

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 47, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 83 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 83

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 47) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. 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 Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees; (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-2, if offered by the Majority Leader or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to commit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself as much time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1240

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 83 provides for a structured rule for consideration of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. The rule also provides for consideration of one substitute amendment to this underlying legislation. This process ensures there's ample discussion on both options presented to the House, to give Members, both the minority and the majority, the opportunity to participate in these debates.

I support the rule, and I hope my colleagues will support it as well because, by supporting and passing this resolution, we'll be able to move on to debating the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

As a former law enforcement officer who spent 38 years fighting against all types of violence, I have seen the evils and cruelty of domestic violence issues firsthand. That's why I also volun-

teered with and even served on the board of directors for the Dawn Center, which is a refuge for victims of domestic and sexual violence in Hernando County, Florida.

With these sorts of experience, I know and understand how important grant programs like these authorized by the Violence Against Women Act are to law enforcement agencies fighting domestic violence, the advocates serving the victims of domestic violence, and most importantly, the victims themselves.

Violence against women is unacceptable in any terms. It should be unacceptable to everybody in this room, regardless of your gender, regardless of your sexual orientation, and regardless of your age. I hope it's that obvious.

The rule we have before us today provides the House the ability to consider measures that would help provide stakeholders with the tools they need to combat this terrible crime.

If House Resolution 83 passes, then tomorrow the House will debate two separate versions of reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act. We will have 1 hour debate on the underlying bill, which passed the Senate just 15 days ago.

We'll also spend 20 minutes debating a Republican alternative to the Senate bill. At the end of the debate, we will vote first on the Republican alternative to the Senate bill, and if that House amendment fails, then we'll have an up-or-down vote on final passage of the Senate reauthorization. It's that simple.

These options offer two separate and distinct visions on how the Federal Government can help aid in the fight against domestic violence.

I can say that, during my time as sheriff, I never saw a single Federal domestic violence case ever prosecuted, but I know the Federal dollars went to the States and counties to help combat these types of crimes. I also know that victims of all genders and sexual orientations found shelter and safety in places like the Dawn Center because of grants like those authorized in the Violence Against Women Act.

For all those reasons, I know this a debate we need to have. That's why I'm proud to stand here today sponsoring a rule that lays the options out on the table, provides for vigorous and enthusiastic discussion of those options, and ultimately, let's the people's House work its will.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, good afternoon.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when I joined my former colleague, Representative Pat Schroeder of Colorado, to write the original Violence Against Women Act, it didn't occur to us to exclude or dis-

criminate against anyone. And in the multiple times the law has been reauthorized, we, as a legislature, have always tried to ensure that all victims of domestic violence receive the protections under the law.

As my colleague pointed out, up till now they have. Unfortunately, the latest attempt to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act has been different. This time, the majority has alternately tried to pass extreme legislation that would weaken current law and rejected calls to pass bipartisan legislation that would strengthen the current law.

On February 12, with 23 Republican Senators voting in favor, including every Republican woman in the Senate, they approved a reauthorization that is both comprehensive and inclusive in nature. Unfortunately, instead of allowing a clean, up-or-down vote on this bipartisan bill, the majority leadership proposed a substitute amendment that removes key provisions from that bill.

For example, the leadership's amendment fails to explicitly protect LGBT victims, and limits protections for immigrants. At the same time, the amendment fails to close the legal loopholes that leave Native American victims of domestic violence with nowhere to turn.

Additionally, despite the high rate of dating violence and sexual assault on college campuses, the amendment entirely omits protections for young women who are victimized in college. And that's why the majority's amendment is opposed by groups including the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, the National Congress of American Indians, and the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, among many others.

It's dismaying that some in the majority want to weaken a strong bipartisan Senate bill, and it's vital that this Chamber reject their alternative partisan amendment.

With the votes we are about to take, we will be asked to choose between an amendment that fails to protect some victims of domestic violence, and the bipartisan Senate bill protecting all victims. The choice is so clear.

We'll be asked to choose between an amendment opposed by victims and victims' rights advocates and a bipartisan bill. And when looking at those options that are before us, it is clear what we must do. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the substitute amendment tomorrow to the Senate bill, so the original Senate legislation will receive a vote in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment and talk about the incredible impact the Violence Against Women bill has had since it was enacted. Thanks to that Act, instances of domestic violence have fallen by 67 percent, and over 1 million people have obtained protective orders against their batterers.

Before the passage of the Violence Against Women Act, police officers were not trained to separate a victim and abuser when they responded to a domestic violence call. Thanks to the law, the police officers are now trained to do just that, a most important change that stopped violence from resuming the moment the police left and the front door closed.

But perhaps the greatest victory of the Violence Against Women Act is that the law finally brought millions of victims out of the shadows and gave them a place to stand.

In 1994, domestic violence in our country was not even discussed, and its scars were never acknowledged. And as a result, the victims often became abusers in a cycle of violence that simply wouldn't end. We wrote the law to stop that cycle of violence, and we think we have achieved much of that. For 18 years, this law gave victims a choice and made incredible progress in ending the cycle of violence.

Every time we've renewed the law, our goal has been the same: to ensure that all victims of domestic violence, no matter their ethnicity, their sexual orientation, their age or their gender, are acknowledged and helped and protected by the law.

It has been now more than 500 days since the Violence Against Women Act expired. Today is the day that ends, and we act in the name of justice. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the exclusionary substitute amendment tomorrow so we can vote "yes" and get this bill to the President right away.

Now, in addition, I want to mention on the previous question, today we're going to have an opportunity to stop the sequester, which is scheduled, as you know, to take effect in just 2 days.

We all know all the harms. We know very well what the sequester is going to do to the economy and to the workforce in the United States. And most importantly, we know that we cannot afford such a slowdown.

Now, today we're going to give Members of the House an opportunity to vote on a sequester solution. If we defeat the previous question—and please pay attention: If you want to go on record against having the sequester go into effect, we are giving you an opportunity to do that.

By voting "no" on the previous question, you will allow the House to vote on a measure that Mr. VAN HOLLEN, ranking member of the Budget Committee, has come to the Rules Committee three times with to try to achieve the end of saving us from ourselves. Mr. VAN HOLLEN's legislation would reduce the deficit in a balanced and responsible way but stop the devastating sequestration cuts.

□ 1250

Today is the last chance for the House of Representatives to stop the sequester. Despite what some have said, this Chamber has not passed a solution to the sequester during this Con-

gress. It is vital that the inaction of the majority come to an end. We must take a step to stop the sequester today.

So let me urge you to vote "no" on the previous question if you wish to be on record saying you do not support the sequester, you do not want to see this damage done to the economy and to the United States and, incidentally, to our reputation in the country and in the rest of the world. Doing so will allow Mr. VAN HOLLEN's legislation to have the serious debate and vote that it deserves.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. I rise today in support of the rule which provides for consideration of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013.

Mr. Speaker, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act has been successful. We have seen its benefits. It has saved lives and helped millions of women find safety, security, and self-sufficiency. While there are deeply held differences about some policies in the bill we consider today, now is the time to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

If a daughter, sister, or perfect stranger were raped, battered, or needed help, no one would ask or care what her ethnicity, national origin, or sexual orientation was before coming to her aid—nor should the Violence Against Women Act. No community, no person should be neglected when it comes to domestic violence. As a father of a young daughter, Grace Catherine, I don't know or care what her orientation is—and neither should Congress. I simply know that she and all women and girls should be equally protected under its laws.

We have an opportunity now to finally pass a bipartisan, inclusive Violence Against Women Act that service providers, law enforcement and, most importantly, all victims deserve. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Small Business.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I want to thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, twice in two decades Members of both parties have crossed party lines to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. Yet this week we are considering a partisan bill that excludes some victims based on sexual orientation or immigration status. Does abuse not "count" if the victim happens to be a gay man or a lesbian? What if the victim is an undocumented worker?

Here are some facts my GOP colleagues may be unaware of: 40 percent of gay men experience domestic abuse, as do 50 percent of lesbian women. For

undocumented women, abuse rates are slightly higher than the rest of the population, but go unreported for fear of deportation. Those are millions of people and thousands of New Yorkers who are being hurt. This legislation adds insult to their injury by basically saying because of who you are, we won't help you.

I hope my Republican colleagues agree that that is not the message we want to send. Vote "no" on the rule and the underlying bill so we can approve a real Violence Against Women Act that protects all victims equally. Shame on us. This should not be a partisan issue.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the underlying legislation. This rule brings the Senate-passed version of VAWA to the floor and allows us to vote on House language to replace that version. I want to particularly thank my good friend, Chairman SESSIONS of the Rules Committee, for devising a rule that will help the House work its will on this important issue—and do so smoothly, fairly, and quickly.

I want to particularly thank Leader CANTOR for his hard work and effort to truly understand and deal with the problems that Native American women face. That part of our population, as many of my colleagues have learned during the course of this debate, is in many ways the most at-risk part of our population. One in three Native American women will be sexually assaulted in the course of her lifetime. The statistics on the failure to prosecute and hold accountable the perpetrators of those crimes are simply stunning. I'm very proud that both the Senate and the House have turned their attention to this issue and finally begun to give it the consideration that it merits. Again, I particularly want to thank Leader CANTOR. The House version has improved tremendously over what this body passed in the last Congress; and that's due, in large measure, to his hard work.

That being said, I cannot support the House version of VAWA. While it's made great strides in recognizing the jurisdictions of tribal courts over non-Indian offenders, it falls short of giving tribes what they need to keep their citizens protected from the scourge of domestic violence. Unlike the Senate version, the House version fails to recognize existing tribal sovereignty that's enshrined in the Constitution and has been recognized throughout the history of our country. The House version requires tribes to seek Department of Justice certification before exercising jurisdiction over non-Indian offenders. I cannot think of any example where one sovereign has to seek permission to exercise their rights as a sovereign. It doesn't make sense to ask

tribes to willingly abdicate part of their sovereignty to exercise another part of their sovereignty.

In the same vein, the House bill waives sovereign immunity on behalf of the tribes. As sovereigns, tribes should make that decision on whether or not to waive sovereign immunity. In the final analysis, Indian tribes and Indian women need help—and I don't think there's much debate about this in this body. And they prefer the Senate bill to the House bill. That settles the issue for me.

I support this rule. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the House amendment to the underlying bill, and I support the underlying bill that's been passed by the Senate.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I rise today in opposition to the amendment made under this rule to gut the Senate-passed Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. The Senate bill is a bipartisan approach that protects vulnerable populations, and the amendment made under this rule would remove those protections. Furthermore, S. 47 includes legislation that I have worked on in these two past Congresses with Representative VIRGINIA FOXX of North Carolina, who I call my good friend, and Senator KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota. I reintroduced the STALKERS Act this Congress and am pleased that it is included in the underlying bill.

No one can deny that the Internet is a great tool for all of us that connects billions of people around the world. But one of the problems with it is that it's proven to be an effective weapon for stalkers to prey on innocent people. Current Federal stalking statutes simply have not caught up with the new tools and the emerging technologies that these criminals use. The STALKERS Act would bring our laws into the 21st century by giving law enforcement the tools they need to combat stalking in the digital age.

The STALKERS Act would protect victims and empower prosecutors by increasing the scope of existing laws to cover acts of electronic monitoring, including spyware, bugging, video surveillance, and other new technologies as they develop. Currently, Federal laws cannot be enforced unless stalking victims can demonstrate that they are in reasonable fear of physical injury.

Again, I thank you for including the STALKERS Act in the underlying bill.

□ 1300

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass the rule and the underlying bipartisan Senate Violence

Against Women Act. This is the first bill that I worked on when I came to Congress with the great LOUISE SLAUGHTER and Patricia Schroeder, and then-Senator JOE BIDEN. It has been reauthorized in a bipartisan way many times.

From 1994 to 2010, about four in five victims of intimate partner violence have been female. These numbers are real people, and so are the tragedies behind them. But this is not about politics. This is about the single most fundamental task that we require of our government: to keep its citizens safe from violent assaults—all of our residents, all of our citizens, immigrants, no matter what the sexual orientation is of our citizens. It's for all of our citizens.

I am pleased that two of the bills that I have authored are part of the Senate version. It would be ripped out by the Republican version, so I strongly support the bipartisan Senate version. One I authored with Representative POE in a bipartisan way, and that was the SAFER Act. This took the monies and directed Justice not to spend more money but to process the backlog of DNA kits in rape cases to put rapists behind bars. And also, the Campus Save Act.

There's too much violence on campus. One in five women will be sexually assaulted during their college years. This provision that I authored would increase the obligations of colleges to keep students safe and informed about policies on sexual assault. Also, the very bipartisan, important anti-trafficking bill is part of it.

So I urge my colleagues, in a bipartisan, historic way, to reauthorize, re-pass the Violence Against Women Act, the Senate version.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the bipartisan, Senate-passed Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

Since the Violence Against Women Act first became law in 1994, the incidence of domestic violence is down more than 60 percent. It is with that same record of success that we should address the prevalence of domestic violence in underserved communities.

In my district of Sacramento, we are fortunate to have an organization called WEAVE, which provides crisis intervention services to domestic violence and sexual assault victims. Recently, WEAVE admitted a woman and her 8-year-old son, Tucker, to their safe house. By the time Tucker reached the safe house, his father's verbal abuse had convinced him that he was stupid and insignificant. For an 8-year-old boy to no longer smile, to play games, to enjoy life is heartbreaking.

Fortunately, Tucker's mother rescued herself and her son by using the

resources that the Violence Against Women Act makes available. Tucker is now living away from his father, in counseling, and on his way to a happy and healthy future.

Time and time again we hear that programs like this break the cycle of domestic violence. We must view this legislation not just as a women's issue, but as a family issue, as a community issue that touches all of our lives.

It is essential for all past and future victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking that we strengthen and reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. I urge my colleagues to reauthorize an all-inclusive version of the Violence Against Women Act.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the rule but oppose the House Republican substitute, and to urge my colleagues to vote for the real Violence Against Women Act's reauthorization. This passed the Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Real VAWA focuses on key programs to address sexual assault, including the backlog in testing rape kits. It also consolidates programs to ensure that resources are reaching victim services and local law enforcement, and it ensures protection for all victims of abuse and violence.

In Nevada, nearly half of all women have been the victim of some kind of sexual assault, and more than a quarter have been the victim of rape. The Rape Crisis Center in Las Vegas—an excellent organization that I've worked with closely over the years—assists victims in the transition to become survivors. This Congress should support the Center's efforts, not hinder them.

Violence against women is not a game. It is time for House Republicans to stop playing games and to reauthorize this final legislation now.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank you so much for the time.

Isn't it ironic that today, the Supreme Court of the United States of America is considering section 5 of the Voting Rights Act in terms of whether it will continue to apply to the United States of America and those specific States and areas that are included therein. This is being done at the same time we are considering the Violence Against Women Act, which in my opinion should be called a Family Violence Act. I say this because we cannot exclude people because of their sexual orientation.

This is my watch. I have a duty to stand up for those who are being left out or left behind. This act should include the LGBT community, and any

substitute that would remove the LGBT community is a substitute that I cannot support.

Isn't it ironic that today, the Supreme Court is considering section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, and we just had a statue of Rosa Parks made available to the public in Statuary Hall? Friends, it's time for us to come up to the standards of this time, and let's bring all of our people with us. The LGBT community merits our consideration. I will not vote for the substitute. I support the LGBT community.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) to discuss the previous question. Mr. VAN HOLLEN is the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank Ranking Member SLAUGHTER.

I hope tomorrow this House will finally have a chance to vote on the bipartisan Senate bill to prevent violence against women. I hope tomorrow we will also have a chance to vote on a proposal that we've now put forward three times this year to replace the sequester. Unfortunately, the rule reported out of the House Rules Committee denies us that opportunity. So let's just remind people what will happen starting March 1.

Starting March 1, if this House does not take action to replace the sequester, we will lose 750,000 American jobs between March 1 and the end of this year. Those are not my numbers; those are not President Obama's numbers; those are the numbers from the non-partisan, independent Congressional Budget Office—750,000 fewer American jobs by the end of this year if we don't replace the sequester.

This majority in this House has not taken any action this year in this Congress to prevent that sequester from happening beginning Friday, not one step. We have now asked three times for the opportunity to vote on our alternative.

So what's our alternative, Mr. Speaker? Our alternative would replace the sequester with a balanced mix of cuts and revenue generated by closing tax loopholes and tax preferences that benefit the very wealthy.

So very specifically—because it's a concrete proposal—we would get rid of the direct payments that go to agribusinesses, something that used to have bipartisan support because that's an unnecessary subsidy that has outlived its purpose. So that's a cut.

□ 1310

We also say we no longer need taxpayer subsidies for the big oil companies. Guess what? That's an idea that was proposed by President Bush who said taxpayers should no longer be giving these big breaks to big oil companies; they don't need that extra taxpayer incentive in order to keep pro-

ducing oil and making record profits. So we do that.

Then we say to folks who are making \$2 million a year that we're going to limit the number of preferences you can take. We're going to limit the number of tax breaks that you take that allow you to effectively pay a lower rate than the people who work for you. So if you're making \$2 million or more per year, we say you should pay an effective tax rate of 30 percent.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. If you take that balanced combination of targeted cuts and the elimination of tax breaks that disproportionately benefit very wealthy people, guess what happens? You get the same deficit reduction over the budget window, so you reduce the deficit by the same amount as you would get if you allow the sequester to take place throughout this year, but you do it in a way that does not lose 750,000 American jobs. You do it in a way that does not cause disruption at our airports; in a way that does not cause disruption to our food safety system; in a way that does not cause disruption to the nurses who are caring for our veterans in military hospitals and veterans hospitals around this country; and in a way that does not disrupt our military operations.

So, Mr. Speaker, we just have a simple question: Why is it that as we gather here Wednesday, we're denied the opportunity to even have a vote on this alternative, this balanced alternative, to prevent the loss of 750,000 American jobs? We're not asking Members of this House to vote for our alternative, although we think it's a good one and would urge them to do so. We're simply asking that in the people's House we have a vote on an alternative to something that will create these great job losses and that great disruption.

I think the American people are going to ask themselves why we were not even granted that opportunity with less than 3 days to go before we hit that across-the-board sequester, which is just Washington-speak for massive job loss and massive economic disruption.

In addition to the job loss, according to the independent Congressional Budget Office, it will cause one-third less economic output in the United States of America in this year at a time when the economy remains very fragile. So I ask, finally, Mr. Speaker, give us that opportunity at least to vote so people have a choice to prevent the sequester.

I thank the gentlelady from New York, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for

her leadership as the senior Democrat on the Rules Committee.

Today, we have an interesting discussion. We are debating the rule that will enable us to bring to the floor the Violence Against Women Act. As part of the debate on the rule, we are asking a "no" vote on the previous question which will enable us also to not only vote on the Violence Against Women Act but, at completion, to go on to voting on the proposal that the Democrats have to resolve the sequester issue.

I'll start first, though, with the Violence Against Women Act. As of yesterday, it was over 500 days since the Violence Against Women Act had expired. The reauthorization is long overdue. Last year, the Senate, in a bipartisan way, passed a bill that was comprehensive, that did the job. The House Republicans resisted that. Here we are again, this year, last week, the Senate, in a bipartisan way, passed 78-22 the Violence Against Women Act, which is comprehensive and does the job. That means 78 percent of the Senate voted—78 percent of the Senate voted—for this Violence Against Women Act. It means also that all of the women in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike, voted for this act. It also means that a majority of the Republicans in the Senate—a majority of the Republicans in the Senate—voted for this comprehensive Violence Against Women Act.

So the Senate has passed it overwhelmingly with the majority of Republicans supporting it. The President stands ready to sign it. Democrats in the House support it. We will call upon the leadership of GWEN MOORE, who has a similar bill in the House. We stand ready to support the Senate version. The Senate has passed it, we support it, the President is ready to sign it, and, once again, the Republicans in the House are the obstacle to passing this legislation.

It's really hard to explain to anyone why we would say to the women of America, Women of America, step forward; we are stopping violence against women. Not so fast if you're an immigrant, not so fast if you're a member of the LGBT community, not so fast if you're a Native American. What is that? Violence against some women but not others? Quite frankly, the groups that are excluded by the House bill are the groups that are in the most need of protection against violence.

So I would hope that in the course of the debate that we will move on to on the Violence Against Women Act that we will all open our hearts to what is needed to reduce violence in the lives of America's women.

In the meantime, we have a procedure that is not preferable, we have asked over and over again, as the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) has said, this will be the third time we've asked to get a vote on a Democratic alternative. The American people want to know why we can't pass something to avoid sequestration. We have this proposal that is

fair, that does make cuts, that does produce revenue, and that does not impede growth with jobs in our economy. All we want is a vote. Why do we have to beg, hat in hand, for a vote on the floor of the House in this marketplace of ideas? What are the Republicans afraid of? They may be afraid that it will win because it makes so much sense that their Members may be attracted to vote for it. Or they may not want to put their Members on record voting against something that is so balanced, that is so commonsense driven that is a solution, a solution to sequestration.

What does sequestration mean? Well, whatever it means, this is what it equals: sequestration equals unemployment. Sequestration equals job loss. And we just cannot have a slowing down of our economic growth. We cannot afford losing the 700,000 jobs. That's the low estimate that has been put forth by economists and by the Congressional Budget Office itself.

We urge people to vote "no" on the previous question, which means that we would then be allowed to come to the floor to take up the Violence Against Women Act and also to take up the sequestration bill. It is really something that deserves debate on the floor of the House.

The Republican leadership has said, well, we voted on that last year. Last year was another Congress. That Congress ended. How to make a law: Congress ends, we have an election, and a new Congress begins. The Constitution says that bills that relate to revenue or to appropriations must begin in the House. So they said, We did it last year. It doesn't count. Let the Senate begin. That's not what the Constitution says.

So let us take our responsibility and not be afraid of the ideas that people sent us here to discuss. We don't have to agree on every point, but we certainly should have an opportunity on the floor of the House. People across the country are talking about this. You can't turn on any media without their talking about this. The only place we can't talk about it or get a vote on it is on the floor of the House of Representatives. That's plain wrong.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, a "no" vote on the Republican Violence Against Women Act, and a "yes" vote on the bipartisan Senate bill when we have an opportunity to vote on that.

□ 1320

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 15 seconds to Mr. VAN HOLLEN for clarification, and following that I will yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, just three numbers: 750,000 fewer American jobs, cutting growth in GDP by one-third, not economic output but growth

in GDP by one-third. That's one number. The second number: three, the number of times we've tried to get a vote on this. The third number: zero, the number of times our Republican colleagues this year have tried to resolve the sequester issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in support of this comprehensive and bipartisan effort to end violence against women.

The Violence Against Women Act recently passed by the Senate properly updates this crucial legislation for the 21st century by providing necessary resources and support to all victims of domestic violence regardless of their race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation. An overwhelming 78 Senators, including 23 Republicans, recognize the need for these protections, and I'm thrilled that we're finally moving to recognize that same.

I'd like to express my gratitude to the champions of this bill in the House, including the gentlelady from New York. Several of my colleagues and I, along with hundreds of groups and thousands of concerned citizens all across the country, have worked tirelessly these past few weeks to make sure that the voices of survivors and advocates could be heard over partisan debate. That is why the bill we consider today reflects the needs of vulnerable populations that have been ignored in the past. It will give Native American tribes the tools to hold abusers accountable, LGBT survivors the protection they need to access services, and immigrant survivors the independence necessary to escape violence.

I'm proud to vote in favor of a comprehensive Violence Against Women Act for my constituents, for my children, my daughters, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

May I inquire of my colleague if he has any more requests for time?

Mr. NUGENT. I do not.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. If not, then I'm prepared to close.

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

This has been a wonderful day for us in some way because we are finally debating the Violence Against Women Act, with a great possibility of passing the Senate bill, which will protect all women in the United States and not just some. It's terribly important that we do that. And I think we may have caused some confusion there as we talk about violence against women, and we're also talking about the previous question which deals purely with sequestration. I would like to close speaking about that.

I think everyone understands the importance that we attach to the Violence

Against Women Act, but we are also very much concerned about sequestration. The reason we have brought it up on a previous question on the Violence Against Women Act is we've had absolutely no other opportunity to bring it up.

The American public has been told over and over again that twice this House has passed legislation dealing with sequestration. All of us know—I'm not sure the public knows, but let me make it clear—that anything done before December 31 of last year is no longer valid.

Nothing has been done this term to stop the sequestration. The only effort that has been made to do so has been done by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member of the Budget Committee. He has a very moderate request, one that does not do great harm either to the employment situation in the country or to the output of GDP, and what he said was terribly important.

What we are about to embark on here is totally unknown. We know that it's bad. I think everybody has understood that it's bad. Why we would continue to do it is beyond my imagination. But let me make it absolutely clear here: no opportunity has been given to our side of the House to even attempt to deal with sequestration. This is it.

For any Member of the House of Representatives who would like to go on record saying that they don't want sequestration to take place on March 1, this is your only opportunity. So we are asking that you will vote "no" on the previous question so we can at least go on record in this House and we can do our very best to stop what, by all accounts and by what all important economists say, will be an unmitigated disaster.

If we defeat the previous question, we will offer the amendment, which will allow the House to vote on replacing the entire sequester for 2013 with savings from specific policies that reflect a balanced approach to reducing our national deficit. It is a balanced approach, Mr. Speaker, not a meat-ax across the board.

We have to act now if we're going to avert this crisis. I can't reiterate enough that this is our only chance. If we're going to avoid the unnecessary cuts to essential programs, the time is now.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues in this House, because none of us want to face that abyss, to vote "no" to defeat the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I support this rule and encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

Every day, people flee their homes because of violence they suffer at the hands of a domestic partner. If there's something we can do to stop that violence to save those women and children, then we need to do it. Inaction is unacceptable. I've seen the consequences of doing nothing too many times when it comes to domestic violence.

We have before us a rule that provides the House with multiple options on how we take a stance against domestic violence right here and right now. We may not agree on which of these two visions is the best one, but I think we can all agree that something must be done. That's why I say to you, Mr. Speaker, support the rule before us today. If you want to do something, anything, then you need to start with voting for the rule. That's the first step. That's what we need to pass first and foremost so we can debate those options.

Some folks here will like the Senate's vision of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act more than they like the House alternative. Others have problems with the Senate bill and think the House's plan is the way to go forward. Either way, if you want to take a stand against violence against women, then you need to support this rule.

This rule is how we move to the next step, to debate the options before the House to ensure that law enforcement departments, organizations like the Dawn Center back home, and victims of domestic violence can get the support that they so desperately need.

There are those who want to confuse this with another issue before this House, but this is the issue that we have today, the issue on domestic violence, the Violence Against Women Act.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 83 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 699) To amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to repeal and replace the fiscal year 2013 sequestration. 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill 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. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution * * * [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule * * *. When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous ques-

tion on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. NUGENT. With that, 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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1514

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) at 3 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 83; adopting House Resolution 83, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.