

want fairness and a chance to make a living.

But one of the things Secretary Clinton talked about is, yes, this administration is actually enforcing labor laws in Guatemala, this administration will enforce labor laws in the labor component of our trade agreements across the world because we as a country stand for a more egalitarian workforce. We stand for workers rights. We believe workers should organize and bargain collectively, if they choose. We believe in a minimum wage. We believe in workers' compensation. We believe in workers' safety. We believe in human rights. All of that is about the labor movement.

You can support labor rights in Guatemala, but you better be damned sure you are supporting labor rights in Wilmington and Columbus and Cleveland and Detroit and Dover, DE, and everywhere else. Those were some of the words Secretary Clinton said. I am obviously expanding on them.

I looked back in history and some of the worst governments we ever had, do you know the first thing they did? They went after the trade unions. Hitler didn't want unions. Stalin didn't want unions. Mubarak didn't want unions. These autocrats in history did not want independent unions. So when I see Egypt or I see old Soviet Russia and history tells me about Germany—I am not comparing what is happening to the workers in Madison or in Columbus to Hitler and Stalin. But I am saying, history teaches us that unions are a very positive force in society that creates a middle class and that protects our freedom.

So don't tell me you support unions internationally but you don't support unions here. Don't tell me you support collective bargaining in Poland but you oppose collective bargaining in Zanesville or Dayton, OH, because, frankly, that is inconsistent and ultimately it is not taking the side of people whom we are supposed to represent.

I am proud of my State. About two or three blocks from the capitol, in 1876, the capitol in Columbus, the American Federation of Labor was formed. What we know now as the AFL/CIO began in Columbus, OH, in 1876, when some workers got together thinking there was some strength and some safety in numbers and they were going to have a better standard of living and better country and more freedom for all if they began to coalesce in a group of people—not to bust a hole in the State budget, not to hurt companies but to make sure the workers were represented and get a fair shake in the society.

It is all pretty simple. We have a strong middle class in this country because we have the right to organize and bargain collectively. We have a strong middle class in this country because we are a democracy, because workers can share in some of the wealth they create for their employers. So I hope 10 years from now—I know in Delaware this is

something we fought for with manufacturing and middle class and all—we will see, as productivity goes up and profits go up, that workers' wages will go up too. It is the American way. It is what we stand for. Nothing in our society, frankly, is more important than a prosperous middle class and what it brings to us in terms of freedom and equality.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first hour and the Republicans controlling the next hour.

The Senator from Maryland.

#### EFFECTS OF H.R. 1 ON WOMEN AND CHILDREN

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am here representing 150 million women in the United States of America, and they are bewitched, bothered, and bewildered by what the Congress, particularly the House of Representatives, in H.R. 1, has done to women.

Women all over America have to balance their family budgets, so they know our United States of America needs to get its fiscal act together. They also know we need to live in a more frugal time. They understand that. But what they do not understand is that in H.R. 1, with what the House did, the entire burden has come from a very limited amount in discretionary spending. When you take off defense, homeland security, women and children are actually thrown under the bus. Well, they are mad as hell, and they don't want to take it anymore. So the Democratic women today, in the hour we have been given, are going to lay out the consequences of what H.R. 1 means.

Now, we in the Senate, and we, your appropriators—of which there are many women on the committee: LANDRIEU, FEINSTEIN, MIKULSKI, MURRAY—we know we have to bring about fiscal discipline. The Senate Appropriations Committee has already worked to reduce the appropriations in the Senate by \$41 billion. Now that is really meat and potatoes. So we feel we have already given an option, but, my god, enough is enough.

Let me give you just the top 10 reasons why H.R. 1 is bad for women and

children and examine why we are ready to negotiate so we do not have a shutdown of the government. We need a final settlement on the budget for 2011.

Let's just go through them. One, it defunds the entire health care reform law. That is bad for saving lives and saving money. It also eliminates title X family planning money. It jeopardizes breast cancer and cervical cancer screenings for more than 5 million low-income women. They even went after Head Start. Even little kids in Head Start had to take it on the chin. It is going to cause 218,000 children to be kicked off of it. But they go further. For the group who says they are pro family, family values, and that they have to defend life, yet they slash the nutrition programs for pregnant women by \$747 million, affecting 10 million low-income pregnant women, new mothers, and children. They also cut funding for prenatal care, and they went after afterschool programs.

They cut funding for Pell grants. They terminate funding that helps schools comply with title IX. They cut funding for job training, which hurts over 8 million workers, many of them getting new training for the new jobs for the new economy. And something very near and dear, I know, to the Presiding Officer: they went not after Social Security in terms of the benefits but went after the people who work at Social Security—the Social Security offices where they work on everything from the regular Social Security benefit to the disability benefit. If H.R. 1 passes, over 2,500 people at Social Security will be laid off. In my home State, they were out in the streets in front of the Social Security headquarters saying: What about us? We come every day. We give you the actuarial information on how to keep it solvent. We make sure checks are out there on time, and in snowstorms we are showing up to make sure everything works. But at the end of the day, we are going to be told we are nonessential.

This whole nonessential drives me crazy because, ironically, Members of Congress are considered during a government shutdown. Well, if we are going to be essential, we need to get real about how we come to an agreement on this Continuing Resolution.

So, Mr. President, we in the Senate feel we have given \$41 billion already, and we think H.R. 1 just goes too far. It goes too far by leaving so many things off the table.

Now I want to talk about health care reform. We had many goals during health care reform, one of which was to expand universal access. Again, the Presiding Officer has been a champion of that, a stalwart defender of the public option, and a stalwart defender of the single-payer system. As we worked on it and came up with a compromise, what was very clear was that there were certain things we just had to do. One was—whether you were for the public option or not, whether you are for a single-payer system or the system

we have now—we knew we had to end the punitive practices of insurance companies.

We knew in the health care reform bill we also had to improve quality measures that would actually save lives and save money. We also knew that if we had a strong preventive care benefit, we, once again, through early detection and screening, could minimize the cost to the insurance companies and the Federal budget and also the terrible cost to families who face all kinds of problems but particularly cancer. So that is why we passed the health care reform.

Over in the House, they thought it was going to be really cool to say: We could repeal health care—remember, they said “repeal and replace.” They have only talked about repeal because they do not know how to replace. So they decided, through H.R. 1, to defund it, to take the money away. So let me just outline very quickly what we think it means to women and children.

First of all, we ended gender discrimination by the insurance companies. Before we reformed health care, women were charged 40 percent more in many instances for health care premiums as compared to men of comparable age and health care status—40 percent more. There was a gender tax of 40 percent put on by the insurance companies. We ended that.

The second thing is that the insurance companies were treating simply being a woman as a preexisting condition. So we went to the floor, and with the great guys of the Senate we passed the preventive health care amendment. We wouldn't let them take our mammograms away from us. We also made sure our children could have early detection and screening in schools. And, because it is not about gender, it is about an agenda—we included men in these preventive health services as well.

Now, if we agree to that element in H.R. 1, we will take away the preventive health care benefits. They guarantee coverage of preventive care and screenings, such as mammograms for women under 50. We cannot go back.

It would also repeal the quality measures, such as the famous Pronovost checklist developed in Maryland by a Hopkins doc. When used at just Michigan hospitals alone, it is a simple, low-tech way to lower in-house infections in hospitals. In Michigan hospitals, it has saved 2,000 lives and has saved the State \$200 million each year.

We can do this. There are so many things that are important in the health care reform bill. We cannot defund it.

As we move ahead in what we hope will be a negotiation and a settlement, we, the women of the Senate, will not surrender the women and children of this country. We will not let them be thrown under the bus and run over by H.R. 1.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor to one of our very able advocates,

someone who has been a stalwart defender of childcare in our country, Senator PATTY MURRAY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for being our fearless leader and making sure women have had a voice at the table for many years. I wish to thank her for leading this important debate and discussion today about how H.R. 1 will affect women and children in this country in a very dramatic and very troubling way.

Since Wall Street came crashing down on Main Street, I have been very proud to work with so many of my colleagues on efforts to get our economy back on track and our workers back on the job. We all know we have a long way to go. So many families in our country today are fighting to stay in their homes. Small businesses are struggling to keep their doors open. Many of our workers are still trying desperately to find work or they stay up at night wondering what would happen to them and their families if they are the next ones to get a pink slip. So that is why I am so disappointed that at the very moment we need to be working together to invest in our future, cut spending responsibly, and support those American families, House Republicans have decided to take a slash-and-burn approach to the budget that would devastate our economy and cost us hundreds of thousands of jobs.

While many Republicans came to this Congress this year promising to work with Democrats to focus on the economy, they have now chosen instead to push their extreme, antichoice agenda of a minority of Americans who want to go further than ever to restrict health care options for women and families. So I am here this afternoon with my women Senate colleagues to talk about that aspect of the budget proposal they sent to us because this assault on women's health will be truly devastating if it is acted, and this extreme agenda does nothing—nothing—to further our goals of getting our economy back on track.

The House Republican-proposed budget they sent to us completely eliminates title X funding. That is funding for family planning and teen pregnancy prevention. And it includes an amendment that completely denies funding for Planned Parenthood. That is so wrong. It would be absolutely devastating for 3 million men and women across the country who depend on those services.

I recently got a letter from a woman named Elizabeth. She lives in Bellingham, WA. She is 28 years old. Elizabeth told me she is uninsured, and she depends on her local Planned Parenthood for her annual checkups and for family planning. She told me that cervical and breast cancer run in her family, and she does not know what she and her husband would do if she was

not able to access this care that Planned Parenthood provides.

Elizabeth is not alone. I have received hundreds of letters just like hers, women telling me about the health care they got at Planned Parenthood and the critical services title X allows them to access.

Title X supports cancer screenings, family planning, and preventive services for more than 5 million low-income men and women and families across this country. In my home State of Washington, more than 100,000 patients who otherwise would not have access to care are able to receive treatment thanks to these services. The House Republican plan would devastate this for women, and honestly, it just does not make sense. In my home State alone, family planning services at title X-funded health care centers prevent over 21,000 unintended pregnancies every year. Without these services, our States and the Federal Government would end up spending far more in services for low-income families over the long run. So cutting off these important programs would be wrong, and I am going to do everything I can to stop it right here in the Senate by fighting alongside my women colleagues.

That is not all the House Republicans are proposing in their extreme budget. They want to slash nutrition programs for women and children by \$747 million. That would end support for close to 10 million pregnant women, new moms, and infants in the country. That is not what we stand for.

They want to cut funding for prenatal care by \$50 million. That is going to jeopardize care for 2.5 million women and 31 million children. That is not what we stand for.

They want to cut \$39 million from the childcare and development block grant that would end the child support many low-income families need so the parents can go out and work and put food on the table. That is not what this country stands for.

They want to slash \$1 billion from Head Start. That not only cuts off comprehensive early childhood services for nearly 1 million children, but it puts tens of thousands of teachers and staff out of a job. Guess what. Most of them are women.

The House antifamily agenda is wrong, and we are not going to stand for it. We do need to cut the budget. We do need to work together to bring down the deficit. But we are not going to do it on the backs of women and children. We are going to do it responsibly. We are going to do it right. I have said many times on this floor a budget is a statement of our values. It is a reflection of our priorities as a nation. I feel very strongly that we do need to work together to invest in our future and get our economy back on track, put people back to work, and make sure families get the support they need so they feel secure again. The House Republican spending fails to meet those goals. It

fails our women, it fails our families, it fails our communities, and it fails our Nation.

So I urge my colleagues to reject the House Republican slash-and-burn approach on the backs of women and children and families and work with us to propose a responsible long-term budget reduction plan that reflects the values for which this country stands.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York, Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Although our newest Democratic Senator, she has been a strong advocate, and she is not new to being a strong advocate. I yield her 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for her leadership.

I rise today to join my colleagues and speak out about the failure that is taking place on the other side of Capitol Hill right now in the Republican-controlled House. The election last November was not a mandate for any one political party or extreme ideology. It was a mandate for action—for solutions that will create jobs and get our economy moving again. But rather than focusing on jobs and responsible budgeting, House Republicans have engaged in an all-out assault on the health and well-being of women, children, and families in America.

The American people voted overwhelmingly for debate on economic solutions that will create jobs. That is what many of my colleagues and I have been trying to focus on during this Congress. But what are the House Republicans focused on? Not creating jobs, not creating ideas for how we are going to create economic growth, but undermining the health care rights of millions of American women and families.

We have an undeniable job crisis on our hands and they are ignoring it. Unemployment is still far too high. Having a national rate of close to 10 percent means real unemployment is closer to 15 or 20 percent when we look at all of those who are underemployed, working less hours, or who are no longer looking for work. Twenty-two percent of our youngest veterans coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan are unemployed. That is more than one in five. What are they doing to address those problems?

Rather than debating the solutions for how we create this economic growth or how we spur growth among small businesses and how we help our middle-class families, they are focused on degrading women's rights—basic privileges and health care priorities and safety nets for the women and children who are most at risk in this country. They have shown a heinous disregard for the health and safety of women and young girls, and they have worked to undermine their ability to buy affordable, accessible health care.

Republicans lament at length that government is too intrusive, too large, too overblown. But tell me: What is more intrusive than telling every woman in America that their decisions are going to be made in Congress, not by them, not by their doctors, not by their families?

Let's look at the facts. The temporary budget bill that came out of the House slashes critical funding for prenatal care, that unbelievably important care when a woman is expecting. They have cut nearly \$750 million from nutrition programs for pregnant women and their children. They have cut access to lifesaving breast and cervical cancer screenings for more than 5 million American women. Their budget destroys early childhood education, taking nearly \$1 billion from Head Start and nearly \$40 million from childcare, robbing nearly 370,000 American children of early childhood learning. They have even cut more than \$2 billion from job training programs that we need to prepare America's workforce for the jobs of today and the jobs of tomorrow.

What kind of priorities does that demonstrate? It demonstrates a disregard for the future of this country—for our children, for our women, for their health, their well-being, their education, for job training, for the future. This debate is much more than about where the dollar figures lie. It is about what will happen to the women and children they are now disregarding.

Let's look at the single mother who has two jobs and needs this support to feed her children. Let's look at the young women in every State of this country who will now get cancer because they were denied those precancer screenings. Let's look at the children who will never walk through the door of a university because they were denied access to the early childhood education that would have prepared them so that they could achieve their God-given potential.

We cannot slash and burn our way to a healthy and growing economy. It is time these Members of the House get serious about economic growth, about our small businesses, creating access to lending, creating a tax policy that is going to create economic growth. Those are where the solutions lie, not undermining the health, well-being, and future of our women and our children and America's prosperity.

I now yield the floor to my colleague from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, Senator MIKULSKI has asked that I control the time for our side, so I will stay on the Senate floor. What time does that time expire?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator controls 37½ more minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much.

Mr. President, I am here today to speak out along with my colleagues for

the women and children in our Nation who would be gravely harmed by the House budget, H.R. 1. I hope we get the chance to vote on that House budget because I think the American people need to look at what is going on with my Republican friends who are in charge of the House of Representatives.

We all know we need to reduce the deficit, but we also know the right way to do it. We did it with President Bill Clinton. We did it with a mix of revenue-raisers and smart cuts, plus investments that paid dividends. We did it in such a way that we actually had a surplus at the end of the day, and 23 million new jobs.

When George W. Bush took over, the surplus was gone and the job creation was gone. Compared to 23 million new jobs, under President George W. Bush there were 1 million jobs created, and he left us with soaring deficits and the deepest recession since the Great Depression. That is the story. It has a beginning, a middle, and we are about to write the end.

I will be honest. I will stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are willing to fight for the people of this country and the middle class of this country.

According to leading experts, the budget bill, H.R. 1, would destroy 700,000 jobs, hurt our families, and, to me—this is my personal opinion—it looks as though they have a political vendetta against women, children, and a healthy environment on which they rely because they need to breathe clean air and drink clean water. All of this is on the chopping block in the House.

Let's look at the title X family planning program. It is zeroed out. It is zeroed out in H.R. 1, the House Republican budget. What does title X do? Title X provides contraceptive services for 4.7 million women nationwide, almost 5 million women nationwide. It helps prevent almost 1 million unintended pregnancies. Now, here are my friends on the other side joining with us. We are all saying let's make sure we cut down on the number of abortions. What is one proven way to do it? Contraception. They would prevent almost 1 million people from getting that kind of service.

Planned Parenthood operates 800 health care centers nationwide. I know my colleagues are very aware of health centers. They provide 720,000 breast exams nationwide, 730,000 pap tests. What does this mean? Hundreds of thousands of women just in California, and millions nationwide, go to Planned Parenthood to make sure they don't have breast cancer, they don't have cervical cancer, they don't have an STD, they don't have AIDS. And if, God forbid, it turns out they have any of these things, they can get treated. Without this, they are in deep trouble. Everyone in America knows early detection is where it is at. So if I said the impact of the Republican budget would mean more abortions, more breast cancer, more cervical cancer, more STDs,

more AIDS left untreated, that is not hyperbole. It is not an understatement. That is a fact.

I wish to talk about Nicole Sandoval from Pasadena, CA. She wrote to me and said: Please support Planned Parenthood because—by the way, our colleagues eliminate Planned Parenthood getting \$1 of Federal funding. What are they implying? That the funds are used for abortion services. That is an outright lie. Since the 1970s, the Hyde amendment has said not one penny of Federal funds may be used for providing abortions, so they know that is an untruth. Yet they let it hang out there. The money Planned Parenthood gets is for just what I said: cancer prevention, sexually transmitted disease prevention, and contraception.

So what does Nicole say? She was 23 years old. She had no insurance. Planned Parenthood was there for her and caught her cervical cancer early enough to save her life. So I stand with Nicole Sandoval.

I am here to stand with Leah Garrard from Torrance. She wrote to me about a horrific incident in which a member of her family was raped. This young woman went to Planned Parenthood. She didn't know where else to go. She wrote and said: Planned Parenthood directed her family member to a local hospital, got in touch with the local sexual assault nurse examiner, and contacted her family to come and take care of her. Had her family member not gone to Planned Parenthood, she truly, she wrote, would not have survived that experience. I stand with Leah and her family and with Planned Parenthood.

Zero out Planned Parenthood? Where are we going? We are certainly not going forward. We are going backward. I remember the years when George Herbert Walker Bush was on the board of Planned Parenthood. Planned Parenthood is a bipartisan operation. If you walk in the door, they don't ask whether you are a Democrat, Republican, registered voter, or who you are. You get taken care of, and the community is healthier.

Now, in the remaining time I wish to talk about the attack on the environment in which women and children have to live. The attack on the Environmental Protection Agency is the biggest cut of any agency in the Federal Government by our Republican friends over in the House.

Seventy percent of the American people say the Environmental Protection Agency should do its job. Sixty-nine percent think the EPA should update EPA Clean Air Act standards with stricter air pollution limits. Sixty-eight percent believe Congress should not stop EPA from enforcing Clean Air Act standards.

Sixty-nine percent believe that EPA scientists—not Congress—should set pollution standards. Look at this. In this tough time, when the country is divided, almost 70 percent of our people say leave EPA alone. But, no, our Re-

publican friends whack that agency by one-third—billions of dollars—and not only that, instruct that agency with riders telling them they can't enforce air pollution standards for soot. We know what happens when you are exposed to soot. We are looking at other exposures as well—small particulate matter which gets into our lungs and is lodged in our lungs.

They say we can't look at cement manufacturing and go after the mercury that comes out of those stacks—the mercury and arsenic. Do we think the American people want dirtier air? Is that what the election was about? I just came out of a tough election. I have to tell you that not one person ever came up to me and said: Please, I want more soot. I need more smog. It is missing out of my life. Oh my God, when my kids drink water, I want them to get contaminated.

Forget it. That is not what the election was about. It was about jobs, jobs, jobs. OK. Let's look at a photo of a child who pays the price when the air is dirty. Children's exposure to air pollution worsens asthma attacks and causes lost days at school, emergency room visits, and for older people, it causes heart attacks, stroke, cancer, and premature death. According to the American Lung Association—and we have another picture—asthma is one of the most common chronic diseases in children. It affects 7 million children. Here is a photo of another beautiful baby. I am showing you this as a grandma. I am going to take another 2 minutes and then turn it over to Senator SHAHEEN.

Look at this picture, this face. Look at those eyes. I wish to say to our friends in the House, what are you doing? You are throwing women and children under the bus. You are throwing the middle class under the bus. I, for one, am going to tell the truth. During my campaign, people would say: What are you going to do to win? How are you going to win? I said: I have a secret plan. I am going to tell the truth. I am going to just lay it out there.

Look, the truth is, EPA released a new report that was asked for by Congress. Congress demanded to know the benefit of the clean air law. They said that, in 2010 alone, 160,000 cases of premature deaths were avoided. Can you believe that? They want to turn all this back. The American Lung Association says H.R. 1 is toxic to the public health. They say it would result in millions of Americans, including kids, seniors, and people with chronic disease, such as asthma, being forced to breathe air that is unhealthy. It can cause asthma, heart attacks, strokes, cancer, and shorten lives.

A Republican President set up the EPA—a Republican President—Richard Nixon. What are you doing over there? I already said that George Herbert Walker Bush was on the board of Planned Parenthood. Richard Nixon signed the Clean Air Act. They don't

either seem to have a sense of history or they have moved so far away from some of the proud traditions of their party that they have lost total touch.

In closing, we have to stop this war against women and against children. We are going to have to stop this war against the environment. We are going to come forward with deficit reduction that will equal what they do, but we will do it in a way that doesn't hurt job creation and doesn't hurt our kids, our families, and the environment we all depend upon.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the devastating impact that H.R. 1, the House Republican continuing resolution, would have on women, children, and families nationwide.

House Republicans would eliminate the \$317 million title X Family Planning Program, which provides critical health care services to over 5 million Americans each year, including 1.2 million in California.

House Republicans would also exclude Planned Parenthood, which serves over 2.9 million women annually, from Federal funds. These services provide necessary preventive health care including: contraceptive services, education, cancer screening, annual exams, STD and HIV testing, smoking cessation, flu vaccines, and well baby care.

It is ironic for people who do not believe in abortion to propose these cuts, when in fact, through family planning, contraception, and education, title X programs prevented 406,000 abortions nationwide in 2008 alone; 83,600 of those were prevented in California. So by cutting these programs, the numbers of unplanned pregnancies and abortions will increase.

How does this make sense? These cuts are not about deficit reduction. They are biased, politically motivated cuts that will result in increased Federal spending. These cuts hurt women. In California alone, these programs helped save \$581 million in public funds in 2008.

Nationwide, title-X supported family planning centers saved taxpayers \$3.4 billion in 2008. Every dollar invested in helping women avoid unintended pregnancies is estimated to save taxpayers \$4.02. Some might not think these programs are important, but I judge they are.

In the past 3 weeks alone, I have received 28,000 letters urging me to oppose eliminating title X and Planned Parenthood.

Over 153,000 Californians have signed a petition to express their opposition towards defunding Planned Parenthood.

I have heard from uninsured college students, who only make \$10,000 a year and cannot afford basic preventive care without title X and Planned Parenthood.

I have heard from outraged constituents who point out title X family planning programs have been in place since

1970, and have provided cancer screening, annual exams, and prenatal care for millions of women.

I have heard from young women who went to Planned Parenthood for STD screening and birth control, when they had no other place to go. Half of all pregnancies in the United States every year—about 3 million pregnancies—are unplanned.

I have heard from women pleading with me to preserve Federal funding to Planned Parenthood; telling me that the cancer screenings they received saved their lives. I have heard from women all over my State, whose primary source of health care is a woman's health center like Planned Parenthood.

Eliminating this funding will also cause a rise in another epidemic: teen pregnancy. Teen pregnancy costs taxpayers an estimated \$9.1 billion annually. Without title X programs in California, teen pregnancy levels would have been almost 40 percent greater.

House Republicans would also eliminate the \$110 million Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program, which has the potential to serve 800,000 teens by 2014. In California, the estimated cost from teen pregnancy to taxpayers in 2004 was at least \$896 million. From 1991–2004, unintended teen births in California cost taxpayers a total of \$17.3 billion.

California has managed, through programs like the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program, to reduce the rate of teen birth in the State by 46 percent from 1991 to 2004. This saved California taxpayers an estimated \$1.1 billion in 2004 alone. The House Republicans plan to slash funding all but guarantees the rate of teen pregnancy will go up, and costs for taxpayers will increase.

Almost 9 in 10 adults believe there should be direct efforts in communities to prevent teen pregnancy. Once again, this is not about deficit reduction; it is about harming women's health, and taking away comprehensive education.

House Republicans would also cut \$1.3 billion from Community Health Centers, which is 45.8 percent below fiscal year 2010 levels. Community Health Centers serve over 20 million patients nationwide, who otherwise cannot receive care.

Almost one-third of patients are women of childbearing age, 37 percent are age 19 and under, and 13 percent are children under 6. Ninety two percent of this patient population is low income, meaning they may not have anywhere else to go. With these cuts, 11 million patients are at risk of losing access to primary and preventive care provided by these health centers.

In California, almost 458,000 patients would immediately lose access to care, and \$31.8 million in funding would be immediately lost. By defunding the health reform law, House Republicans block critical consumer protections in the law.

The health reform law will decrease costs for everyone, but particularly for

women who have been charged more for insurance, simply because of gender. In 2014, insurers will not be able to charge women higher premiums than they charge men. Additionally, the medical loss ratio requires insurance companies to spend at least 80 or 85 percent of premium dollars on actual medical care, not on profits. With these and other benefits in the law, women make great strides towards equality in the insurance market.

The House Republicans plan would allow women to be charged more for insurance than men, and prohibit enforcement of this medical loss ratio requirement. This would allow insurance companies to discriminate against women, charging more for health premiums simply because of gender, while companies continue to rake in enormous profits.

The assault on women's health from Republicans in the House is astounding to me. Obliterating family planning services that have been around for 40 years, slashing teen pregnancy prevention, prohibiting funds for primary health services is nothing short of irresponsible.

We need to look carefully at our spending and we need to make cuts, but those cuts can't be politically motivated and they shouldn't put us at risk of another recession. I do not support any biased cuts that harm women and children.

Mrs. BOXER. It is my honor to yield to Senator SHAHEEN for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I thank Senator BOXER for her leadership. I thank Senator MIKULSKI for the work she has done to organize us this afternoon, to point out just what is being proposed by our colleagues in the other Chamber.

We need to address our long-term deficit. We all know that. We need to make some hard choices to balance the budget. But there is a right way and a wrong way to do that. The right way is to first look at things such as eliminating the billions of dollars in duplicative programs that were identified just this week by the GAO. The wrong way is to address the deficit by doing what our colleagues in the House did when they slashed funding for services that are critical to middle-class families and our future prosperity.

The House Republican budget cuts include a \$1.1 billion cut to Head Start and childcare. This is money that is critical to so many working families in New Hampshire and across the country. Let me put it into perspective. A cut this size would mean that nationally over 200,000 children would be kicked out of Head Start and an additional 360,000 children would lose childcare opportunities.

I have three daughters and seven grandchildren. So I understand, like so many mothers do, how difficult it is to juggle work and family obligations. I

appreciate how important it is for working parents to understand that their children are being supervised by quality caregivers. I also understand that a working parent can be a productive member of the workforce only when they know their children are safe.

When I was Governor, we asked for a report to be done on childcare in New Hampshire. We found in that report that there is a direct result between quality childcare and the productivity of their parents in the workforce. Childcare is expensive. Quality childcare can easily top \$10,000 per child per year—an amount that is out of reach for so many working families who are trying to make ends meet—especially in this economy.

The unemployment rate in this country is 9 percent. We should be putting our focus on creating jobs today and helping to build a strong workforce for the future. The proposed budget that the House Republicans have done would do the opposite.

Research shows that the quality care and early childhood development is critical to preparing our children for tomorrow's jobs. We know that the first 5 years are the most important in the development of a child's brain. During these years, children develop their cognitive, social, emotional, and language skills that form a solid foundation for their lives.

Economists point to the strong return on investment we get for intervention early in life. For every \$1 we spend on quality early learning, we return up to \$17. These same experts cite an increase in productivity, workforce readiness, and in graduation rates among children who are in quality early childhood programs. In addition, they have also found out that for those children there is a decrease in special education, crime rates, welfare dependency, and in other behavioral problems.

One of the things that made me aware of this direct relationship was going to my first Governors' conference after I got elected. I heard a presentation on brain development. The presenter showed that the brain scan of a child who had quality early learning looked very different than the brain scan of those children who did not. They showed a graph that demonstrated that the way a child's brain develops is inversely proportional to our investment. In other words, we are making the smallest investments in the years when it would make the most impact on how a child develops. This made such an impression on me that I went back home to New Hampshire and focused so much of my time as Governor on the importance of early learning.

When I became chair of the education commission of the State in my second term as Governor, this became the top priority for me and for ECS. There is no doubt—and we can look at all the

data—that helping working families afford quality childhood care and education programs has immediate and long-term benefits.

I urge my colleagues to reject the shortsighted, reckless cuts that have been made in the House Republican budget and, instead, invest in our future and the future of our children and families.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my colleague from New Hampshire. I yield 5 minutes to Senator KAY HAGAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I also rise to speak for women and children across this country but especially in North Carolina.

Prenatal and postnatal maternal care translates into healthy moms and healthy families.

Children who receive regular well-child visits to their doctors and recommended immunizations live healthier lives. They can go to school and just be kids.

But the House-passed continuing resolution for the remainder of fiscal year 2011 makes draconian cuts to community health centers and the title V maternal child health block grant—two programs that are vital in reducing maternal and child mortality.

If these cuts go through, nearly 4 and a half million women and children under age 6 are at risk of losing care.

Consider that community health centers account for 17.2 percent of all low-income births, but prenatal patients at health centers are less likely to give birth to low birth weight babies compared to their counterparts nationally. It is because they are getting good prenatal care.

Moreover, rates of vaccination among children receiving regular care at a health center are uniformly higher than those of children with another source of care.

With the House-proposed cuts, pregnant women and children, who rely on community health centers for care, will be left with literally nowhere to turn for health care.

By slashing \$50 million in funding from the maternal child health block grant program, the House bill would dramatically curtail services to the 35 million women and children across this country, including the nearly half a million women and children in North Carolina who receive such services as newborn hearing screenings and postnatal care.

In North Carolina, infants born to minorities are twice as likely to die as those born to Caucasians. However, the Healthy Beginnings Program is working to reverse infant mortality and low birth weights among minorities in North Carolina.

Healthy Beginnings provides case management, general health education, and other support for at-risk women throughout their pregnancy

and until their child turns two. In 3 years, this initiative reduced infant mortality by 60 percent in participating communities.

Also, early detection of permanent hearing loss is essential for children to progress at age-appropriate rates.

Research shows that by the time a child with hearing loss graduates from high school, more than \$400,000 per child can be saved in special education costs if the child is identified early and given appropriate educational, medical, and audiological services.

The North Carolina Early Hearing Detection and Intervention, EHDI, Program was established in 1999 as part of the State's title V Maternal and Child Health Program.

Since the establishment of the EHDI Program, there has been a remarkable increase in the percentage of infants screened in the State. All neonatal facilities in North Carolina offer initial newborn hearing screening prior to infant discharge.

In 2009, 96 percent of infants completed newborn hearing screening—about 100,000; 450 children receive hearing aids or cochlear implants annually through a contract funded by the maternal and child health block grant.

I heard from three families in North Carolina—all whose children failed the screening tests. Their stories were heartwrenching as they described their hours-old babies not being able to hear their parents' first words to them.

But in all three families, the hearing loss was detected as part of the newborn screening, and the North Carolina EHDI program immediately provided them with followup and hearing aids or cochlear implants. As a result of these programs, in each of these families, the child is ahead of their peers verbally.

These are just two critical programs that are funded by the title V maternal and child health block grant. As we can see, these are not just statistics but real women and kids and families who benefit from this important program.

I strongly believe we have to work together to get our country back on solid fiscal ground. I am very much concerned about it and want to work on it. But the path we are on is obviously unsustainable. In fact, I was one of the Senators who advocated for the creation of the Bowles-Simpson fiscal commission. But our fiscal challenges require a thoughtful bipartisan solution that gets us on the right track and encourages economic growth. These cuts are simply counterproductive. We cannot balance the budget on the backs of our Nation's future—our children.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank Senator HAGAN for her remarks. She is one of the leaders in the Senate in finding solutions to the deficit that do not kill jobs and do deficit reduction in the right way. I thank her.

She made the point that when we attack kids and pregnant women, at the

end of the day it is morally reprehensible, but in addition to that it costs money. That point was made beautifully.

It is an honor to yield 10 minutes to a great colleague, Senator MARIA CANTWELL from Washington State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for her leadership and her articulation on the floor earlier about the rider that is on H.R. 1 that would undo what the Supreme Court said EPA should do, which is to make sure the Clean Air Act is enforced.

I thought the comments of the Senator from California about no one in California telling her they wanted more smog was a very profound statement because that is what people are saying when they try to do a rider: EPA, do not enforce the law the Supreme Court told you to enforce. It is as if they are jamming down small children across the country air and air quality that is something less than sufficient. We know that. We know that because it is based on science. That is what EPA has said, and that is what the Supreme Court has said they should enforce. Yet here we are, in the middle of all of this, the solution to our economy is to have a rider on legislation basically saying: Do not enforce what the Supreme Court says is the Clean Air Act.

I thank the Senator from California for her leadership on this issue.

I come to the floor to join my other colleagues because I think the American people sent a clear message. They want us to focus on creating jobs, promoting innovation, and putting people back to work. That is what we are trying to do in the Senate.

But in the House, the Republicans seem to be saying: Let's cut programs and vital services to working women and families, and somehow that will generate economic growth. Instead of creating jobs, all they have done is launched a war on women.

H.R. 1 would eliminate funding for title X, which would provide health services, including family planning, breast and cervical cancer screenings, and other preventive health care. This certainly would impact low-income women. It does not create jobs. There is nothing in what I just said with regard to these cuts that would create jobs. How are jobs created out of cutting those services? It is actually an attack on access to health care. When we do not have healthy people, I guarantee you, Mr. President, we end up with bad economic consequences.

The bill also cuts funding for teen pregnancy prevention programs and funding for Planned Parenthood centers that serve more than 3 million women each year, jeopardizing, again, access to critical preventive health services.

Just in the State of Washington, we have 39 centers and serve over 130,000



patients annually and administer over 170,000 tests for sexually transmitted infections. One of my constituents was diagnosed at age 22 with abnormal cell growth on her cervix wall. She went to a Planned Parenthood clinic. Why? Because she did not have health insurance. In fact, quoting her, she said:

I would not have scheduled an annual exam on my own. Without Planned Parenthood, I may have died or lost my ability to have children in the future. . . . Aside from these personal effects, as an uninsured student, I would have been a huge financial burden to my family and my community.

There it is. Planned Parenthood has been effective in preventing over 40,000 pregnancies and diverting \$160 million back to the State, which we need in these tough economic times.

Instead of supporting women and families so they can be productive parts of our economy, Republicans are continuing to turn the clock back on hard-fought access to healthy services and attacking a woman's right to choose. Their proposal would deny women using flexible spending accounts, from using pretax dollars for insurance to cover a wide range of reproductive choices; deny small businesses their tax credits if they choose employee health coverage that includes reproductive health care; and would disallow tax deductions for health insurance for the self-employed if the insurance included reproductive health care.

The Republican answer to the economy is attack reproductive health care? It seems to me that these proposals are just about attacking the most vulnerable in our society, including the elderly where they would have an impact on services for the elderly, including meals, housing, and employment services.

Women comprise two-thirds of our elderly, and they would be harmed most by these cuts. For example, in 2009, 25 percent of all families with children were female head of households, and 78 percent of mothers with children between the ages of 6 and 17 were in the labor force. That is a big percentage. Therefore, cutting programs that support working mothers, such as job training, childcare, education, and health care will impact those families' ability to be productive members of our economy.

I personally do not understand why in the world at this point in time, with this high unemployment rate, we would ever cut job training programs. I can tell you, I travel the State of Washington and I constantly hear, even in these hard economic times, employers who cannot find the workforce they need to do the jobs. When one thinks about that, when a company cannot find the workforce it needs because there is a skills gap, that is holding that company back from producing higher revenues, from meeting their goals, and from adding stimulus to the economy, all because they cannot find the workforce.

Yet we in the Senate are trying to promote workforce training and to have programs that have been tested successes, such as the Workforce Investment Act. For every dollar invested by the Workforce Investment Act, it is \$10 in stimulating our economy. It is a 1-to-10 ratio. Why would we cut such a program?

In Washington State, our local WorkSource Centers have helped over 78 percent of job seekers find jobs. It is a high percentage of helping people and placing them.

I look at the example of this big decision on Boeing winning the refueling tanker decision. Here we are with 11,000 jobs in Washington State and a supply chain that is going to also have more jobs created. Yet if we do not make an investment in workforce investment that supply chain will not be able to find the people to fill those jobs to help fulfill this contract. Something as big as a \$35 billion contract we are involved in because it is the Department of Defense, and yet at the same time the Republicans in the House are saying: Let's cut the Workforce Investment Act—even though we know we have a plane to deliver, even though we know it has a military purpose we support, and we are going to say let's cut programs because somehow that is going to make our economy healthier.

I can give an example. General Plastics would not have been able to keep its current staff level or grow its business in the past year without the help of workforce investment dollars. They were in partner with Tacoma Community College and trained a workforce in improvement techniques that allowed the company to streamline its production and grow its business effectively.

In the last year, they grew 10 to 15 percent and became more competitive. They also added about 22 new employees because of additional new business.

These are programs that would be cut by the proposal in H.R. 1 that the House Republicans are trying to push. I do not think it would improve our economy. I think it would stall what is a very fragile recovery. Workforce development is economic development, and when people are trained and skilled, the employers get what they need, the community prospers, and everybody truly wins—what the President has called for in winning the future.

We need to make sure that we in the Senate stand and say no to these cuts, such as in the Workforce Investment Act, in family health, cuts in the Pell Grant Program which would be cut by more than \$800 per student or Head Start or Early Start that, again, would impact thousands of children in Washington State.

In addition, we should not cut what are the healthy elements of our economy but make sure we are helping women and families do what will help them survive and help them help us with economic recovery.

I know some people think this is the way to get our economy going again.

But I can tell my colleagues, our economy certainly hit the iceberg in 2008. But what H.R. 1 does, instead of saying women and children first, they are basically cutting them off the lifeline they need and cutting off what are essential programs to help us grow jobs and have a healthy economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, after consulting with my friends, Senator COLLINS and Senator SESSIONS, I give Senator LAUTENBERG until 6 minutes after the hour and then add 6 minutes to the time of the Republicans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I hope it is noted that I stand here as a male Member with my colleagues who comprise a significant part of the women Members of the Senate. They do the mothering, they do the family raising, but it is pretty obvious to all of us that fathers and grandfathers have an active interest in what happens with our children, what it takes to make sure they grow up healthy, that they grow up with the tools they will need in their future lives for them to contribute to themselves, their families, and the country at large.

What we are witnessing in America today is an assault by House Republicans in trying to ram through a reckless, unhealthy spending plan that will ultimately bring shame to our country as it causes pain for little children who come from families who do not have the means, who do not have the stability of family life, in many cases, that will give them an opportunity to establish themselves with a cycle that will bring them to successful lives later on, to be able to hold jobs of significance and create a family environment.

It is hard when we look at this to figure out the mission. I come from the business community. I have been here a lot of years—27—but I spent 30 years in the business community. I learned something about financial statements. I learned you have to sometimes cut costs here or there and that sometimes you have to make investments so you can expand your business, you can make it more competitive.

As we look at the plan that is being offered, to cut, cut, cut, it causes us to rethink what is taking place, to think outside the box, as they say. There is a lot of applause for cutting costs. There is a whole group of people in the House of Representatives who have targets for cost cutting that will leave America without the tools in the future to remain competitive and to remain a place where great things can happen. Why is that? A lot of it is because they are cutting education programs—Head Start, for one thing.

I think every Senator ought to pledge to take a trip through a Head Start facility and see what it is like.

See what it is like when you have children, even 1 and 2 years old, in the early Head Start Program or 3, 4 and 5 in the full Head Start Program. See the enthusiasm that exists with these children.

I have an indication of that here—this card. It was Valentines Day when I went to the city of Perth Amboy. Oddly enough, Perth Amboy is where the first signature on the Bill of Rights was made, in New Jersey—the Bill of Rights. Here is an opportunity that is certainly a right, to be able to learn. I get notes from these children—flattering, by the way, and not because of my looks. They say:

Dear Representatives: We love coming to school. We learn languages. We can be scientists. We can be artists. We can be authors and illustrators. We are lifetime learners.

Here they talk in less precise handwriting about how nice it is to be able to come to school. The design of this makes it a little tougher presentation:

Dear Mr. Representative: We love our preschool class. We learn to write. We explore science. We explore changing things in the world. We love to be here in school.

We love it when they are there because we know that not only are their lives going to be improved substantially, but also they are going to be contributing citizens to the society we live in.

So this is amazing and often neglected. I asked for some indication of what happens at Head Start. But let me say, first of all, all those children are beautiful. I never saw so many beautiful children in my life. I am a professional grandfather. I have 13 grandchildren. My wife brought 3 to the marriage and I had 10. There is nothing like seeing a 1½-year-old learning, a 2-year-old learning.

What we have found is that by the age of 1, most children begin linking words to meanings. They understand the names used to label familiar objects—body parts, arms, legs, animals, and people. At about 18 months, they add new words to their vocabulary at the astounding rate of one every 2 hours. By age 2, most children have a vocabulary of several hundred words and can form simple sentences, such as “Go outdoors” or the traditional “All gone.” Between 24 to 30 months, children speak in longer sentences, and from 30 to 36 months kids can usually recite the alphabet and count from 1 to 10. The fact is, they are learning something.

By kindergarten, kids are beginning to turn the pages of the book, and they start learning to read by about 5 years of age. There is a real reward for the country when they do that. Our society receives nearly \$9 in benefits for every \$1 invested in Head Start children. It leads to an increase in achievement and lots of good things.

I learned a little bit the hard way about what Head Start means when I and a business partner of mine went back to a school we went to as kids. We went to the sixth grade and offered a

scholarship program to youngsters in the sixth grade to pick up a large part of their college tuition. For 28 young people in our class, we would contribute toward a large part of their college tuition if they were accepted at any one of 30 colleges picked at random. We had counselors, and we brought them down here. I was able to take them on a visit to the White House, where Vice President Dan Quayle was very generous with his time, and I took them to the company I was running so they could see.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL). All time dedicated to the majority has expired.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, you say there is no time left on our side for a presentation?

I will wrap this up very quickly, if I might. Just a couple words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator continuing?

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, if the Senator is truly going to wrap it up, I don't object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank my colleague and friend from Maine.

Very simply, we now see what the problem was. We analyzed it thoroughly. The problem was we started too late. In the sixth grade, it was too late to get a learning habit. Now we see these little tots and how quickly they are learning, how quickly they talk, and how quickly they adapt.

These children will suffer the pain created by Republicans' cuts—and shame on us if we don't stop them. You have to wonder why children are their No. 1 target? Did children cause the financial crisis? Were Head Start kids engaging in credit default swaps with mortgage-backed securities?

You have to wonder if House Republicans think this is the case. They want to decimate Head Start by cutting its funding by \$1 billion. If they have their way, roughly one-quarter of all children in Head Start will be kicked out of the program. This includes 3,700 kids in my State of New Jersey, like the kids at the Head Start Center I visited last week and the kids who sent these Valentines Day cards. How can we tell these children: Forget about getting a head start. You must go to the back of the line.

The fact is, the House Republican budget will poison our future. Their prescription for America's kids is toxic. If we want our country to succeed, we must invest in its future—and that means protecting and inspiring our children. So let's reject shame and pain. Let's reject the disastrous House Republican budget plan. Let's invest in our kids and win the future. Our country's children deserve nothing less.

Madam President, I thank my colleague from Maine for the courtesy, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

#### DOD FUNDING AMENDMENT

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise to express my deep concern that the Senate has yet to consider the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2011.

As the Presiding Officer is well aware, we should have completed work on this bill and every other appropriations bill before October 1 of last year. But with the Department of Defense, this is becoming increasingly problematic. For this reason, along with two members of the Republican leadership, Senator ALEXANDER and Senator BARRASSO, I have filed an amendment to the patent reform bill that would fund the Department of Defense for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Just think what we have done the last 3 weeks. We took up an FAA reauthorization bill. Then we went on recess for a week. And now we are on a patent reform bill. I don't mean to suggest that FAA and patent reform are not important—certainly we could have gone without having a recess—but both of those bills pale in comparison to the urgency of providing our service men and women with the resources they need to carry out their mission.

Secretary Gates, Admiral Mullen, and other military leaders have repeatedly and clearly warned us about the dangers of failing to pass a full-year Defense funding bill. It is hurting our national security and harming our readiness. Secretary Gates' put it bluntly, saying: “The continuing resolution represents a crisis at our doorstep.” Deputy Secretary of Defense William Lynn testified that “a year-long CR will damage national security.”

At no time in recent memory has Congress failed to pass a Defense appropriations bill. Even when there was a year-long continuing resolution for most of the government during fiscal year 2007, the Congress passed a separate bill funding the Department of Defense. With troops in harm's way, now is not the time to break with that precedent.

If we do not provide the authority for the Air Force to buy unmanned aerial vehicles to fly combat air patrols over Afghanistan, the fighting there will not be halted until we do so. If we do not act to provide the \$150 million that has been requested to meet the very specific and urgent requirements of our special forces, we will be failing those who are truly on the frontlines.

Secretary Gates has made it clear, military readiness will suffer because of fewer flying hours for our pilots, fewer steaming days for our ships, and cutbacks in training for home-stationed forces.

A full year's CR will also delay much needed modernization of our military equipment. This would come at a time when our Navy is at its smallest size since 1916 and at a time when the aircraft and our Air Force inventory are older than at any time since the Air Force was created. The Navy will not