

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, yesterday, this Chamber narrowly passed a bill entitled the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. But although the bill we voted on shared its name with landmark legislation that this Chamber passed in 1994 to deter crimes against women, it failed to advance the important protections that should be afforded to all victims of domestic violence and sexual assaults.

Our colleagues in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, worked together to pass a strong, bipartisan reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. Yet, rather than carrying on the important tradition of working in a bipartisan fashion to strengthen and reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act here in the House, Republicans crafted a partisan bill that failed to include many of the important protections enacted by the Senate. In fact, the Republican legislation would undermine vital protections and services for victims of domestic violence. The House Republican proposal left out improvements that the Senate had passed, including protections for immigrant women, college students, and LGBT Americans.

A bipartisan coalition of 13 women Senators, including Republican Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, signed a letter to Speaker BOEHNER yesterday urging that he call a vote on the strong, bipartisan Senate-passed bill that would strengthen protections for all victims of domestic and sexual violence saying, "We should not let politics pick and choose which victims of abuse to help and which to ignore"—a bill, by the way, that every single woman in the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, voted for.

Reauthorizing important provisions that help ensure the safety of all victims of domestic and sexual abuse across our country should be routine—even in Washington, D.C. But once again, House Republicans have allowed a far-right ideology to interfere with the commonsense approach to protecting women and families from violence.

Women's lives are too important for another round of congressional brinksmanship. Last year, in my home State of Rhode Island, more than 13,000 hotline calls were answered by the Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

Republicans in this Chamber are wrong to relegate the safety and well-being of these women behind an extreme political ideology. I urge my colleagues to continue their strong support for the bipartisan Senate legislation that would provide effective protections for all victims of sexual or domestic violence. We must keep the pressure on for passage of the Senate

bipartisan bill. America's women and our families deserve no less.

NATIONAL DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Madam Speaker, later today, we will debate the National Defense Authorization Act. Just yesterday evening, section 1021 of last year's bill was given an injunction by U.S. District Judge Katherine Forrest when she stated:

In the face of what could be indeterminate military detention, due process requires more.

As we debate this bill, we will have an opportunity to act on several amendments which will make due process a key part of this bill and eliminate the concerns that the judge had when granting that preliminary injunction.

I take the opportunity today to remind us of some history. Dateline: Paris, December 20, 1787. In a letter to James Madison, Thomas Jefferson wrote, in regard to the Constitution of the United States that was being proposed:

I will tell you now what I do not like. First, the omission of a Bill of Rights providing clearly and without aid of sophism, for freedom of religion, freedom of the press, protection against standing armies, restriction of monopolies, the eternal and unremitting force of the habeas corpus laws, and trials by jury in all matters of fact triable by the laws of the land, and not by the laws of nations.

To say, as Mr. Wilson does, that a Bill of Rights was not necessary because all is reserved in the case of the general government, which is not given, while in the particular ones, all is given which is not reserved, might do for the audience to which it was addressed; but it is surely a gratis dictum, the reverse of which might just as well be said; and it is opposed by strong inferences from the body of the instrument, as well as from the omission of the cause of our present Confederation—that would be the Articles of Confederation—which had made the reservation in express terms.

It was hard to conclude, because there has been a want of uniformity among the States as to the cases triable by jury, because some have been so incautious as to dispense with this mode of trial in certain cases; therefore, the more prudent States shall be reduced to the same level of calamity.

It would have been much more just and wise to have concluded the other way, that, as most of the States had preserved with jealousy this sacred palladium of liberty, those who have wandered should be brought back to it, and to have established general right rather than general wrong.

□ 1030

He goes on:

For I consider all the ill as established, which may be established. I have a right to nothing which another has a right to take away.

And he goes on:

Let me add that a Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on Earth, general or particular, and what no just government should refuse, or rest on inference.

There are those, in regard to the debate on the NDAA and particularly section 1021 of last year's bill and the similar language this year, that it is inferred that those rights are not given away. Jefferson was not willing to allow us to rest on the rights of inference, nor should we in this Congress also not be willing to rest on the rights of inference.

And when particularly you have language such as this coming out of the court yesterday evening, this court finds the plaintiffs who are, as discussed below, have reasonable fear of future government action sufficient to confer standing.

Ladies and gentlemen, many of you cannot see it, but behind me here in the desk is the word "liberty stands," it is written in. It was not left to inference. It's right here for us to look at every day. And, ladies and gentlemen, as long as I serve in Congress, I will stand up for liberty and make sure that no citizen of the United States has their due process removed.

I will support the Amash amendment, the Smith amendment, and the Goodlatte amendment. Thank you very much. I hope you do the same.

OUR NATION IS AT A HISTORIC
CROSSROAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today because our Nation is at a crossroads. We are emerging from a deep recession but face a deficit topping \$1 trillion for the 4th straight year.

And while we all agree that we must reduce our deficit, the real question, of course, is: How? How we decide to reduce our deficit will not only define our budget, it will define who we are as a Nation. Will we be a Nation that cuts vital programs like food and Medicaid in order to not only preserve but grow an outsized defense budget? Or will we choose a middle ground that is balanced, bipartisan, big, and leaves nothing off the table, including defense?

Sadly, the National Defense Authorization Act before us offers no middle ground and is not bipartisan. It is not balanced. At a time when we are being asked to cut education, infrastructure, and health care, this defense bill increases spending \$4 billion over the President's request.

Let me be clear. We all want to cut spending. In fact, I, myself, introduced a bipartisan budget that mirrored the Simpson-Bowles plan and would have reduced the deficit with two-thirds cuts and one-third revenue. But the key to developing a bipartisan, balanced plan is to put everything on the table, including defense.

Military spending has more than doubled in the last 10 years and now comprises close to 20 percent of our overall budget. We spend almost four times more on defense than China and more

than the next 10 largest military spenders combined. We spend \$500 million a year on military bands alone.

But it's not just about what we spend; it's also how we spend. Former Secretary of Defense Gates called for billions in cuts, saying, "what had been a culture of endless money" at DOD must "become a culture of savings and restraint."

Admiral Mike Mullen once called our debt the "greatest threat to our national security."

The Sustainable Defense Task Force and the Bipartisan Policy Center have also outlined close to \$1 trillion in defense cuts that can still keep us safe.

But this defense budget doesn't reflect the expertise of our military leaders, defense experts, or the American people.

It ignores our military leaders by including a new east coast missile interceptor the Pentagon doesn't want, and it rolls back efforts by the DOD to be more energy efficient because the commanders on the ground know that lives are lost transporting fuel to troops abroad.

It ignores military experts by funding the deadly V-22 Osprey, which is 186 percent over budget, it is not safe to fly in extreme heat or excessive sand, has killed 36 servicemembers, and can be replaced with cheaper helicopters.

It also ignores experts such as Henry Kissinger, who promote drastically reducing our nuclear stockpile by including a huge funding increase for nuclear upgrades.

Finally, perhaps more importantly, it ignores the American people, who want a smaller military footprint and want our troops home from Afghanistan. According to a recent report released at the Stimson Center, the public supports cutting the defense budget by 18 percent. And according to the latest opinion polls, close to seven in 10 Americans oppose the war in Afghanistan, yet this defense bill includes language aimed at slowing down the withdrawal of U.S. troops.

We aren't fighting the Cold War anymore, yet this budget continues to invest billions in nuclear weapons and thousands of troops stationed in Europe and Asia.

Today our greatest threat is a global network of extremists who find safe haven in ungoverned spaces across the world. There have been at least 45 terrorist attacks plotted against the U.S. since 9/11, and each one of them was foiled, not by our mass ground forces in Afghanistan, but through intelligence, policing, and citizen engagement.

According to terrorism expert Erik Dahl of the Naval Postgraduate School, when it comes to domestic attacks and securing the homeland, what works is really good, old-fashioned policing, law enforcement, tips from the public, and police informants. Our enemy today must be caught with less costly policing, intelligence gathering, and special operations, not multibillion dollar tanks and nukes.

The real ramification of overspending on defense is not simply that we have too many unneeded nukes or planes, but that we don't have enough resources to support vital domestic investments such as health care, education, and infrastructure needed to remain a superpower.

Military power is not simply about spending more than our adversaries. Real military power, argues Kori Schake, a former McCain advisor, is "premised on the solvency of the American Government and the vibrancy of the U.S. economy." In order to maintain that vibrancy, we must get our fiscal house in order and do so by reexamining our defense spending, and making cuts and reforming where necessary.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Speaker, every year, in May, this country celebrates National Nurses Week. Often described as an art and a science, nursing is a profession that embraces dedicated people with varied interests, strengths, and passions because of the many opportunities the profession offers.

As a husband of a critical care nurse, I know all about the lives they touch each and every day. They work in emergency rooms, school-based clinics, hospitals, and homeless shelters, just to name a few. They have many roles, from staff nurses to educators to nurse practitioners and nurse researchers, and serve all of them with a passion for the profession and with a strong commitment to patient security and safety.

National Nurses Week occurs each year in May, surrounding Florence Nightingale's birthday. Our nurses strive for excellence in all they do. They provide patients and their families with skilled, compassionate care, and help them navigate a very complex and oftentimes overwhelming health care system to provide safe passage for the patients and their families.

Regardless of their role or title, nurses educate, counsel, advocate, and lead. These men and women work to make a difference to countless patients, families, and communities who benefit from nurses' dedication and professionalism.

This month is a time to reflect on all the good nurses do. It is a time to acknowledge and celebrate the differences our nurses make.

□ 1040

HORSE PROTECTION PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to discuss an important

and timely issue negatively affecting the welfare of the horses of this great country. It's called "soring." Soring is the act of deliberately causing pain to exaggerate the leg motion of high-gaited horses, such as Tennessee Walking Horses.

This inhumane practice, despite being illegal for almost 40 years, is still used far too often by many owners and trainers to win in the show ring. Today, I hope I can persuade you, my fellow Members of Congress, to take interest in this issue, to oppose this cruel and illegal practice, and to increase the support for the USDA's Horse Protection Program.

Horses are sored in several different ways:

Caustic materials, such as kerosene or mustard oil, are applied to the lower leg. This makes the horse's leg sensitive so that, when certain cruel devices like chains are placed against it, it causes severe pain, causing the horse to lift its leg high in an exaggerated gait. There are other common approaches also, like trimming the hoof excessively, exposing sensitive tissues, inserting devices between the shoe pads and the sole of the horse and, frankly, improper shoeing techniques. No matter the technique, its purpose is to cause the horse pain so that it lifts its leg higher and faster.

While rest and training may allow some horses to eventually recover from that harm, others suffer irreversible hoof damage and are actually crippled for life. The harm caused by soring is not just physical. The mental damage done to the horse can make its rehabilitation difficult, if not impossible.

Soring is so egregious that it has actually been illegal in this country for over 40 years. The Horse Protection Act was passed in 1970. So why, 40 years later, are we still having the same conversation?

The problem lies within the culture of some of those in the walking horse industry, in which unethical trainers and unethical owners not only continue this practice but use tricks to deceive detection. Substantial financial gains come from winning horse shows, and this makes soring appealing to many unscrupulous owners and trainers. Soring is a shortcut that overshadows the balance and collection seen in the beautiful natural movement of horses that perform racking gaits. These gaits can actually be achieved without soring, rather by investing the proper time, training, and conditioning on the horse.

The Horse Protection Program at the USDA serves as regulatory enforcement for the Horse Protection Act. Unfortunately, due to budget constraints, USDA inspectors only attend a small fraction of the shows. In 2011, USDA documented 587 violations of the act while attending only 62 of the 600 to 700 shows held that year. Fiscal year 2012 was the first time in the history of the Horse Protection Program that it actually received more than \$500,000 in