 million people who buy their insurance would lose coverage as well.

You also need to know that the Democrats' proposal ends the current government healthcare programs. Medicare for seniors would be gone. Federal employees' health insurance would be gone. TRICARE for the military would be gone, and the children's health coverage also would be gone under this Democratic healthcare, one-size-fits-all plan. That is confirmed by the Congressional Research Service.

The Congressional Research Service recently sent me a formal legal opinion. I requested it from them. It is a formal, legal opinion, stating: Medicare for All "would . . . largely displace these existing federally funded health programs" that I just mentioned—Medicare, Federal employees' health insurance, TRICARE, children's health coverage. It would largely displace these existing Federal health programs as well as private health insurance, the insurance people get from work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the