

Cleaver	Israel	Pingree (ME)
Cohen	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Connolly (VA)	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Conyers	(TX)	Rangel
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Richardson
Courtney	Kaptur	Rothman (NJ)
Crowley	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Rush
Davis (IL)	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	T.
Deutch	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Dingell	Loebach	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lofgren, Zoe	Schiff
Doyle	Lowey	Schwartz
Edwards	Lujan	Scott (VA)
Ellison	Lynch	Serrano
Engel	Maloney	Sherman
Eshoo	Markey	Smith (WA)
Farr	Matsui	Speier
Fattah	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
Filner	McCollum	Sutton
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Fudge	McGovern	Tierney
Garamendi	McNerney	Tonko
Green, Al	Meeks	Towns
Grijalva	Miller (NC)	Tsongas
Gutierrez	Miller, George	Van Hollen
Hahn	Moore	Velázquez
Hastings (FL)	Moran	Visclosky
Heinrich	Murphy (CT)	Wasserman
Higgins	Nadler	Schultz
Himes	Napolitano	Waters
Hinche	Neal	Watt
Hirono	Oliver	Waxman
Hochul	Pallone	Welch
Holt	Pascrell	Woolsey
Honda	Pastor (AZ)	Yarmuth
Hoyer	Payne	
Inslie	Peters	

## NOT VOTING—16

Amodei	Granger	Sires
Bachmann	Paul	Slaughter
Camp	Pelosi	Wilson (FL)
Carnahan	Pence	Young (FL)
Giffords	Polis	
Gonzalez	Reyes	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1956

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote numbers 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, and 791. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote numbers 787, 788, and 790. I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote numbers 786, 789, and 791.

Bill, question, rollcall vote number, vote:

H. Res. 430, Final Passage, 786, no;

H.R. 2250, Cohen Amendment No. 22, 787, aye;

H.R. 358, Motion to Recommit, 788, aye;

H.R. 358, Final Passage, 789, no;

H.R. 2250, Motion to Recommit, 790, aye;

H.R. 2250, Final Passage, 791, no.

## HONORING MAJOR THOMAS E. CLARK

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. The motto inscribed on the Prisoners

of War/Missing in Action flag reads, "You are not forgotten."

I rise today to Honor Major Thomas E. Clark, a U.S. soldier who served in Vietnam, an airman who gave his life defending this country.

Originally from Emporium, Pennsylvania, Major Clark studied at Penn State before being accepted into the Air Force Academy and graduating in 1963. In 1969, while flying an F-100 in a mission over Laos, Major Clark's aircraft was hit by enemy fire. The plane went crashing into the jungle canopy. The wreckage was not found and Major Clark went missing in action for 4 years when, in 1973, the Air Force determined Clark was "killed in action; body not recovered." In 1991, some of the wreckage of the F-100 was found. Finally, in 2009, an investigation found the remains of Major Clark.

Next week, the Air Force will bring home Major Clark to Emporium, Pennsylvania, to have him properly laid to rest in his family's plot. I'm truly proud and honored to recognize his bravery and thank him for making the ultimate sacrifice for this country. He will not be forgotten.

Major Clark, may you rest in peace.

HONORING MILKEN AWARD  
WINNER SETH BROWN

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Wayzata West Middle School math teacher Seth Brown on winning the 2011 Milken Educator Award. Seth was honored by the Milken Family Foundation for his efforts to close the achievement gap and use creative technology in the classroom, particularly in using iPods as math aids.

This award is known as the "Oscars of Teaching." The Milken Family Foundation gives these outstanding teachers a \$25,000 award, with no strings attached. Seth plans to use this money to help pay his graduate school bills as well as donating some of the money to the local PTA, which was a strong supporter of his use of technology in the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Seth Brown on his achievement and for also being an outstanding teacher. And to Seth and all the other teachers out there, I want to thank you for doing what you do in educating and inspiring the next generation of American leaders.

□ 2000

## THE PROGRESSIVE MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOWDY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

I'm Congressman KEITH ELLISON. We're claiming this hour on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, which tonight is going to feature a number of critical issues, all focusing on the importance of the rights of women and the assault they have been under in this Congress.

To lead off our hour and to get started, I first want to introduce a good colleague from the great State of California—Oakland, California, who's going to lead off our hour.

Congresswoman BARBARA LEE has been a champion of the rights of all people. She has been a champion for peace and justice around the world. And she has been an unswerving champion for civil and human rights not only for women, but for all people around the world.

So let me first recognize, on behalf of this Special Order hour, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

Congresswoman LEE, I yield the floor to you.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much. I want to thank our chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus for yielding and for your amazing leadership on so many tough issues that we're dealing with.

Tonight we're joining with the Congressional Pro-Choice Caucus, of which I'm also a member. And so I'm very pleased to be down here with my colleagues to discuss this critical issue, a very sad day, quite frankly, for women in this country, and especially for poor women, for African American women, for women of color.

This bill which was passed today is really just the newest attack in what I have been calling from day one the Republican "war on women." Today, instead of focusing on ways to find jobs for Americans, the Republicans are focusing on eliminating family planning programs, undercutting women's right to choose, and returning our country, unfortunately, to the days of back-alley abortions, which I remember very well.

H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act—can you believe that, "Protect Life Act"—forces coverage for women to be dropped from State exchanges, which will cut off millions of women from affordable, comprehensive health care. In fact, this bill makes it virtually impossible for any health care plan to offer abortion coverage and allows hospitals to refuse to provide lifesaving care to a woman who needs an abortion to protect her own life. This is unprecedented, and it should have been rejected on this floor.

This legislation really though is part of a coordinated, nationwide war on women. Just last week, the Republican-controlled House Foreign Affairs Committee voted to defund the United Nations Population Fund, an organization that supports lifesaving activities for women and families in post-conflict and disaster situations. And before that, the very same committee voted

to reinstate the Global Gag Rule, which prevents health care providers from even discussing or offering comprehensive health services to women and girls. This affects women and girls in sub-Saharan Africa who bear the brunt of the global AIDS pandemic. And of course, as usual, the Republicans have targeted Planned Parenthood, putting increased requirements on how this nonprofit, which provides affordable health care to low-income women, black women, women of color, Latino women, Asian-Pacific American women—if Planned Parenthood wants to receive Federal funding, they have to stop, mind you, providing women reproductive health choices, which really is only a tiny percentage of what Planned Parenthood offers to women.

Sadly, it does not end there. It's nothing less than shocking that after holding the fiscal year 2011 budget hostage over their controversial policy proposals, the anti-choice leaders in the House seem eager to pick up some of the very same fights once again this year.

The Republican appropriations bill continued this attack on women's reproductive health by eliminating title X, the Nation's family planning program, defunding Planned Parenthood, cutting funding for science-based teenage pregnancy prevention initiatives—prevention, mind you—and redirecting those funds into failed abstinence-only programs. And the list goes on.

So let's just return to the battle, though, that took place today. In putting forward this very divisive bill, Republicans made the false claim that the Affordable Care Act needs to be amended to ensure that United States taxpayer dollars are not used to fund abortions. The fact of the matter is that it's very disingenuous, and it's just wrong. And it's really amazing that that argument could even be put out there because the fact is the Hyde amendment has been in effect for decades, since 1976, and the Affordable Care Act continues the Hyde amendment policy, despite my personal view that it should be overturned.

The Republicans continue to invent new ways to try and erode and deny women their constitutionally guaranteed rights purely on religious beliefs and on ideology. This is a democracy; this is not a theocracy. The religious views of some—and I am a woman of faith, but I have to tell you, the religious views, the personal religious views of some should not dictate public policy for all.

I'm also aware of the fact that sometimes we as a Nation really don't give young women and girls the right tools to prevent unintended pregnancies in the first place. But the fact of the matter is this Republican war on women and this bill will put more lives at risk, isolate us from women who have no money, who are poor—especially women of color, who have become really central targets of these efforts. Evidence of this is seen all over the coun-

try, and very recently in the form of very offensive billboards that denigrated African American women in my own district in Oakland, California—which we fought against and which were quickly taken down. Now, by using a combination or at least trying to use a combination of law and guilt, these efforts undermine really the basic health care rights of women, African American women, low-income women, women of color.

As SisterSong Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective states, “Black women make decisions every day about whether to parent or not, not just whether to give birth. Those who think they should dictate our choices won't be there when the child is born to help us fight for better education, increase childcare, keep our kids out of jail, send our children to college, or get affordable health care.”

This war on women must stop. We cannot and we must not allow the Republicans to turn back the clock on women, on choice, and on our access to health care. So I urge my colleagues to fight this war, fight against these unnecessary and these harmful initiatives that keep coming forward that continue to do damage to women and that continue to try to erode our basic health care and basic human rights. We need to create jobs rather than continue to deny health care to women.

Thank you, Mr. ELLISON, our cochair of the Progressive Caucus, for your leadership. Once again, I want to thank you for your leadership on our jobs initiative, on each and every effort that the Congressional Black Caucus has mounted. And thank you for joining with the Congressional Pro-Choice Caucus in our efforts to protect women and protect our basic rights.

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank the gentlelady from California, BARBARA LEE, a fearless, unrelenting struggler for the rights of all people.

Tonight we're here with the Progressive Caucus. We're talking about the harm that H.R. 358 would do to women's rights. It would hurt the rights of women in three important ways. It would deprive women of comprehensive health insurance coverage, eliminate emergency lifesaving protections, and undermine health care benefits in the Affordable Care Act. For the first time, private health care insurance coverage for women will be restricted.

And so to carry the discussion further, and from a very important perspective, my good friend from New York—also a tireless fighter for the rights of all people, a leader in the area of choice and women's rights—let me yield the floor to CAROLYN MALONEY.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you, Congressman ELLISON, who is the chair of the Progressive Caucus. Thank you for your leadership on this and in so many other areas. And thank you for having this Special Order on this disturbing vote that took place today in the Congress.

There is no question and there can be no debating the fact that the bill that

the Republicans put forward endangers women's health, puts their lives at risk, and intrudes on their constitutionally protected liberties.

The bill extends the reach of government more cynically and in a very profoundly disturbing way. And that is why President Obama put out a veto threat on Wednesday that he would veto any bill that would restrict insurers from paying for abortions, saying, in the President's words, “it goes too far.” And I'd like to quote from the President's statement on this.

“Longstanding Federal policy prohibits Federal funds from being used for abortions, except in cases of rape or incest, or when the life of the woman would be endangered.”

□ 2010

The Affordable Care Act preserved this prohibition and included policies to ensure that Federal funding is segregated from any private dollars used to fund abortions for which Federal funding is prohibited. So that's very, very clear, and I don't understand why the Republicans forced a vote on this, like the other anti-women, anti-choice, anti-respect of a woman's right to choose and her judgment have failed so far in the Senate.

So I feel that instead of looking at creating jobs, which is the priority, and the Republican majority has consistently said that jobs and job creation is their priority, but then they spend their time on debating a bill that even their own Members admit the President will veto and it is going nowhere in the Senate. So instead of creating jobs, they remain focused, Mr. ELLISON, on creating obstacles for women to access safe, legal, and badly needed health care.

This bill, H.R. 358, is an attack on women's access to reproductive health services and our fundamental right to lifesaving medical care. It is stunning in its scope, appalling in its indifference, and outrageous in its arrogance.

Americans want Congress to create jobs, strengthen the middle class, and find bipartisan consensus. So it's time to end this attack on women and get to work on our top priority, or what should be our top priority, creating jobs.

This bill is just another attempt to keep women down and back and not to protect their constitutional rights and access to the health care that they feel they deserve.

I thank the gentleman for organizing this and for yielding to me.

Mr. ELLISON. Congresswoman MALONEY, I wonder if you would yield for a question.

Mrs. MALONEY. Absolutely.

Mr. ELLISON. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists wrote, in order for women to receive the best health care and disease prevention, they must have access to all medically appropriate, legal medical procedures, regardless of the ability to pay. The American College of Gynecologists and Obstetricians opposes

legislative proposals to limit women's access to any needed medical care. These proposals can jeopardize the health and safety of our patients and put government between a physician and a patient.

My question to you is: This bill, H.R. 358, the very deceptively titled Protect Life Act, does this bill have scientific and medical backing behind it as the opposition to this bill has? In other words, do they have trained medical professionals operating on the basis of science supporting their position?

I yield to the gentlelady.

Mrs. MALONEY. No, they do not. In fact, the scientists and the medical professions all support access to all medically appropriate legal medical procedures. There are some times when the fetus is not—could not live or has died and is in jeopardy of causing, literally, the destruction of organs or even death of the woman. So this is, I would say, a life-taking bill from the health and welfare. And this bill also allows hospitals to deny lifesaving care. This is a big change in our values and our procedures in this country.

And I want to point out very importantly, Mr. Chairman, that at the same time they are restricting reproductive choices, Republicans are limiting access to family planning and primary care by their efforts to defund Planned Parenthood, which is a primary care provider to most women for their basic health in this country. And these actions I would label just plain too extreme.

Mr. ELLISON. The gentlelady has been very eloquent about the assault on women's health. If you don't mind, given that you are a member of the Joint Economic Committee, which is a bicameral committee, bipartisan committee, I think, in the Congress, I wonder if you don't mind talking with me just a little while about the assault on women's economic prospects.

In your opinion, Congresswoman MALONEY, how will assaults and cuts to Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security impact women, given that women statistically live longer than men and have a greater representation for use of those important programs? Are we seeing not just the health but also the economic viability of women under threat, as well as seeing important programs that women rely on disproportionately cut into?

I yield to the gentlelady.

Mrs. MALONEY. It is true that women disproportionately rely on government programs and, regrettably, women are the largest segment, older women are the largest segment of people living in poverty. So the discrimination that has existed in pay, there is still, for over 30 years, an unexplained gap between men and women, the pay gap, well over 20 percent; and this then translates into your Social Security—less Social Security, less pension—and the need for Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare to help women.

And also, a lot of women that are around the age of 55, when their

spouses die and they've been stay-at-home-mothers and wives, they lose the coverage that their husbands have, and there is a gap that's not there until they reach Medicare age of 65. So they rely disproportionately on these safety net programs.

So any cuts—and I hear from my constituents, I know that you do, too, that say: I can't absorb another cut to my Medicare; I can't absorb a cut to my Social Security. And I believe that's one reason why Democrats have fought so hard to keep that safety net in place for working men and women in our country.

Mr. ELLISON. I appreciate the gentlelady shedding some light on this issue because the fact is that today we were looking at a bill that would restrict women's health care access.

But you know that we have been trying to fend off assaults on the viability of women's economic situation. We still know that women earn about 80 cents for every dollar men make. This is unexplained, or it is explained. It's explained by gender discrimination.

And I think it's important for even men to take account of this important fact, that if your wife or partner is being discriminated against in the workplace because she's a woman, then your total family income is being hurt because of sex discrimination in the workplace. It's important that men and women come together to fight these attacks on women's rights because, even though the direct victims of this kind of discrimination are women, this invariably hurts the entire family, and so this is everybody's business to stand up for the rights of all people.

I tell you, one of the things that really concerns me is this gap in pay between men and women. The median weekly—women earn about 81.2 percent of what men earn. In addition to that, they have assaults on their access to health care. When you add these things up, what does this mean in terms of the majority's commitment to women's rights? What does it all add up to?

I wonder if the gentlelady might offer her views on this subject.

I yield to the gentlelady.

Mrs. MALONEY. I think all of those efforts, whether it's the Pitts bill that passed today, I think it's a very dangerous bill that threatens women's ability to even purchase private health insurance that includes abortion coverage with their own money, and codifies broad and troubling conscience provisions. And it's another attempt to unravel the health care law while at the same time expanding anti-choice laws that will harm women's health.

□ 2020

That's an anti-woman agenda that just passed this great body. And when you talk about the assaults on programs that women disproportionately rely on, it is another step that will keep women down and back. And I'm proud of the Democrats for standing up

for women, children, and families. You rightfully pointed out that when you discriminate against a woman, you discriminate against her husband and her children. And you and I know that it takes two working parents sometimes two jobs by each parent to pay the bills and keep the food on the table. So these are very serious concerns and ways that we need to fight back and stand up for the women of America.

Mr. ELLISON. Now, Congresswoman MALONEY, I know you might have to run, but I appreciate your standing here with me tonight because I think that the people of America, Mr. Speaker, need to hear from a person like yourself, Congresswoman MALONEY, who has been laboring in the vineyards of economic and civil rights, both, for a few years now. You know what you're talking about, you've been doing this work, you've served the community for many years, and I just want to see if I can get your views on another issue, and that is that one of the things that Republicans have been doing is having this program to cut, cut, cut government services, which, of course, has led to reductions in public employees.

So, for example, while the private sector has added about 1.7 million jobs over the last 12 months—of course, during the Bush administration we were losing jobs—the public sector has lost about 400,000 jobs. When you consider the fact that women are disproportionately likely to work for the public sector, their employment decline has been particularly hit when public sector employees get laid off.

So I want to keep connecting the dots tonight, if I may. We started out the conversation with the cuts to women's health in this deceptively entitled bill, the so-called—I don't even want to repeat it because it is so wrong, but the Protect Life Act, actually it's a "not to protect women's life" act.

Mrs. MALONEY. That's a better name.

Mr. ELLISON. But then we move on to cuts to important programs that older women are disproportionately relying on, we move to the wage gap, and now we're seeing that these cuts to public employees are falling more heavily on the shoulders of women.

You mentioned an agenda. Are we really talking about an agenda here, not just a single program but a whole agenda?

I yield to the gentlelady.

Mrs. MALONEY. Well, the gentleman is correct to connect the dots, and you are absolutely correct that when you cut education and health care, these are the two areas that women are employed in predominately. In many cases they have achieved leadership positions in these two fields. Yet these are the two areas that have been cut the most in the municipal areas across the country that have hurt our States and our cities.

And the gentleman is very correct to point out that you cannot cut your way to prosperity. Many economists

have come out in support of President Obama's jobs bill, including two Nobel laureates. And one economist that I like to read because he is employed by the private sector, which means if he's wrong he's going to get fired, and he was a Republican economist in that he was the chief analyst for Senator MCCAIN when McCain ran for President, and this is Mr. Zandi. And Mr. Zandi said that President Obama's economic plan, the jobs bill that he's put out, would create next year 1.9 million new jobs, add 2 percentage points to the GDP, and also cut the unemployment rate by at least 1 percent. I use his numbers since he was Senator MCCAIN's adviser and economist.

But there is a drumbeat of economists across the country that are saying you cannot cut your way out of a recession and that we are getting dangerously close to a double-dip when you combine all these massive cuts with what's happening in Europe and the instability with the countries' finances and certain of our allies, and this is an extreme challenge here at home. And economists have universally said that we need to invest and continue to work to get the economy moving by investing in job-creating areas such as the infrastructure bank and such as rebuilding our bridges and making sure they're safe.

One part that I particularly like as a former teacher is the plan to rehab schools and make them ready for the 21st century. That will employ people across this country and invest in making our schools appropriate. I know that even in the great State of New York, some of our schools are not properly wired for computers. Mr. ELLISON, when you and I were in school, all you needed was a pencil. But, today, our young people need computers. They are competing not with the people in the class but with people around the world. And they need to have high-tech access, and our schools have to be wired for the 21st century.

And the investment in creating good jobs by building high-speed rail to move us into the 21st century and repairing our infrastructure with our roads and our trains in so many ways, and also making sure that our teachers, our police and our fire are not laid off during this recession when we need to invest in helping America.

Every economist will tell us the best investment we can make for the future of our country is to invest in education. We can't afford to not be competitive with modern schools and not competitive with the proper number of teachers so that our classrooms are not so overcrowded. So that is a particular area that I like in this particular jobs program.

Mr. ELLISON. I like the jobs bill as well. It's too bad that the American Jobs Act was not even able to be debated in the Senate yesterday. You would think that we could debate the bill at least. If Republicans have different ideas about job creation than we

do as Democrats, I'm okay with that. Let's debate it, and let's get it out on the floor. But they don't even want to have the debate. You mentioned the public sector getting support.

Mrs. MALONEY. I would like to applaud what you just said. I truly do believe that there is no idea that is so frightening or threatening that it can't be debated in the United States Congress. And so I agree with you. Let's have a debate. The President has put forward his program. Let's see what the Republican program is. Let's bring it down, have it debated, and let's have the economists across the country and across the world weigh in on which program is going to get the economy moving and move us with greater strength in the growth of our economy.

Mr. ELLISON. Congresswoman MALONEY, as you know, the President challenged them, the Republicans, to do this. He said, look, I'm putting my bill up here, you bring yours up here, and we'll see which one creates more jobs. And folks like Mark Zandi, an economist who has advised both Republicans and Democrats, took an evaluation. He said the Republican plan is not likely to create any jobs next year. Well, people are employed this year and next year. And what are they doing about it? Well, they're just cutting basic services in local government, they're getting rid of health regulations in the EPA, they're doing things like creating cultural fights, like the one they did today, trying to sort of divide Americans based on people's deeply held views about the issue of abortion when we need to be getting people back to work, which is, in my view, trying to take our eye off the ball.

But I just wanted to throw out a couple of facts that I think may contribute to the dialogue. Here's one: In September, 2011, a month that just passed, the public sector lost 34,000 jobs. Eighty-two percent of those jobs were women's jobs. This is an important fact. This is according to the National Women's Law Center. And then also, the damage in the public sector was driven largely by cuts to local governments' education. I'll say that again. And, Congresswoman MALONEY, you're a former teacher, so I know this is close to your heart. The damage in the public sector was largely by cuts to the local governments' education.

In this field, one that is nearly three-quarters women, 24,400 jobs were lost from August to September. Since the recovery began in 2009, this field has lost more than 250,000 jobs. What does it mean when we, as a society, disinvest in public education?

□ 2030

One thing it means is that women workers will be hit harder because that's who three-quarters of our teachers are. It also means that our young people will be deprived.

As a person who has been in the classroom, Congresswoman MALONEY, what does that mean when a classroom

goes from 20 kids to 35 kids? What does it mean to the kids who might not be catching on to the lesson or who may have a learning disability? I mean, is it even possible for a competent, caring teacher to teach all the kids given that some may need extra help?

Mrs. MALONEY. There is scientific data that, as schools are overcrowded, the quality of the teaching goes down. That's very troubling when you talk about the hemorrhaging of so many jobs.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are 14 million people out of work, and there are 3 million jobs that are out there now. So, if we could miraculously fill those 3 million jobs overnight, there would still be 11 million Americans out of work and looking for jobs. For every job opening, there are five people, at least, standing in line for that job.

What I find particularly troubling is that many of these people are young people who have invested in their education and who are burdened with huge student loans, but they can't find employment. They are facing a terrible situation. Studies show that, if you can't find employment in the early years of your career, it affects your earnings and your self-confidence and your productivity for the rest of your life. For no fault of theirs, they are confronting, really, the worst employment situation in my lifetime and, really, in decades.

So we need to work together. If there were one area in which the Republicans and Democrats should work together, it's in creating jobs and moving our economy forward. Regretfully, some people don't want to do anything until the 2012 election, but the people who are out of work can't afford to wait until 2012. It is really incumbent on us to act now to help them.

Mr. ELLISON. Congresswoman MALONEY, you just mentioned a moment ago this idea of reinvesting in our schools. Today, I had a visit from a number of superintendents in my State of Minnesota. They were not all from the Fifth Congressional District, which I'm honored to represent, but they were from a cross-section around the State.

They told me that there were literally nearly 100 different school districts going to the voters for a referendum so that they could pay their basic expenses because the State government is backing off its commitment to education because the Federal Government is backing off its commitment.

The fact of the matter is we have a disturbing trend here.

They said, Look, if we could just get the part of the American Jobs Act passed that would help us with these old and outdated and rupturing boilers, these old, beat-up pipes, this poor ventilation, these windows that are not opening and closing properly—if we could get some help with our capital budget—that would free up money for

us to hire teachers and to do some real instruction.

What do you think of that part of the American Jobs Act which goes to this issue of investing in our schools and in keeping our teachers out there and preventing 280,000 teachers from being laid off? What do you think about this idea of, really, just making sure that the infrastructure of our schools is sound for our kids and for the people working in the schools?

Mrs. MALONEY. You focused, really, on one of the critical parts of the President's jobs proposal—modernizing our schools.

Not only would it help you through this period by creating good-paying jobs to modernize the schools and to keep the teachers working—and, I would say, the police and fire—but it also invests in better education, a better environment for our young people to learn and grow, and to modernize the schools to the extent that they are wired appropriately for the 21st century. These are important areas that we need to look at and think about.

I also want to point out the unemployed. The jobs aren't out there, so when you don't continue the unemployment insurance, there is no hope for these people. It's better for them to continue looking for a job and to continue trying and not to give up hope so that they continue working towards that end.

I just want to tell you how much I enjoyed sharing with you information on the jobs program for the President and, really, of the opposition's agenda—our friends on the other side of the aisle—to keep women down and back, of disproportionately cutting programs that aid women, of disproportionately going after, literally, their constitutional rights to make the choices that are legal in our country which provide the best health care for them.

The Progressive Caucus has always stood up for women, children, and families, and I want to thank you and the caucus in a programmatic way for standing up for women, children, and families and also for organizing this Special Order.

Mr. ELLISON. Congresswoman MALONEY, I know that you have to take care of other important responsibilities, so I want to just thank you.

I just think it's important, Mr. Speaker, for people to know that Congresswoman MALONEY is the author of the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights Act. It's when you go and use your credit card and don't get back a bunch of fees and stuff you didn't even bargain for—terms being changed without any notice to you. When you used that credit card and were late on that card, sometimes they used to jack you up on the card you weren't even late on because you were late on some other card. They can't do that anymore.

When people benefit from credit card justice, you have to thank CAROLYN MALONEY. You cannot just use that card and say, Wow, things are better

than they used to be with this card. They're better because CAROLYN MALONEY fought tirelessly.

This was an uphill climb for you. It wasn't easy. You had to work on editorial boards; you had to work on Republicans; you had to work on Democrats; you had to work on the Senate. You had to just pound the pavement night and day; yet you got that done, and this country cannot pay you back for the good work you did.

Congresswoman MALONEY, I wish you many, many, many years here in this Congress; but no matter how long you stay here, I just want you to know that that accomplishment is a towering achievement which will stand the test of time and is historic. So I don't want to hold you up, because I know you've got to go do some important things, but I just didn't want you to leave without my mentioning how important that service that you gave was, not to mention the work that you do every single day, including the work you do on the Joint Economic Committee, on the rights of all people as well as on women's rights.

Mrs. MALONEY. I just want to thank the gentleman for his statement.

The Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights, according to the Pew Foundation, saved consumers over \$10 billion in the last year by cutting out unfair, abusive, deceptive practices—and I'm using the terms from the Federal Reserve. I am proud that it helps Americans better manage their credit.

No longer can people raise rates any time, for any reason retroactively on their balances, trapping them, really, in a never-ending cycle of debt. I had many constituents who had purchased items, and they had paid so much in interest over that time that they could have paid for the car or the washing machine; yet they still had not paid it off. This is wrong and unfair.

Central to this bill, it gives consumers the opportunity and the right to make a decision. If they're going to raise their rates, they must notify them, and the consumers have the choice of whether they opt in to a higher rate or pay off their cards and go to another provider that may have a lower rate. So it puts more competition in the system. It has lowered the interest rates, the fees, and has really helped consumers.

I want to say that we were cochairs of the Consumer Justice Caucus. We started that, really, to build support for the bill, and you were a strong part of helping me pass it.

Mr. ELLISON. That's right.

Mrs. MALONEY. It was difficult, but I'm proud that the President signed it into law and that it is now benefiting Americans and allowing more of an ability for them to control their own businesses, their own assets, their own credit. I must say, when it did pass the House, there was strong Republican support for it in both the House and the Senate.

Mr. ELLISON. Yes, there was.

Mrs. MALONEY. I am pleased that Americans have this added benefit in their lives.

Thank you so much for your leadership. It has been a pleasure to join you tonight.

□ 2040

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank you again, Congresswoman MALONEY. You have a wonderful evening and, again, thank you for all of the great work you have done and thank you for your help tonight. I am just going to remain a few more minutes to help the American people understand what is in the American Jobs Act.

The American Jobs Act is an excellent piece of legislation. We have been talking a lot tonight here at this Progressive Caucus Special Order about women's rights, but we've also been talking about jobs and, of course, these subjects go right together.

But it's important, as we talk about this subject tonight, that the American people know what's in the American Jobs Act. The American Jobs Act will put Americans to work when jobs are needed, which is now, not later, not next year, not some other time, now.

The emphasis of the American Jobs Act is immediacy. It will preserve and create jobs now. It will put money in the pockets of working Americans now. It will give businesses job-creating tax breaks now. And it will provide a boost to the economy right now.

So this is what we're aiming for in the American Jobs Act. Republican colleagues have failed to produce any kinds of a jobs bill. The only time they ever talk about jobs is when they're not talking about jobs. They say that cutting important health regulations will create jobs. They won't.

They say that cutting taxes for people at the very top of the American income scale, corporations, will create jobs. It won't. Corporations already are awash in corporate profits. They're not using the money to create jobs, and they won't use the money even if we give them more money because what they don't have is customers. Why don't they have customers? Because people aren't working.

Americans need to be put back to work, and when businesses find that they have customers and orders they will hire people to fill those orders. When they have excess capacity, they are not going to just hire people. They're going to hire people when they need to hire people because they've got sales that they need to make.

Of course, this is a basic and fundamental difference of opinion that we have with our Republican colleagues about the way the economy works. But I do believe that after years and years of trying, trickle-down economics must be discarded, must be dismissed, must be thrown away as a discredited economic theory.

Trickle-down economics, which is the Republican mantra—they believe in trickle down. They believe if you give

rich people enough money maybe the money will trickle down to the rest of us.

This has been a failed economic policy. They are wrong. They have been proven to be wrong, and yet they never stop coming here saying, if we just gave the rich people another tax cut, if we just gave the rich corporations, who don't pay any taxes now, more money. If we just gave them more money, all those profits that they have they might maybe hire somebody. They're wrong, and history has proven them to be wrong. I don't know why they cling to this outmoded, discredited, discarded theory of economics, but they cling to it.

The American Jobs Act would do something different. It would put people back to work, and with people working again, this will boost aggregate demand, aggregate meaning added up, cumulative demand. And with that, more customers, more people with money to buy and spend, this economy will take off and the store will hire people because they will have a reason to. So the American Jobs Act goes right to the problem.

But here's the other thing. The American Jobs Act calls it a Jobs Act, and it is. But there's something also very important that the American Jobs Act does that I wish got more play. It invests in our Nation's basic infrastructure, and it invests in our Nation's human capital.

It puts targeted tax breaks—not just giving money to rich people and corporations who have plenty of money and who won't use it to hire people—but it gives targeted tax breaks and puts money in the pockets of American workers and American employers so that they will add and grow jobs. And it puts the money into job training, which does skill upgrades for our people so that they are more productive and better at what they do. The job saving and job-producing actions will put paychecks into the economy, will provide vital economic needs and invest in economic growth.

I just want to quote Mark Zandi for a moment, this economist who works for both Republicans and Democrats. He is unbiased, and here's what he had to say. He says, President Obama's job proposal would help stabilize confidence and help keep the U.S. from sliding back into recession, add 2 percentage points to GDP, and add 1.9 million jobs and cut the unemployment rate by a percentage point.

Now, that's a big deal. Wouldn't the people watching this show, Mr. Speaker, like to be able to see America go from 9.1 percent unemployment to 8.1 percent unemployment? I think this would be great, and here's the best thing about the American Jobs Act. It's paid for.

Unlike the two wars that the Republicans got us into in the last decade, unlike the big PhRMA Medicare part D, unlike the tax breaks under George Bush and the Republican majority,

these, the American Jobs Act, is paid for.

President Obama has offered pay-fors in this which cover the cost of the bill. This is something the Republicans are not used to, which is why they may not quite understand the American Jobs Act. They like to spend money that we don't have. That's what they did with the two wars, Iraq and Afghanistan. That's what they did with the Bush tax cuts. And that's, of course, what they did with the Big Pharma giveaway.

But this bill is paid for. The American Jobs Act is paid for, which may be why they don't support it, because they don't understand things that are paid for. They just understand spending and adding to the deficit.

But the Republicans have not only failed to produce or support any jobs bill of their own, other than just absurdly claiming that getting rid of important health regulations is going to create jobs, they're refusing to even act on the American Jobs Act. In fact, Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR has already said the Jobs Act was dead, his words.

The Republicans not only failed to produce or support any jobs bill, they are refusing to act on this bill, and I think ERIC CANTOR has also said it was "unacceptable," another word that he used. Now, that's, again, fine with me.

If the majority leader could say, look, I don't like this part, but I can maybe go for that part, let's get the bill up here, all four amendments, debate this thing. But by all means let's start talking about jobs around here. The Republicans are more invested in protecting millionaires from paying their fair share than helping their middle class to work.

By a 16-point margin, Mr. Speaker, the Americans support President Obama's proposal to create jobs, 52 percent to 36 percent. Fifty-two percent of Americans want it, 36 percent of Americans don't. By a 16-point margin Americans support President Obama's proposal to create jobs.

By a 15-point margin, more Americans trust President Obama to do a better job creating jobs than congressional Republicans, 49 percent to 34 percent. Sixty-two percent of all Americans, Mr. Speaker, and at least 62 percent of the people surveyed support a balanced approach. That means cutting spending and raising revenue to reduce the deficit.

And, Mr. Speaker, three out of four Americans support raising taxes on Americans with incomes of \$1 million or more. These are the so-called job creators Republicans like to talk about. The only problem is they haven't been creating any jobs.

But what will create jobs is businesses and small businesses that have orders and have consumers and have people working and have people who have money to spend at their businesses. That's what will create jobs.

I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, to point out to the American people

that the three components of the American Jobs Act are designed to win. One, the American Jobs Act and reinvesting in America, preventing up to 280,000 teacher layoffs and keeping first responders, firefighters, and police officers on the job. Two, modernizing at least 35,000 public schools across the country.

Mr. Speaker, myself and Congresswoman MALONEY were talking about this. She's a former teacher. We were talking about supporting new science labs, Internet-ready classrooms, school innovations, both rural and urban. But as I talked about earlier today, the superintendents and the schools that I represent, some of them have boilers that are about to go out, windows that aren't fixed up right, roofs that need repair, basic stuff.

This would put thousands of Americans back to work as we give our young people a good decent place and a modern place to go learn in.

□ 2050

Of course, another part of the American Jobs Act, all under this important category of investing in America, is making immediate investments in infrastructure, modernizing our roads, our railways, our airports, and putting hundreds of thousands of Americans back to work; Project Rebuild, a great effort, an effort to put people back to work, rehabilitating homes and businesses and stabilizing communities, leveraging private capital and scaling up successful models of public-private collaboration; and, of course, expanding wireless Internet, expanding wireless Internet to 98 percent of Americans by freeing up the Nation's spectrum.

The second element of this important American Jobs Act which Republicans should support and Democrats do support is tax cuts for employers and employees. This is not just some giveaway. This is targeted tax cuts that are designed to succeed.

Some of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle like to say Democrats don't like tax cuts. This is not true. We are for tax cuts when they are targeted and designed to help the average working American, not just some giveaway to rich people. And, of course, I have nothing against rich people. I like rich people. In fact, one day when I leave Congress and go back to the private sector, maybe I can be one of them. But the fact is right now, right now the fact of the matter is we need tax cuts that are targeted and designed to spur the economy, not just giveaways, hoping and praying that the money will trickle down.

Specifically what I'm referring to is cutting payroll taxes in half for 160 million workers next year. The President's plan will expand the payroll tax cut passed last year to cut workers' payroll taxes in half in 2012, providing \$1,500, a tax cut to the typical American family, without negatively impacting the Social Security trust fund.

This is important because things are tough around the house. Things are tough around the kitchen table, and Americans could really use this, particularly now. It will help maintain aggregate demand, and it would be very helpful.

Also, allowing more Americans to re-finance their mortgages at today's near 4 percent interest rate, which can put more than \$2,000 a year in a family's pocket.

Also, cutting the payroll tax in half for 98 percent of businesses. The President's plan will cut in half taxes paid by businesses on their first \$5 million in payroll.

Mr. Speaker, another important element of the American Jobs Act that has to do with this tax issue is a complete payroll tax holiday for added workers or increased wages. The President's plan will completely eliminate payroll taxes for firms that increase payroll by adding new workers or increasing wages. That's a targeted tax cut. That's a tax cut that's going to get people to hire somebody, not just some give money to rich people and hope they hire somebody. This is a targeted tax cut that will actually be of value.

The next one, Mr. Speaker, encouraging businesses to make investments by extending 100 percent business expensing into 2012. This extension would put an additional \$85 billion in the hands of businesses next year.

The third thing that I think is important to mention is helping the unemployed with pathways back to work. Some people like to refer to our social safety net. I think it is much more effective to refer to it as our social safety trampoline. That is when you fall down, America, caring, compassionate Nation that we are, provides a way for people to bounce back. And that is what the third element of this American Jobs Act does. Returning heroes, offering tax cuts to encourage businesses to hire unemployed veterans.

Now, I know there are some Republicans who would vote for this provision. There's got to be. Businesses that hire veterans who have been unemployed for 6 months or longer would receive a tax credit up to \$5,600, and that credit rises to \$9,600 for veterans who have a service-connected disability. Now, I have just got to believe that there are a few Republicans who would give a green vote to a good piece of legislation like that.

In the same vein of helping our unemployed, the most innovative reform to the unemployment insurance program in 40 years, as part of the extension of the unemployment insurance, to prevent 5 million Americans looking for work from losing their benefits, the President's plan includes innovative work-based reforms to prevent layoffs and give States greater flexibility to use unemployment insurance funds to best support job seekers and connect them to work, including in this innovative program things like work sharing, unemployment insurance for workers

whose employers choose work sharing over layoffs.

Second, improve reemployment services for long-term unemployed through counseling eligibility assessments.

Three, new bridge to work program. This plan builds on and improves innovative State programs where those displaced take temporary, voluntary, or pursue on-the-job training.

I'm about at the end of my time tonight. This has been the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and we are here with the progressive message, which we like to come to as often as we can. What we're talking about tonight is standing up for the rights of women. More than 50 percent of Americans are female. My daughter is one of them. I just want to argue that for this country to rise to its full measure of greatness, we have to have full and equal rights for everybody, especially women.

Today, there was an attack on women's constitutional rights today. There also have been assaults to programs which women disproportionately rely on like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and also employment sectors that women are employed in such as the public sector. This is too bad, and we need to stand up against it. But also jobs. Instead of dealing with divisive social issues where Americans of honestly held conscience disagree very severely on this issue of pro-choice/pro-life, instead of dealing with these old issues, things that we have been fighting over for years and will probably never be solved, why don't we talk about jobs.

And so we did go into the American Jobs Act tonight where we talked about the key parts of this important bill by President Obama. First, investing in our infrastructure and in our people skills; second, targeted tax breaks designed to put people back to work, not just giveaways for the rich; and, third, help for the unemployed. These are three very important features which I believe will really help America.

All we want is a chance to debate these issues on the House floor. We can bring amendments, debate them, vote some up, vote some down, but it's just wrong to deny the American people a chance to get a good jobs bill. So tonight, I just want to wrap up by saying that it's always a pleasure to come before the House and discuss critical issues facing the American people.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### CURRENT EVENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do appreciate the opinions of our friends across the aisle and those who

have spoken here tonight, and I know we both have similar goals—get people back to work. But when I hear my colleague across the aisle say Republicans keep proposing plans that have proved failures, the truth is the failures that the Republicans have supported were the things that our Democratic friends were in favor of.

I sure like President George W. Bush, but in January of 2008, he took a page right out of the Democrats' playbook—proposed a \$160 billion stimulus, \$40 billion of which went as rebates to people that didn't pay any income tax. So you had people getting rebates that didn't put any "bate" in. That money really didn't do any good.

And then we come around and end up in late September or early October of 2008, having unfortunately the Treasury Secretary appointed by a Republican, pull a page out of the Democratic playbook and help the folks on Wall Street that contribute and vote 4-1 for Democrats over Republicans. Bailed them out.

□ 2100

Some of us made clear you don't abandon free market principles to try to save the free market. If you have to abandon free market principles to save the free market, it's not worth saving. The trouble is we've gotten away from free market principles and that's why we were in trouble.

We had friends across the aisle that were demanding that loans be made to people that couldn't afford the loans. We had friends across the aisle that were verifying here in this room and in other hearing rooms that, by golly, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, they were healthy, there were no problems, when it turned out they were rotting from the inside.

So, apparently, as smart as my dear friends are across the aisle, they have not been taught history very well. The things that have failed are the very things that are being proposed again. The \$700 billion wasn't enough. Actually, President Bush's Treasury Secretary, the second worst Treasury Secretary in the history of our country, exceeded only now recently by Secretary Geithner in just how poor a job has been done, but they spent maybe \$300 billion, \$250 billion of the \$700 billion. So the Obama administration got about \$400 billion, \$450 billion of that \$700 billion. President Bush unfortunately listened to "Chicken Little" Paulson as he ran around saying that the financial sky was falling. That ended up all going to President Obama and Secretary Geithner for them to squander, which they have, and basically used it as a slush fund, in fact.

Then we're told we have got to build bridges. We have got to do infrastructure. How could anybody disagree with infrastructure? Well, most of us didn't disagree with doing infrastructure as long as it was governmental functions. The trouble is the President had \$400 billion, \$450 billion from TARP still