

The members of the President's Cabinet; The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

**JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED**

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved. Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m. ), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1226

**AFTER RECESS**

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York) at 12 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.

**COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, April 3, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 3, 2019, at 12:00 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1839.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

**PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS**

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1585, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019**

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 281 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 281

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant

to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-9 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 281, providing for consideration of H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Re-

authorization Act of 2019, under a structured rule.

The rule self-executes a manager's amendment that makes technical changes to reflect appropriate statute sections, corrects terminologies, and makes in order 40 amendments.

Mr. Speaker, this year, we are celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, a landmark piece of bipartisan legislation that has helped to reduce instances of domestic violence and ensure that millions of survivors have access to the services they need.

VAWA was the first piece of Federal legislation to acknowledge domestic violence and sexual assault as crimes and has dramatically improved our Nation's response to helping survivors in both the short and long term.

Since its enactment in 1994, VAWA has brought together law enforcement, social service organizations, and victims' advocates to bring domestic violence to light, provide survivors with support, and hold abusers accountable for their actions.

VAWA was and still is a piece of legislation developed by the people who work closest to these issues in their communities. The bipartisan bill we will vote on this week reflects the ongoing commitment of Members on both sides of the aisle to ending domestic violence and abuse in all forms.

Before I get further into the components and details of the bill, I would like to share two stories about my constituents to illustrate why VAWA reauthorization is so necessary and why we must continue to commit ourselves to preventing domestic violence at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, please keep in mind that each of these stories happened in the past week in my district.

First, last week, a young woman was murdered by her ex-husband at a convenience store, where the two were meeting to exchange custody of their 6-year-old son. The ex-husband left their son at home and, instead, brought an AR-15 style rifle, which he used to murder the woman in the middle of the store.

He was caught by law enforcement after he fled the store, but as a result of these horrific actions, a young woman was murdered in cold blood and a child has, effectively, lost both parents.

This was not the first time the ex-husband had threatened to kill his ex-wife during a child custody exchange just like the one this past week. Following an incident 3 years ago, he was charged with harassment and making terroristic threats, and the woman was granted a protection-from-abuse order.

But this didn't prevent her or her family from living in fear of what her ex-husband might do next. Tragically, the very worst happened.

Then, just this past Sunday evening, another woman was asleep in her home in Upland with her three children when, just after midnight, her ex-boyfriend broke into her house, entered

her bedroom, and shot her. Her 5-year-old child witnessed the shooting. Had the gun not jammed when the ex-boyfriend fired a second time, the victim would be dead.

This victim, too, had a protection-from-abuse order against her attacker, hers being issued just 5 days before that attack.

These two attacks happened just miles apart from each other, just a few days apart. These stories are all too common, because violence against women is all too common.

I am willing to bet that every Member of this body could point to similar examples of violence against women from their own congressional districts. Such acts of violence are not isolated incidents but are, instead, representative of the larger systemic problem.

According to the National Center on Domestic Violence, one in four women experiences severe intimate partner physical violence, intimate partner sexual violence, or intimate partner stalking, with impacts such as injury, fearfulness, post-traumatic stress disorder, and more.

The same organization found that one in three women has experienced some form of physical violence by an intimate partner, and one in seven women has been stalked by an intimate partner during their lifetime, to the point they felt very fearful or believed that they or someone close to them would be harmed or killed.

Intimate partner violence accounts for 15 percent of violent crimes nationwide. Women between the ages of 18 and 24 are the most commonly abused by an intimate partner.

It is absolutely no wonder why domestic victimization is correlated with a higher rate of depression and suicidal behavior later in life.

Further, 19 percent of domestic violence involves a weapon of some kind. The presence of a gun in a domestic violence situation increases the risk of homicide by 500—that is 500—percent. You don't need to be a mathematician in order to see that guns in the hands of domestic abusers routinely leads to violence and death.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act recognizes this indisputable fact and takes active measures to correct and improve our laws.

In the United States, women are 21 times more likely to be killed with a gun than women in any other high-income country.

Mr. Speaker, 4½ million American women alive today have been threatened by intimate partners with firearms. One million of those have actually been shot or shot at by their abusers.

I have represented some of these women and have seen the fear that they live with and the impact it has on their children and families.

This bill finally closes the boyfriend loophole. While Federal law prevents gun possession by people convicted of, or under a restraining order for, abus-

ing their spouses, dating partners are generally exempt from these restrictions.

This gaping hole in our gun safety laws has become even more deadly over the years. The share of homicides committed by dating partners has been increasing for three decades. Today, women are as likely to be killed by dating partners as they are by spouses.

Closing the boyfriend loophole is a fact-based, commonsense response to a very real threat.

The provisions in this reauthorization would protect women from abusive dating partners by ensuring that their abusers are prohibited from possessing guns under Federal law.

The definition of “dating partner” is already contained in the Violence Against Women Act. This simple update to policy will provide increased protections for partners in unmarried relationships.

Closing the boyfriend loophole has been a bipartisan issue since long before this bill. Last year, six Republicans cosponsored legislation that would have closed this loophole, and 23 States, in their own laws, have already acted to prevent abusers from obtaining guns, including Pennsylvania and Arizona.

It is time we update Federal law to reflect the reality, which our States have already recognized, and prevent violent dating partners from being able to access weapons.

This bill also closes the stalker loophole. Stalking has been shown to be a predictor of intimate partner violence and homicide, although current law does not prohibit misdemeanor stalking offenses.

A study of intimate partner homicides and attempted homicides involving female victims found that 76 percent of those murders and 85 percent of attempted murders were preceded by at least one incident of stalking before the attack.

Passing this bill will protect women from stalkers by ensuring those convicted of stalking offenses are prohibited from possessing guns under Federal law.

On top of limiting stalkers and abusive dating partners from legally owning weapons, this bill strengthens enforcement by alerting State and local law enforcement when an abuser fails a firearms background check. This notice gives State law enforcement an opportunity to intervene before an abuser can obtain a firearm or do any further harm.

This provision mirrors a bipartisan bill that was introduced earlier this year to notify State law enforcement each time a person who is not allowed to have guns tries to buy a firearm and fails the background check. Clearly, keeping guns out of the hands of those who should not have them is a bipartisan priority.

Mr. Speaker, one of my first experiences as a young attorney was representing women and families who had

sought shelter at the People's Emergency Center in West Philadelphia. That agency was started by former Congressman Bob Edgar.

Most of the women in that shelter had been subjected to domestic abuse. This was before VAWA was the law of the land, but even then it was clear there were significant problems with how the system cared for abused women and punished their abusers.

When VAWA was enacted in 1994, it spoke to so many of the problems my then-clients were facing, issues with housing and employment, caring for young children, and fighting for custody in court.

What makes VAWA such a critical bill is not just the legal protections it puts in place to protect women but the structures it sets up to help women who have been abused.

This reauthorization bill builds upon those critical reforms from 25 years ago and updates them to address current needs.

The bill funds and improves screening for victimization and the perpetration of intimate partner and sexual violence across federally funded healthcare programs. The healthcare system is often one of the first places women go where unseen abuse can be detected. Empowering healthcare professionals to address such sensitive situations can help to avert abuse before it escalates or prevent it from happening in the first place.

The bill ensures that survivors of domestic abuse can maintain housing in the event of a breakup with their partner and further protects their privacy through strengthened confidentiality agreements with housing authorities. Similarly, the bill extends traditional housing grant opportunities to organizations that help underserved populations.

Victims of domestic abuse are often at risk of significant financial loss if they are unable to work and provide for their family as a result of abuse. This bill protects survivors from termination from employment due to disruption caused by domestic abuse and also addresses the impact of domestic abuse on a woman's credit rating.

We should also note that transgender people are disproportionately survivors of sexual assault and violence, and they deserve to access services consistent with their gender identity.

Domestic violence providers and law enforcement agree: Transgender women being in the same space as other women does not make either less safe. Laws that prohibit discrimination based on gender identity have been in place for years, including specifically for VAWA programs.

Minneapolis, for example, has had gender identity protections since 1975, and there is no credible evidence that the existence of these laws has contributed to violence against women. Instead, they simply keep transgender people safe.

Since 1994, VAWA has provided critical tools to survivors of domestic

abuse, law enforcement, and community organizations to prevent and address the impact of domestic violence. Using those tools to represent survivors of such abuse, I have seen both clients and constituents find safe havens, rebuild their lives, protect their families, and develop emotionally and financially productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to reauthorization of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Representative SCANLON for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am a survivor of domestic violence. I also serve on the advisory council of a domestic violence shelter in my district, and I am the co-chairwoman of the congressional Bipartisan Working Group to End Domestic Violence.

That is why having a strong Violence Against Women Act, commonly known as VAWA, that works for the American people is so very important to me.

Ending violence against women and protecting women and children should not be a partisan issue. However, we find ourselves debating a VAWA reauthorization act that is literally a Christmas tree of progressive, liberal policy objectives rather than an honest approach to reforming and updating such an important law for millions of women and children.

VAWA has lapsed, putting millions of women and children at risk, when it didn't need to. I, along with 194 other Republicans, voted to reauthorize VAWA through the end of the fiscal year on February 14, 2019.

I sponsored the Protecting Women Act, which would reauthorize VAWA until September 30, 2019. This would have allowed the program to stay in place while we worked in a truly bipartisan fashion to update and reauthorize this critical program.

VAWA has historically been a bipartisan bill with little controversy. However, this particular VAWA proposal moved through the Judiciary Committee without a single vote of support from any Republican.

Throughout this process, my friends across the aisle have talked a lot about bipartisanship, but I have seen little effort from my Democratic colleagues to engage in a process to pass a VAWA reauthorization bill that could garner wide-ranging bipartisan support. And believe me, I have tried.

I have reached out to my Democratic colleagues to set up meetings several times, to no avail.

□ 1245

H.R. 1585 is a treasure trove of liberal policy objectives that will put women, girls, and children at risk. This bill, as written, forces shelters and service providers, under the power of Federal law—shelters that may not even be equipped—to place males in the same sleeping and showering quarters as

women and children purely based on how that individual “identifies.”

These gaping holes in the law will put women and children at risk to predators, who may have experienced trauma from male predators themselves. Based on this bill, the shelter would be required to accept a biological male even if the shelter is not equipped to separate males and females, forcing vulnerable women who have been abused and maybe sexually assaulted to shower with and sleep next to males.

We hear constantly from the other side of the aisle that this is all conjecture, what I am saying is all conjecture and completely hypothetical, and that this just does not happen. However, we know this is not true, and I have stated this before in the Judiciary Committee and the Rules Committee.

Nine women in Fresno, California, are suing a shelter for being sexually harassed in a shelter by a biological male.

The Hope Center in Alaska is another example, where a woman was quoted as saying she would rather sleep in the woods than have to be in close quarters with a male and relive her trauma.

Further, this legislation requires—requires—prisons to place biological males who identify as women in women's prisons. We have seen how this played out in Britain, where a biological man who identified as a woman raped two females.

Those on the other side of the aisle have accused those of us who want to preserve sex-segregated spaces based on biology as discriminatory and demonizing transgender individuals. This is completely false.

Nothing in the amendments that I have offered would discriminate against anyone. Any shelter could still take anyone in, but I don't want government forcing the shelters to take someone in if they are not equipped to do so.

What we are pointing out are gaping holes in this legislative proposal and potential for predators to take advantage of the law. We must give those who are sheltering and serving women the tools to keep them safe.

H.R. 1585 also seeks to eliminate due process and infringe on Second Amendment rights. I agree that we need to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous criminals, but expanding laws to prohibit individuals from exercising their Second Amendment rights without them even being present to defend themselves, as is the case in *ex parte* orders of protection, is a dangerous precedent.

Further, H.R. 1585 includes provisions that would result in a permanent prohibition on owning or possessing firearms by anyone convicted on a misdemeanor. Permanently losing a fundamental civil right for a misdemeanor conviction is virtually unheard of. The bill uses the legitimate and serious issue of domestic violence as a way to limit legitimate gun rights.

When coupled with the bill's expansion of the definition of “domestic relationship” to include “former dating partners,” a subjective term that could be easily abused, the bill expands power to permanently remove someone's right to own firearms to an untenable degree.

This legislation also advances policies that could reduce criminal prosecutions by tying States' grant eligibility to policies that ensure that compelling victim testimony is discouraged.

Further, it permits the use of VAWA funds for new “alternative justice” models, under which funds could be granted to programs that force mediation between an abuser and the victim of the abuser.

Finally, H.R. 1585 rolls back protections for sex trafficking. The bill de-prioritizes the use of grant funding to protect victims of sex trafficking and would only allow this funding to go to grantees if their program is primarily focused on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

These are just a few of the hyperpartisan provisions that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have injected into this VAWA reauthorization. We all want to protect women and children, and VAWA has typically received wide-ranging bipartisan support; however, this legislation fails to do that.

We should be focusing on common-sense, bipartisan reforms to VAWA instead of on a bill that is a nonstarter in the U.S. Senate and a bill that will not be signed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This is not the first time that I have heard my colleagues misgender trans women as biological males, and I need to point something out. Beyond this term being outright offensive, it shows how disingenuous their concern for the safety of women is, and they are showing their hand.

The use of the term “biological male” is a dog whistle to transphobia that runs rampant in society and seems to be on the other side of the aisle. It is not rooted in concern for women but, rather, a manifestation of their disdain for the trans community.

Also, my constituents are not the Senate. My constituents are not Mr. MCCONNELL. My constituents want VAWA reauthorized, and we are going to do what we can to pass it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for yielding me the time.

I rise today in support of the Violence Against Women Act of 2019.

I want to thank the chair of the Judiciary Committee, and I want to commend the chair of the Subcommittee

on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security for her leadership and quick action to get this reauthorized in the 116th Congress.

I also want to thank the chair of the Rules Committee for his effort to bring this to the floor today and to have a strong debate.

The Violence Against Women Act is a success story. Since its groundbreaking passage in 1994, this bill has been an example of Congress working in a bipartisan way to address an intolerable problem, the problem of domestic violence. Today, we are here, over two decades later, making VAWA even better.

H.R. 1585 will improve services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. It assists young victims of violence, and it extends programs to address bullying. It also updates current programs relative to dating violence and children exposed to violent acts.

Of particular importance in the State of Maine, the bill will further protect Native American women by expanding the provisions written in 2013. H.R. 1585 will include Tribal jurisdiction over non-Indian predators of dating violence, stalking, and trafficking. At last, the Tribes of Maine and Alaska will have the same protections provided to Tribes nationwide.

According to the most recent data from the National Institute of Justice, four in five American Indian and Alaska Native women have experienced violence in their lifetime. But, according to the way the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act has been interpreted by some, Maine has been left out of the law. Unfortunately, this has resulted in Tribal victims of domestic violence in Maine or Alaska losing out on protections that have been extended to Tribal victims of every federally recognized Tribe in the country.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Maine an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. PINGREE. The benefits that other Tribes have seen from allowing Tribal jurisdiction over domestic violence cases include: increased public safety for all of those living on Tribal lands, increased community conversations about domestic violence, updates to Tribal criminal codes, and increased collaboration among Tribes and local and State governments—all of which have been elusive for the Tribes of Maine.

Today's bill will address this long overdue unfairness that has left Maine Tribes not only to be treated differently, but has also left them out of the benefits of the 2013 VAWA bill.

For every Member of this body, there are many reasons to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

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

Before I have my friend speak, I am going to address what Representative

SCANLON said, that calling a transgender woman a biological male, she said, is offensive and it shows my disdain for transgender individuals. That is absolutely false. I have no disdain. I am just merely stating fact.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), my good friend.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and the underlying legislation.

The Violence Against Women Act was originally enacted to strengthen law enforcement's ability to help women suffering from domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and to bolster their efforts in preventing future violence. I fully support VAWA's original intent; however, this rule and the bill under consideration no longer focus on the women suffering from violence. Instead, H.R. 1585 has been politicized.

This bill was written to use women to overhaul several unrelated areas of law, such as unemployment benefits, housing requirements for nonwomen populations, and the Second Amendment.

In short, the original intent of this measure, to protect women from abuse, has been hijacked. Not only does this legislation lose focus on the matter at hand, which is women suffering from violence, it fails to prioritize a woman's right to privacy, to safety, and to healing from sexual violence.

Specifically, H.R. 1585 continues a misguided policy adopted under President Obama, forcing domestic violence survivors to share female-only shelters with men. Unfortunately, we have already seen litigation in women shelters caused by this type of problematic policy.

For example, as was mentioned by my friend from Arizona, the Naomi's House women's shelter in California is facing a lawsuit on behalf of nine women who were sexually harassed by a transgender individual. Staff at the shelter did not take any disciplinary action due to the fact that, as a Federal grantee, they are required to take in transgender men who identify as females.

The women suffering from sexual violence were not only subjected to additional sexual harassment, but were threatened to be removed from the shelter if they refused to share a shower and coexist with the transgender individual.

In a similar case in Alaska, the city of Anchorage is investigating the Downtown Hope Center, which is a faith-based, nonprofit organization. The reason? They are allegedly violating a local law because they provide shelter to only women.

Anchorage is trying to force the Hope Center to house transgender-identifying men alongside women in its overnight, shared-sleeping facility. However, part of the Hope Center's mission is to provide women suffering from rape, physical abuse, and violence a

safe place to sleep at night without the presence of men.

I would ask my colleagues: How does this policy advance our goal of helping women suffering from abuse when it denies them a safe place to heal? The answer is: It doesn't. These new housing provisions not only diminish the Violence Against Women Act, but also enable more violence against women.

While there are many other concerns with the VAWA language, I will mention just one more.

A 2018 Government Accountability Office report found that Planned Parenthood received nearly \$300,000 from VAWA formula grants during 2013 through 2015. This is extremely disheartening, considering there have been several undercover investigations and news stories suggesting that a number of Planned Parenthood affiliates have not been reporting when clients are victims of statutory rape, child prostitution, or sex trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, while I fully support increased protections for battered women, this bill is not the answer. It further victimizes women, and it uses them to advance other political causes. We need to send this bill back to all seven committees of jurisdiction to address these concerns so that a VAWA law can once again focus on alleviating suffering from violence.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the underlying legislation.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard this allegation over and over again based on one case in Fresno where the facts have not been established. It is still in litigation.

As a former trial lawyer, I know that a lot of allegations can be made, but the fact that what has been stated as facts in this case, that men were in a shelter, is not true. Transgender women were in the shelter.

It has been stated that a transgender man couldn't be excluded from the shelter and that the staff at the shelter failed to take action. That actually is under dispute.

So we have one isolated instance that is being misrepresented to continue this line of argument. What we are really seeing is this tactic of trying to pit one minority group, one group in need of services, against another to convince us that the rights and protections of one group come at the cost of another. They have done it with people of color, with immigrants, and now with women and members of the trans community.

Mr. Speaker, I have a clear message: this country is better than that. They both need help. It can be done under this law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

The world has changed, my friends, since our last reauthorization of VAWA. This bill updates VAWA to cover new victims of domestic violence that were not covered in our prior bill and desperately need protection.

In addition, the #MeToo movement has made women more determined concerning their rights than ever before.

Perhaps the most desperate need of victims of domestic violence is for sanctuary, shelter, emergency housing, and affordable housing, all in short supply.

Victims who stay with an abuser risk everything: homelessness, loss of custody of children, more abuse, and even injury and death.

Victims who remain with an abuser in 40 to 50 percent of cases also see their children abused.

Forty to as high as 70 percent of female homicide victims were murdered by their husbands or boyfriends in a relationship where there had been ongoing abuse.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the most serious issue confronting victims is no alternative place to live or even to shelter. One-third of survivors become homeless immediately after separating from partners.

Our bill bars the eviction of the victim until suitable housing or a termination of a lease without penalty can occur. Grants to help homeless victims achieve stability are necessary to prevent recurrent bouts of homelessness from domestic violence.

This reauthorization is desperately needed without delay. I strongly urge its passage.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I have one comment before I introduce my friend from Oklahoma.

It is said that there has only been one incident where a biological male threatened the women, and that is just simply not true. There have been several incidences. Quite frankly, the question is, how many women have to be put in a potentially unsafe situation or have their privacy violated by males before you realize that this concern is really legitimate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the rule, and to offer conditional support for the underlying legislation, H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

I oppose the rule simply because my friends didn't make in order quite a number of proposals that we had that we think ought to be debated on today, but in fairness, I want to thank Chairman MCGOVERN for making in order quite a few amendments that related particularly to VAWA in Indian Country, and I look forward to supporting those amendments.

I have always tried to consider legislation within its full context and look at the overall benefit of the bill, and I will certainly do the same with respect to VAWA.

Certainly there are provisions in this version of the reauthorization with which I profoundly disagree. Those are particularly related to the Second Amendment; this includes a misguided provision to strip someone of the right to possess a firearm following a misdemeanor conviction.

Frankly, I hope and expect that these provisions will change as the bill progresses through the legislative process.

To enact VAWA, to actually achieve the objective, my friends are going to have to do something they haven't done so far: that is actually compromise. They will have to compromise with a Republican Senate and a Republican President, or this important legislation will not come into law.

However, there are compelling things about this legislation, and I believe them particularly to be consistent with my own views and my own voting record on Tribal sovereignty and protection of native women, and I want to be supportive where I can be.

In 2013, Congress authorized the Tribal Court's jurisdiction over non-Indian offenders that are arrested for committing domestic violence or assault against women Tribal members on Indian lands.

The legislation we are considering today expands this jurisdiction to include not only women, but also Tribal children. Further, it extends critical protection to Tribal police officers.

There are several important amendments that will be debated related to Indian Country, and I urge the adoption of all of them.

I support the right of Tribes to enact their own definition of domestic and sexual violence, rather than replacing it with the Federal Government's definitions. States already have this flexibility; Tribes should as well.

In addition, I also believe Tribal law enforcement should have the authority to have access to the National Crime Information Systems.

Mr. Speaker, more than four out of five American Indian and Alaska Native women have experienced violence in their lifetime. More than half of the American Indian and Alaska Native women have experienced sexual violence in their lifetime. American Indian and Alaska Native women are almost twice as likely as White women to have experienced violence in the past year. Native women face murder rates more than ten times the national average in some parts of the country. They are also more than twice as likely to have experienced rape than non-Hispanic white women over the course of a lifetime.

Given these statistics of acts of violence, 96 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native women who are victims of sexual violence experience violence at the hands of non-native per-

petrators. To reiterate, nearly all the violence committed against native women is committed by non-natives.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the protection of all women and children is or should be treated as a partisan issue. Tribal governments, through trust and treaty obligations, should have the same authority as States to protect women and children in vulnerable situations. All States, Tribal, and local law enforcement authorities should have access to the use of the same tools to prevent these crimes on or off reservations.

As I have said before, hunters know where to hunt, fishermen know where to fish, and predators know where to prey.

The passage of a reformed Violence Against Women Act gives Tribes badly needed tools to combat the epidemic of violence and abuse in Indian Country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House of Representatives to work together in a bipartisan manner to create, in the end, a bill that can pass both chambers and be enacted into law.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of what I consider, and many consider, one of the most important pieces of legislation that protects the families of America, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, because no woman or man or child should ever be afraid to walk into their own home because of fear from violence from a spouse or a dating partner.

So today, I rise on behalf of one of my constituents named Olga, from Florida, who on her wedding day thought she was entering into a dream marriage for herself and her two children. But this marriage turned into a nightmare when her husband became aggressive, violent, and controlling, imprisoning Olga and her two children in their own home, not even letting the children go to school.

Olga fled to my hometown and was nurtured back to emotional and financial health by a local domestic violence organization in my community.

The Violence Against Women Act helps tackle the epidemic of domestic violence, stalking, dating violence, and sexual violence.

Since it was first passed in 1994, serious victimization by an intimate partner has dropped by 72 percent for women and 64 percent for men. However, it is estimated that as many as 45 million adults will still experience physical violence, rape, or stalking by an intimate partner sometime in their lives.

Reauthorizing and strengthening this legislation, expanding protections, increasing funding, and improving services to survivors will save lives across America and help protect women like

Olga and let her children be spared from horrific violence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this great bill.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

The Violence Against Women Act, originally enacted in 1994, was reauthorized twice with broad bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, today's bill has followed the same path as other bills this Congress. Democrats are more interested in playing politics and falsely painting Republicans as anti-women rather than passing legislation to actually protect women.

Sadly, despite years of work through local, State, and Federal efforts, domestic and sexual violence remain serious problems. I have heard from women and those working to help them about the challenges faced by women due to violence, but as Republican leader of the House Education and Labor Committee, I can tell you they have never asked for a GAO study on student loan repayment. Such a study is included in this bill. Another study about repayment options and the challenges of student debt will not help those women who are victims of violence.

If Democrats ever had a compelling argument, Americans would never know, since this bill was marked up in only one committee instead of the seven that have jurisdiction.

This bill also requires a study by the Secretaries of Labor and Health and Human Services on workplace responses to victims of violence against women. We are concerned this study is overbroad, and that the workplace is not the best avenue to address domestic violence, especially when those resources can be directed to already existing programs like the National Domestic Abuse Hotline.

I supported the 2006 reauthorization of this bill and stand strongly against all perpetrators of violence against women.

I will always stand for the protection of women, and any reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act should do the same.

Republicans have been ready and willing to work in a bipartisan fashion to reauthorize a bill that truly addresses domestic and sexual violence, but the legislation before us today is not a product worthy of its predecessors.

This bill should go back to be thoughtfully considered by the Education and Labor Committee and all the committees of jurisdiction before we consider it on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to reject the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 1315

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us have heard, in some way, paraphrased: While Rome is burning, much fiddling is going on.

I am grateful for all of the Members of Congress who helped construct this legislation.

I want to remind my friends, as the authorizations proceeded in the 1990s into the 2000s of the Violence Against Women Act, the last authorization was technically supposed to be in 2010, but it took 3 years until 2013. Working with advocates who represent almost 200 groups, Republicans and Democrats, organizations who deal with women impacted by domestic violence and other sexual assault issues and acts, they indicated that they wanted to see this bill expanded to cover Native American women, they wanted to protect immigrant women who are left vulnerable, they wanted to make sure it was gender-neutral in many instances. But, as I recall, in 2010, it was Native American and immigrants, so it took 3 years. And all the bill wanted to do was to simply protect people who are vulnerable.

In this bill, that has been 3 years in writing—with every opportunity with the preceding chairman of this committee, preceding Congress, and members on the Judiciary Committee to sit with us to work—I, for one, remember constant meetings with staff and members interested, Democratic members, in how we can work together.

This bill is long in waiting for prosecutors and law enforcement. They are waiting on the \$291 million for stock grants and resources for women's shelters.

This bill is a bipartisan bill. I thank Mr. FITZPATRICK for his work. And in this bill is a whole section on healthcare that Mr. FITZPATRICK's bill allowed us to put in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AGUILAR). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It is an important contribution to this legislation.

There is an amendment by Mr. GOMERT, my friend from Texas, on female genital mutilation. It is an amendment that we worked on, in discussion about reporting on the incidences with Indian women, Native American women. My amendment was joined, supported, by Republicans in the Judiciary Committee.

This bill is bipartisan, but, most of all, it is a response to desperation of need. The Violence Against Women Act is long overdue for being reauthorized. This is a strong product that covers so many issues to protect women and to ensure that those who have convictions with gun violence do not allow them to come and kill an innocent mom with her children.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass this bill. The rule is a good rule. Support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Rule and the underlying bill of H.R. 1585.

The Violence Against Women Act ("VAWA") is landmark legislation which—through policy reforms, interstate cooperation and grant allocation—has been pivotal in providing a national response to protecting half of the population.

Equally important, it has ushered in a seismic transformation on how society perceives violence against women.

The law has enhanced and improved the lives of girls and women, boys and men.

There are many similarities between the year that VAWA initially passed in 1994, and the moment in which we all find ourselves today.

When it was first passed, the country was experiencing reverberations to yet another polarizing battle to fill a seat on the Supreme Court.

Then the courageous victim sharing her truth was Anita Hill.

Today, as VAWA is yet again scheduled to expire, the country is assessing the ripples created by the #MeToo movement.

But despite the passage of over a quarter-century since its first enactment, the malignant treatment received by a courageous person willing to share her story unfortunately endures.

The need to create a safe space for victims of violence, especially women, supported with substantial resources to address this scourge has taken on a new urgency in this era of the #MeToo movement.

When discussing VAWA, we cannot forget the victims of domestic violence like Brittany Smith, who was 23 years old and was gunned down last year in Houston, by her boyfriend and San Diego-based Marine; nor can we forget Charlene Caldwell, a mother and grandmother beaten to death last year by a baseball bat at the hands of her boyfriend in Houston.

Domestic violence was alleged in both of these horrific events.

Unfortunately, there are too many stories like Charlene's or Brittany's.

The stories of these two women remind us of the urgency to protect survivors now, before it is too late, because many of these deaths are preventable.

Despite the experiences of #MeToo survivors or victims like Ms. Smith or Ms. Caldwell, all is not for naught.

Since VAWA's codification in 1994, more victims report episodes of domestic violence to the police and the rate of non-fatal intimate partner violence against women has decreased by almost two-thirds.

VAWA has also led to a significant increase in the reporting of sexual assault.

For example, the percentage of victims of rape and sexual assault who report the assault to the police increased from 28.8 percent in 1993—the year prior to VAWA's initial passage—to 50 percent in 2010.

In the first 15 years of VAWA's validity, rates of serious intimate partner violence declined by 72 percent for women and 64 percent for men.

Research suggests that referring a victim to a domestic violence or sexual assault advocate has been linked to an increased willingness to file a police report—survivors with an advocate filed a report with law enforcement 59 percent of the time, versus 41 percent for individuals not referred to a victim advocate.

This progress cannot be allowed to stop.

Congress must continue sending the clear message that violence against women is unacceptable.

Prior to VAWA, law enforcement lacked the resources and tools to respond effectively to domestic violence and sexual assault.

Each reauthorization of VAWA has improved protections for women and men, while helping to change the culture and reduce the tolerance for these crimes.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019 improves current law in several important respects, and takes a holistic approach to the goal of eliminating the harm faced by victims of violence, and making vital services accessible to victims of this scourge.

For example, this iteration of VAWA contains guidance on the use of grants to activate judicial and law enforcement tools to develop and enforce firearm surrender policies; expands permissible use of grant funding for programs focused on increasing survivor/law enforcement/community safety; and provides legal assistance for dependent children in appropriate circumstances.

It also updates programs designed to reduce dating violence, help children exposed to violence and engage men in preventing violence against women.

Additionally, the bill improves services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

It provides policies, protection, and justice for young victims of violence, including extending the Rape Prevention and Education grant program, addressing bullying of young people, improving grants focused on prevention education for students, and expanding relevant training for school-based and campus health centers; and reauthorizes and updates programs designed to reduce dating violence, help children exposed to violence, and engage men in preventing violence.

This bill also recognizes the cascading ills associated with identifying, eliminating, and preventing the reemergence of domestic violence.

This bill expands grants under the Public Health Service Act to support implementation of training programs to improve the capacity of early childhood programs to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking among the families they serve; preserves and expands housing protections for survivors; provides economic security assistance for survivors, by reauthorizing the National Resource Center on Workplace Responses; protects employees from being fired because they are survivors of sexual assault or domestic violence; and protects survivors' eligibility to receive Unemployment Insurance.

Recognizing that many women are victimized at the hands of intimate partners, this iteration of VAWA helps prevent "intimate partner" homicides, by including provisions expanding firearms laws to prohibit persons convicted of dating violence from possessing firearms, prohibiting persons convicted of misdemeanor stalking from possessing firearms, and prohibiting individuals subject to ex parte protective orders from possessing firearms.

Accordingly, the bill helps protect Native American women, by including provisions to improve the response to missing and murdered Native American women, improving tribal access to federal crime information databases, and reaffirming tribal criminal jurisdic-

tion over non-Indian perpetrators of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, stalking, and trafficking for all federally recognized Indian tribes and Alaskan Natives.

Additionally, this bill protects the Office on Violence Against Women in the Department of Justice from being de-emphasized, merged, or consolidated into any other DOJ office.

VAWA is central to our nation's effort to fight the epidemic of domestic, sexual, and dating violence and stalking.

This work did not happen on its own.

It was the product of a collaborative effort of stakeholders, including victim advocates.

It was the product of those willing to share their stories of the abuse suffered at the hands of those who were entrusted to love, but instead harmed.

The courage, strength, and resilience displayed by survivors has reminded all that we must continue to foster an environment for victims of violence to come forward and expose episodes of violence against women.

This bill represents the good that can come when courageous people with a story to tell come forward with the belief that through their pain, the lives of others can be helped.

Having listened to concerned stakeholders from all pockets of the country, we have put pen to paper and produced a bill that is endorsed by the bipartisan National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (NTF), which is a national collaboration comprising a large and diverse group of 35 national, tribal, state, territorial, and local organizations, advocates, and individuals that focus on the development, passage and implementation of effective public policy to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Indeed, there is no reason our work on this cannot be bipartisan, as has been the custom of prior Congresses in authorizing this critical piece of legislation.

The love for a spouse, the comfort of a mother and the best wishes for a sister know no political allegiance.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my good friend.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, the Violence Against Women Act we are voting on this week is nearly unrecognizable from the legislation originally passed in 1994. Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have chosen to politicize and expand the legislation far beyond the original scope by adding controversial provisions that undermine the constitutional rights of Americans.

In the name of protecting women, Democrats are exploiting this bill as an opportunity to assault the Second Amendment rights of American citizens. It is despicable that anyone would seize on this as such an oppor-

tunity to weaponize a measure that was intended to protect victims.

This body is not meant to fulfill campaign promises that have nothing to do with the legislation allegedly before us. And let's make no mistake, that is what the purpose of this legislation is today. It is being structured intentionally. They are structuring it intentionally to be able to run campaign ads in districts back home, because you have got a piece of legislation that is titled the Violence Against Women Act. So let's just bury stuff in a bill that sounds good to the American people, but which then attacks our fundamental God-given rights reflected in the Bill of Rights.

Now, the gentlewoman from Texas who just spoke, my friend from Texas, just spoke about fiddling while Rome burns. Well, let's talk about the fiddling that is going on on our southern border while women and girls are traveling miles up to our southern border being abused by cartels.

When Amnesty International and when organizations that are non-partisan are talking about a third of these women being abused, my friends on the other side of the aisle bury their head in the sand and don't seem to care.

When we are talking about violence against women, let's talk about the violence against women that is happening today, right now, just across the border in Reynosa. Just across the border in Mexico, some little girl and some woman is going to be raped and abused, while we sit and vote on legislation that is designed to be a political tool by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle against the GOP for political purposes.

I think we should not be fiddling while Rome is burning and while women are being abused on our southern border.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, the NRA has spent a lot of money to create this distraction, making this about them as opposed to protecting the lives of women. Over 50 percent of women murdered in 2017 were slain by an intimate partner or family member; 82 percent of homicide victims targeted by intimate partners are women; the weapon of choice in over half of female homicides, a firearm.

This is an opportunity to support both saving the lives of women and responsible gun ownership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her outstanding work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019.

I want to be associated with the remarks that the gentlewoman just gave

that this is about protecting women, and the addition that says that if you take away guns from convicted abusers or those who are being watched and being restrained, this will save lives. So this is an important part of protecting women.

VAWA is a law that literally, absolutely literally, saves lives, and this bill we are voting on today provides even more lifesaving resources to women and families, like closing the boyfriend loophole that she just mentioned and providing housing and beds for abused women.

It is important to point out that this landmark legislation was created in 1994 and has been reauthorized many times. But I would say that protecting women or providing lifesaving resources should be permanent law. We should not have to come back to this body and be subject to the whims of legislators who don't think it is important to protect women, which this bill does.

One of the lifesaving resources in this bill is the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program, which was created by legislation I first authored in 2004, and it is renewed in this bill through 2024.

This legislation, which has been called the most important anti-rape prevention legislation ever signed into law, provides funding to localities to audit and process DNA evidence kits, including unprocessed rape kits. Each rape kit represents a life. If you convict that rapist and get them off the street, you save the lives of other women and prevent rape. This is just one example of this important bill.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER), my good friend.

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am rising today to speak against the rule for H.R. 1585. Domestic violence is a major problem in our communities and throughout our country. I am in complete support of providing all the resources needed to the victims of abuse and for the law enforcement that protects these vulnerable women.

What could have been an opportunity to work together as a unified House of Representatives and to provide a great bill that we can all be proud of, our colleagues across the aisle dismissed our input on during the legislative process, silenced our voices, and put forth a bill which strikes the unique balance of overreaching where it is unnecessary and underperforming where resources are needed the most.

I don't dispute that my Democrat colleagues are well-intentioned with their legislation, but they missed the mark. In this bill, they diluted important funds meant to help the victims, handcuffed our law enforcement, and reduced their effectiveness. Additionally, they have taken a bipartisan issue and used it to weaken the Second Amendment, reduce religious freedoms, and even possibly cause further harm to victims.

As a woman, a wife, and a mother, as well as a grandmother, who represents a State where one in three women are victims of domestic violence, I say with assurance that my Republican colleagues are committed to reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act in a way that preserves and strengthens the law, provides the needed support for victims of domestic abuse, and strengthens our judicial system. We want to work together on this issue which affects so many people around the country. We can put forth a good bill together.

I have often said that good government is finding the issues that we can all agree upon, Republicans and Democrats alike, and put aside our differences to come together, solve the problem, and make this country better.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

Mrs. MILLER. So, put aside our differences to come together, solve the problem, and make this country better than before we got here. This could have been that chance. We can do better.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and vote against the underlying bill.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and also for her tremendous leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. This critical bill will expand crucial protections for all Americans making very important enhancements to VAWA.

When I was in the California legislature, Mr. Speaker, I authored the Violence Against Women Act for the State of California, and, yes, it was signed by a Republican Governor.

In addition to the protections this bill has provided for 26 years, it will now expand protections for Native American women and will protect the transgender community. Every woman has the right to live free from abuse.

Although my Republican colleagues argued differently in committee, sexual orientation or gender identity should not put victims in a second-class status. This bill will now make sure that every victim of sexual violence has access to support.

VAWA is critical for the 1.3 million individuals who benefit from this program. We must continue to improve these services for victims and survivors by passing this bill here today.

Mr. Speaker, I know from personal experiences, yes, the life-and-death implications of this very important bill. So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill to ensure that all women are protected from sexual and domestic violence.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire on the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona has 6 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining.

□ 1330

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

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide additional consideration of H.R. 1741, authored by Representative ELISE STEFANIK.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1741 is a bill that would provide a 1-year extension of VAWA while we work on negotiating a long-term reauthorization of VAWA. I think there are a lot of things that the Republicans and Democrats can agree on, and I would like to come up with a bipartisan bill.

During the Rules Committee, my colleague, Representative WOODALL, asked the Democrat witness if the majority would consider moving a short-term extension if the U.S. Senate does not take this bill up. The witness could not answer the question.

This is a dangerous gamble the Democrat majority is willing to play. We have received no indication that the U.S. Senate will use this bill as a starting point or move quickly on this liberal proposal, leaving VAWA unnecessarily expired during the meantime.

The Democrats are in control and have the votes to pass their bill; however, they are putting the lives of millions of women in jeopardy by gambling on what the Senate will do. We should not be gambling.

The Democrat majority has already passed up a short-term extension once via a vote, and the program has lapsed. There is no reason why we should not send an additional option that the Senate can take up quickly to keep the program functioning.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, we all—Republicans and Democrats—want to protect women and children and stop violence against women, but, unfortunately, this particular bill advances a separate policy agenda other than that.

The long history of bipartisanship of VAWA will become a thing of the past with this bill. This bill leaves gaping holes for potential predators to victimize women and children in areas that are supposed to be safe.

It advances new gun control policies to permanently restrict people from exercising their Second Amendment rights or does so without that person even being able to defend themselves in court.

It deprioritizes funding to combat sex trafficking and includes various new forms of criminal justice policy that could let perpetrators walk or have opportunities to revictimize women and children.

As a survivor of domestic violence, I want to see a VAWA reauthorization that focuses on women and children and keeps our country safe. We should be voting on legislation which all women of this Chamber could support; however, this bill is not that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge “no” on the previous question, “no” on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have to rebut my colleague’s repeated assertion that this iteration of VAWA would violate the Second Amendment because it fails to offer an opportunity for abusers to protest having their guns taken away—and the gentlewoman said this several times in the course of debate—on the basis that ex parte orders are often entered against abusers.

But, in fact, in every instance, even if an initial order is an ex parte, the abuser has the right to request a hearing, including in Arizona, where title 12, section 1809 provides that anyone who has a protection order entered against them can file a written request for a hearing, and that is when they get their due process. So I just want to point that out.

The purpose of the Violence Against Women Act is today as it was when it was passed in 1994: to keep women safe from domestic abuse. It remains a piece of bipartisan landmark legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE detailed the number of Republican amendments and bills that have been incorporated into this version, so it is a shining example of what Congress can accomplish when we set aside our partisan differences and work together to find actual solutions.

VAWA has dramatically improved our Nation’s response to domestic violence and has provided invaluable support to victims, communities, social service providers, and law enforcement. It is working.

We won’t solve domestic violence overnight, nor will we end it with the passage of a bill, but we can continue to change the culture of violence against women and provide the support that survivors need.

The two constituents I spoke of in my opening never should have experienced the violence that was inflicted upon them; but it is not enough to condemn what was done or to charge those responsible, no. We must change the conditions to allow such acts of violence to occur.

We can look at the facts and we can look at the research so we create policies and pass laws to better protect women from abusers, and this reauthorization is a bold step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 1741) to reauthorize Department of Justice programs that combat violence against women, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1741.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

Adoption of H. Res. 271.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 193, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—231

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

Kelly (IL)	Moulton	Scott, David
Kennedy	Mucarsel-Powell	Serrano
Khanna	Murphy	Sewell (AL)
Kildee	Nadler	Shalala
Kilmer	Napolitano	Sherman
Kim	Neal	Sherrill
Kind	Neguse	Sires
Kirkpatrick	Norcross	Slotkin
Krishnamoorthi	O’Halloran	Smith (WA)
Kuster (NH)	Ocasio-Cortez	Soto
Lamb	Omar	Spanberger
Langevin	Pallone	Speier
Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Stanton
Larson (CT)	Pappas	Stevens
Lawrence	Pascarell	Suozi
Lawson (FL)	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Lee (CA)	Perlmutter	Takano
Lee (NV)	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Levin (CA)	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
Levin (MI)	Phillips	Titus
Lewis	Pingree	Tlaib
Lieu, Ted	Pocan	Tonko
Lipinski	Porter	Torres (CA)
Loeb sack	Pressley	Torres Small
Lofgren	Price (NC)	(NM)
Lowenthal	Quigley	Trahan
Lowe y	Raskin	Trone
Luján	Rice (NY)	Underwood
Luria	Richmond	Van Drew
Lynch	Rose (NY)	Vargas
Malinowski	Rouda	Veasey
Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Vela
Carolyn B.	Ruiz	Velázquez
Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
Matsui	Rush	Wasserman
McAdams	Sánchez	Schultz
McBath	Sarbanes	Waters
McCollum	Scanlon	Watson Coleman
McGovern	Schakowsky	Welch
McNerney	Schiff	Wexton
Meeks	Schneider	Wild
Meng	Schrader	Schrier
Moore	Scott (VA)	Wilson (FL)
Morelle		Yarmuth

NAYS—193

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

Smucker  
Spano  
Staubert  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Timmons  
Tipton

NOT VOTING—7

Estes  
Hoyer  
McEachin

□ 1401

Messrs. WOODALL, TAYLOR, and WESTERMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. VISCLOSKY changed his 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. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 144.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 194, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—231

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Axne  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brindisi  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Case  
Casten (IL)  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Cisneros  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Cox (CA)  
Craig

Crist  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Dean  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Delgado  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Engel  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Evans  
Finkenauer  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Frankel  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
García (IL)  
García (TX)  
Golden  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green (TX)  
Grijalva  
Haaland  
Hafren  
Harder (CA)  
Hastings

Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Worlorski  
Wright  
Yoho  
Young  
Zeldin

Rooney (FL)  
Rutherford  
Ryan

□ 1401

Messrs. WOODALL, TAYLOR, and WESTERMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. VISCLOSKY changed his 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. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 144.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 194, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—231

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Conaway  
Cook  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson (OH)  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy (NC)  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher

Peterson  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rose (NY)  
Rouda  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)

NAYS—194

Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Allen  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gooden  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hern, Kevin  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill (AR)  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lesko  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meadows  
Meuser

Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Suozzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres Small  
(NM)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

CONDEMNING THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S LEGAL CAMPAIGN TO TAKE AWAY AMERICANS' HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 271) Condemning the Trump Administration's Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans' Health Care, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 186, answered “present” 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—240

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Axne  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brindisi  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Case  
Casten (IL)  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Cisneros  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Cox (CA)  
Craig  
Crist  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Cunningham

Davids (KS)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Dean  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Delgado  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Engel  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Evans  
Finkenauer  
Fitzpatrick  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Frankel  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
García (IL)  
García (TX)  
Golden  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green (TX)  
Grijalva  
Haaland  
Harder (CA)  
Hastings  
Hayes  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill (CA)  
Himes  
Horn, Kendra S.  
Horsford  
Houlahan

Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (TX)  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe y  
Luján  
Luria  
Lynch  
Malinowski  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McAdams  
McBath  
McCollum  
McGovern

□ 1412

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.