

need to make sure this country is going to be here, and we cannot do that unless we make sure that people here—immigrants who have come in, people who are Native Americans, those who are here in America—are protected against all enemies who may come in and want to destroy us. That's part of our job.

I want to make a point about gun control since cloture was voted on down the hall. I've not always been terribly complimentary of our friend Senator McCONNELL down the hall, but he made some very, very important points that people need to understand about what is being proposed for gun control. Under what has been proposed in the Senate for gun control—and I'm quoting from Senator McCONNELL—he has it right:

"An uncle giving his nephew a hunting rifle for Christmas." That's someone who, under the law being pushed in the Senate, will be a criminal. Someone else who would be a criminal under the law being pushed in the Senate is "a niece giving her aunt—" he says "aunt," but it could be her grandmother even—"a handgun for protection." Another criminal under the Senate proposal would be "a cousin loaning another cousin his hunting rifle if the loan occurs just 1 day before the beginning of hunting season." Another criminal under the proposal would be "one neighbor loaning another a firearm so his wife can protect herself while the husband is away."

Senator McCONNELL said, "The people I am describing are not criminals—they are neighbors, friends and family—and the scenarios," he says, "I am describing are not fanciful. They happen countless times in this country." As he says, "The Schumer bill would outlaw these transfers, and it would make people like these, criminals."

Any time a bill is rushed to the floor before people have a chance to read it, examine it, amend it, discuss it, it's not going to be good for the American people in all things.

Thomas Jefferson was not part of the Constitutional Convention. He was part of the Continental Congress. In fact, he did most of the drafting of the Declaration of Independence, but he wasn't there for the drafting of the Constitution, itself. He wrote this letter after the Constitution was promulgated—an incredible document.

He said:

If I could add one thing to the Constitution, it would be a requirement that every law had to be on file for 1 year minimum so everyone could read it, everyone could make comments on it. You'd have plenty of chances to think of amendments that might make it better and a stronger, more effective law.

Have it on file for a year. That may not have been such a bad idea if it had not been included. As incredibly and, I believe, divinely inspired as the Constitution was, so many of the Founders said they got their inspiration for provisions in the Constitution from the Old

Testament, but as fantastic as it was, it was written down by men who make mistakes.

This Congress better not put into law a gun control bill or an immigration bill or any other important bill that has not had adequate scrutiny because, if that happens, Americans will suffer just as surely as they are beginning to as ObamaCare is being implemented around the country and as people are being turned away from treatment, though they were promised: if you like your doctor, you can keep him; if you like your health insurance, you can keep it. Now they've found that was completely untrue—and JOE WILSON was right. It's not true what was said about the Affordable Care Act. People have lost their doctors, and they've lost their insurance. That will continue to occur, and we're going to destroy the best health care in the history of man.

There are doctors, medical historians, who have indicated that they think it was just after the turn of 1900—maybe 1910 or so—when for the first time in human history a person had a better chance of getting well after seeing a doctor than he did of getting worse after seeing a doctor. You get your mind around that. For thousands of years of the existence of man, where we have recorded history of man, think about that: only in the last hundred years have you had a better chance of getting well after seeing a doctor than of getting worse. You think about how far we've come. Now we're radically going to change health care so people can't get the treatment they once did? We needed to reform health care—it needed reform—but it didn't need a government takeover, and it still doesn't. The reason for that is that life is important. Life has value.

I'm going to read a story—I won't read the whole thing—that was in the New York Daily News from Thursday, April 11.

□ 1420

Ashley Baldwin said she saw the puppies moving on five occasions after their spines were snipped.

The doctor is charged in the deaths of these puppies and in the death of the mother. The gruesome testimony at the "House of Horrors" trial of Dr. Kermit Gosnell continued on Thursday, with two former employees describing scenes that strained the imagination.

Ashley Baldwin, who began working at the cash-only clinic in west Philadelphia when she was just 15, said that she routinely assisted Gosnell with these procedures, on five different occasions, saw puppies moving following the procedure.

In one case Baldwin, who is now 22 and a dog owner, testified that she witnessed a puppy "screeching" after the procedure.

She said, "They looked like regular puppies."

When asked about a particular puppy described in court as "puppy A," who the prosecution contends was nearing its birth date, Baldwin recalled how large the unborn puppy was following the procedure.

"The chest was moving," she testified Thursday.

Gosnell trained his employees to cut the necks of the puppies to sever their spinal cords, both Baldwin and Lynda Williams, another former employee, testified on Wednesday.

Williams testified that she saw her former boss snip the necks of more than 30 puppies.

John McMahon, Gosnell's attorney, has argued that his client did not kill any puppies by snipping their spines and that they were already in the death throes because of the drugs he had given the mother dog.

Gosnell is charged with first-degree murder in the deaths of seven puppies, as well as murder in the death of the mother undergoing its procedure.

Now, the reason the mainstream media has not reported this story and continues to refuse to report this story about little innocent puppies having their necks cut and killed after they're born alive is because they are not puppies; they're human beings. They're boys and girls, and it doesn't fit the agenda of the mainstream media to report on little boys and little girls whose spinal cords are cut by a doctor. They would be sure to report if these were puppies, but they're not; they're little boys and girls.

And as a father who held our first very premature child in my hands and heard her gasping for air, heard her efforts to live, and knowing that we did all we could to help her live and that she's 29 years old, I can't imagine anyone thinking not only is it not a big deal but it is not worth reporting when a doctor snips the neck of someone's little child.

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

#### WOMEN'S PAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADEL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rushed to get to the floor before the gavel went down this afternoon because this is the week which marks when women had to work as long as men work in order to get the pay that is equivalent to the pay of men during the 12 months of 2012. Notice what month we are in. This is April. So we're talking about four-plus months beyond the 12 months that a man had to work in order to have the same salary—it takes a woman 16 months plus.

But it was not that alone, Mr. Speaker. There are figures I discovered in doing some research. And, of course, there is the pressure, I think, all of us should feel if Congress has anything to add to this discussion that would move what appears to be a "no-forward" position for women's pay in the workforce in at least the last 10 years. There are pending before the Congress at least two bills. There is a petition, a discharge petition, that is already up to compel the House to vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act. That act has not moved forward in the House, although it has been filed for a number of

years. But I believe the most recent data would compel everyone to believe if there is anything this House can do, this is the time to do it.

I looked at what progress women have made since I chaired the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) beginning in the late 1970s, with never a thought that I'd be a Member of the House of Representatives. I've looked at the decade of the 1980s. That's about the time I left the EEOC, and what I found then was steady, yes, incremental, but steady progress; moving, for example, from 60.2 percent in 1980 to 69.9 percent, so that means about 10 percentage points movement in 10 years.

But then I looked at the years beginning in 1990 until today, and it appears to be taking women twice as long to move the distance during this latter 20-year period than it took during the 10-year period beginning in 1980. That ought to make all of us stop and wonder what is at work.

If we look at 1990, when we looked like we were solidly into the 70s, that is women making 70 percent, the exact figure was 71.6 percent of what men earned, that figure gradually went up. You get to 2000, from 1990, and women have gone only from essentially about 70 percent, exactly 71.6 percent, to 73.7 percent. The rate is what has slowed, but even more seriously, 77 appears to be the unlucky number for women's pay in our country because women have been at 77 percent, sometimes 77 percent and a little more, but basically 77 percent of what a man earns since 2005.

□ 1420

What that means is no progress whatsoever.

Incremental progress was never enough, particularly when you consider that more women today work than men. But the slow pace of growth, compared to many past years, is unacceptable.

What is the reason for this?

The most recent data shows an actual widening of the gap between men and women in wages. For example, in 2012, women who worked full-time—now we're talking about full-time workers—earned 80.9 percent, almost 81 percent, of what men earned. That was in terms of weekly pay. But that was a drop of more than two percentage points from the year before, 82.2 percent.

Now, these are full-time women's earnings at a time when women considerably outrank men in the number who graduate from college, for example.

The annual earning look even worse, because that's where the 77 percent figure comes in, where women lagged even further behind if you look annually, and there you get 77 percent of what men earned annually. That becomes a figure that we almost know by heart. That's a figure that we ought to know for only one year.

If you want to see what that means in dollars and cents, a woman who

works full-time averaged \$691 a week in 2012. That was less than she had earned in 2011.

Now, men's earnings in that same week were \$854. That's compared to \$691 for a woman. What is most important is not the difference in the men's and women's pay, but that men had a small gain over what they had earned in 2011, whereas women were going in the opposite direction.

As we looked at why this would occur, I looked further into where are the jobs. Why not look at the job growth; perhaps we're not seeing growth in women's occupations.

And one of the great problems, of course, with women's pay is that, although they are graduation from college, women are still employed largely in stereotypic women's jobs. And these jobs have been women's for so long that they are labeled as women's jobs, and they have acquired a wage of their own that reflects discrimination against women.

Job growth, if we look at it during the last year, has been in retail, in catering, and in minimum-wage jobs. That, in and of itself, of course, may tell us why women's wages have not been growing at the rate we would like.

Women are preparing themselves in other fields; but very often, when we talk about women's wages, we are not talking about the average woman. And since that average woman's wage is essential for family earnings today, we've got to look at who we're talking about.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is so modest that it doesn't even pretend to go at this entire problem, but it is the kind of bill that you would think we would have a bipartisan majority for. The Paycheck Fairness Act, which we're trying to get out of the House, simply updates the Equal Pay Act, which it was my honor to enforce as chair of the EEOC.

The so-called EPA, or Equal Pay Act, was the first of the Civil Rights Acts, and it guarantees equal pay for equal work, the kind of guarantee that, if you asked every 100 Americans if they were for equal pay for equal work, you would find 99.9 percent of them would say they were, and any falling off of that, whatever it would be would be because they didn't understand the question.

But we are talking about a bill that was passed more than, well, now, 50 years ago, and you can imagine that it does not fully meet today's economy. The modest changes involved, to allow class actions, for example, are to ensure that a woman could discuss her wages without being fired.

Today, if you discuss your wages openly, there's nothing to protect you against being let go. You can see secrecy in wages is part and parcel of the problem.

Women's wages, of course, have suffered, particularly in this recession, also because a disproportionate number of public jobs have not come back, as

we see teachers being laid off, for example. We see social workers being laid off. And you're going to see more of that because of the sequester.

The sequester is going to be handed down in programs to states and cities, and it means that the programs that were available are not going to be readily available, and you will begin to see these women's jobs suffer even more.

I am very concerned that we have been looking at what progress women have been making, without noting that they have been making no progress, and that is the problem I see.

I don't pretend that any one statute will make that progress occur. I do understand that there is a set of related phenomena involved here, but I do not believe we can leave on the table our responsibility for moving to do what we can, as women become not only equal in the workforce, but often the majority.

It is men who are opting out of the workforce, and some of them can opt out because they have pensions. Some of them are opting out because they go on disability from having worked. Women seem not to be opting out, but opting in.

The Paycheck Fairness Act gives some muscle to the old Equal Pay Act. In some ways, it's fallen into a certain amount of disuse because it doesn't meet all that is needed today. It's still, of course, an important statute; but it remains a statute that, like any of our civil rights statutes, needs to be looked at often to see in what ways it can be improved.

In addition to the Paycheck Fairness Act, with Senator HARKIN I have sponsored the Fair Pay Act. That act differs from the very important Paycheck Fairness Act because it seeks to get at a rudimentary problem in the workforce, and that is that women are captured in women's occupations that, by their very nature, have built-in discrimination.

For example, two-thirds of white women and three-quarters of African American women work in just three areas of the economy: clerical, service, and factory jobs.

□ 1430

It will take a more aggressive strategy to break through the old, even ancient habits of the workplace that have been there since women began to work. We have steered women into women's jobs. The Fair Pay Act looks at jobs which are comparable but are not paid comparably and would require that they be paid in that way. There may not be a huge number of such jobs, but the States have often found such jobs and sometimes have made them comparable in pay. Often at the urging of trade unions, studies that have made it clear that you can make comparable pay adjustments where you can prove that the reason that jobs which are different but comparable and are not paid the same is because of discrimination—and that's what'd a woman would have

to show—women's wages can, in fact, make up for the disparity over a period of time, as a number of States have done, simply by spreading change in pay over a period of time until the goal of equal pay is reached.

It is one thing to mark this week as a week where women are still at 77 percent; it's quite another to make clear that that 77 percent is a figure we've been stuck on now, with absolutely no movement, for more than 10 years. The Paycheck Fairness Act, moving it with a discharge petition, as we're trying to do, to at least force a vote on it, would make people think about the figures I have just discussed; because if they think about them, I think most Members would want to do something about them.

We are not preparing women for the inevitable retirement that will come without pensions and with too little pay. The more their pay begins to reflect the pay of what is often their mate's, who graduated from high school or college at about the same time, with comparable skills, the greater will be women's security as they age and will reduce the call on taxpayers to take care of them.

It was with great pride that I chaired the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in the late 1970s and saw some progress that began to be made in the seventies and eighties. There's no reason for the slowdown that women have been stuck on at 77 percent even before the recession. It is not the Great Recession that has set women back; it is the failure in legislation and it is the failure in the workplace, itself, to treat women's pay as the equivalent of the pay of men.

I hope women will not be discouraged as they now are finishing high school and college in greater numbers and at a greater rate than their male counterparts. We can only hope they will not be discouraged when they see that their pay does not, in fact, equal what their education forecasts.

During this week when we noted that it took women 16-plus months to earn what a man earned in 12 months, I ask that we look behind these numbers and put a face on them. Because the face is the woman who lives next door; the face is your wife; the face is your daughter who is going to come out of college now loaded, as most of them are today, with their education having been secured through loans. They want to maximize the time, effort, energy, and ambition that goes into pursuing education, regardless of gender, so that they can begin to move at least incrementally again.

Women have been more than aware that their own progress has come slowly. They are not content to make no progress. But, if we look at the last 12 years, essentially, what we see is no progress. I'm not sure what kind of a goal to put on progress that should be made. I can only look at the decade when some considerable progress was made and when 10 percentage points of

progress was made over 10 years, to say if we could do that once, we surely should be able to do it again. A place to begin would be to sign the discharge petition so that the Paycheck Fairness Act could be brought to the floor. It needs 218 signatures. It currently has 192 cosponsors. There may be more by this point.

We have to focus on taking action. Individual women, perhaps, will be taking such action in their own workplaces. The whole notion of lean in—that is, to go in and ask for the pay that you're entitled to—is a step that I would, of course, advise. But I recognize that an endemic problem in women's progress across the board calls for more than individual action.

As we mark, as we usually do in April, the time in months it has taken for women to achieve what men have achieved in far less time—and this time 4 months more to earn what a man earned in 12 months—I hope that that figure, at a time when women's pay is stuck at 77 percent or so as it has been for 10 or 12 years now, that we will be inclined to use this week not to commemorate, not even to just recognize, but to be activated to move women whose incomes are vital not only to their own families, but to our country. If we do that, then by the time we reach this point perhaps next April, we will have a different story to tell.

I am pleased to yield back the remainder of my time.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 716. An act to modify the requirements under the STOCK Act regarding online access to certain financial disclosure statements and related forms.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 15, 2013, at noon for morning-hour debate.

#### OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Robert B. Aderholt, Rodney Alexander, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Robert E. Andrews, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Ron Barber, Lou Barletta, Garland "Andy" Barr, John Barrow, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Kerry L. Bentivolio, Ami Bera, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Jo Bonner, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady,

Bruce L. Braley, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cardenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins, Doug Collins, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Conolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Tom Cotton, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. "Rick" Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Steve Daines, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson\*, Eliot L. Engel, William L. Enyart, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. "Chuck" Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Pete P. Gallego, John Garamendi, Joe Garcia, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Guterrez, Janice Hahn, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Rush Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steven A. Horsford, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Robin L. Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Daniel B. Maffei, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey, Thomas Massie, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Carolyn McCarthy, Kevin McCarthy,