limit is going to bureaucrats and not to victims. Of course, the underlying bill, the Leahy bill, contains no such limit. If you want the money to go to victims and not bureaucrats, those overhead expenses should be capped at this 7.5-percent level.

The substitute amendment requires that 30 percent of the STOP grants and grants for arrest policies and protective orders are targeted to tribal areas. The Leahy-Crapo bill sets aside only 20 percent instead of that 30 percent to fight sexual assault.

The substitute amendment requires that 30 percent of the Debbie Smith Act funds be used to create a national database to track the rape kits. The majority bill mandates that 7 percent of the existing Debbie Smith Act funds be used for State and local audits of the backlog.

Debbie Smith's family has endorsed these provisions. The majority bill has no such provisions. Making sure that money that is claimed to reduce the rape kit backlog actually does so is a priority. True reform in the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization should further that goal.

Combatting violence against women also means tougher penalties for those who commit those terrible crimes. The Hutchison-Grassley substitute creates a 10-year mandatory minimum sentence for Federal convictions for forcible rape. The majority bill establishes a 5-year mandatory minimum sentence. That provision is only in there because Republicans offered it and we won that point in our committee.

Child pornography is an actual record of a crime scene of violence against women. Our alternative establishes a 1-year mandatory minimum sentence for possession of child pornography where the victim depicted is under 12 years of age.

I believe the mandatory minimum for this crime should be higher. In light of the leniency sentences many Federal judges hand out, there should be a mandatory minimum sentence for all child pornography possession convictions. But the substitute is at least a start. This is especially true because the majority bill takes no action against child pornography.

The alternative also imposes a 5-year mandatory minimum sentence for the crime of sexual assault. This crime involves sexual assault through the use of drugs or by otherwise rendering the victim unconscious. The Leahy bill has about this. The status quo appears to be fine for the people who are going to vote for the underlying bill if the Hutchison-Grassley amendment is not adopted.

Instead, the Hutchison-Grassley amendment establishes a 10-year mandatory minimum sentence for the crime of interstate domestic violence that results in the death of the victim. It increases from 20 to 25 years the statutory maximum sentence for a crime where it results in life-threatening bodily injury to, or the permanent disfigurement of, the victim.

It increases from 10 to 15 years the statutory maximum sentence for this crime when serious bodily injury to the victim results.

The Leahy bill contains some of these important protections for domestic violence victims.

The substitute grants administrative subpoena power to the U.S. Marshals Service to help them discharge their duty of tracking and apprehending unregistered sex offenders. The Leahy bill does nothing to help locate and apprehend registered sex offenders. And the substitute cracks down on abuses in the award of U-visas for illegal aliens and the fraud in the Violence Against Women Act self-petitioning process. The majority bill does not include any reforms of these benefits, despite the sexual violence of fraud in the program.

One of the Senators who recently came to the floor complained that there had never been controversy in reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act. But in the past there were no deliberate efforts to create partisan divisions. We always proceeded in the past in a consensus fashion.

Domestic violence is an important issue, serious problem. We all recognize that. In the past, we put politics and partisanship, why, heavens, we obviously agree. It is the majority that has now decided they want to make political points with victim's rights. They want to portray a phony war on women because this is an election year. They are raising campaign money by trying to exploit this issue, and they have demonstrated it by viewing the e-mails that came to our attention.

There could have been a consensus bill before us today, as in the past. But the controversy that has arisen is that what the majority seems to want. We look forward to a fair debate on this bill and the chance to offer and vote on our substitute amendment. That amendment contains much that is in agreement with the Leahy bill. The substitute also is much closer to what can actually be enacted into law to protect victims of domestic violence.

I yield the floor.