

Our Founding Fathers thought that those specific five tenets were crucial to the citizens of America—so critical that they needed to be guaranteed first and foremost.

The conscience protection debate that started a few weeks ago with the administration's announcement of a new rule regarding contraception, sterilization, and insurance policies is a perfect example of the importance of these rights.

The government cannot, and should not, be forcing any employer, whether they are Catholic charities and schools or an individual businessman, to violate the tenets of their faith.

As this debate continues, it highlights the great need to have a standard that explicitly protects employers from attempts to erode our First Amendment rights.

We need to fight for the standard in H.R. 1179, the Respect for Rights of Conscience Act of 2011, introduced by my good friend from Nebraska, Mr. FORTENBERRY.

It simply protects employers from being forced to violate their religious or moral beliefs by an overreaching mandate from the administration. It takes nothing away from the public, nor does it prohibit women from getting services that are already provided, as some have alleged.

H.R. 1179 is a responsible and reasonable response to clarify what can and cannot be mandated through the healthcare law regarding conscience protections.

We cannot allow the federal government to start going down the slippery slope of eroding our constitutionally protected rights—we took an oath to uphold the Constitution.

As a mother and grandmother, I will do everything in my power to ensure that the rights we enjoy today continue to be guaranteed for my daughter, grandchildren, and generations to come.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3630, MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2012

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (during the Special Order of Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-400) on the resolution (H. Res. 554) providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3630) to provide incentives for the creation of jobs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 for the time.

The Progressive Congressional Caucus is that caucus in Congress that comes together to talk about the most important values that our country is founded on—ideas like fairness, inclusion, prosperity for all, protecting our

world and the environment that we live in. The Progressive Caucus can be found talking about civil and human rights, standing for an economy that is fair and inclusive and has shared benefits and responsibilities for everybody. The Progressive Caucus is that caucus in Congress that will stand up for peace and diplomacy and also will make the case for the human rights of all people.

We bring you the progressive message to illustrate what's at stake in America today. I'm very pleased that I'm joined by my good friend from the great State of Illinois, JAN SCHAKOWSKY. We're going to bring the progressive message tonight and just talk a little bit about the values that we share.

You know, I want to set up a question I have for you, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, because we have been dealing with this transportation bill over the last several days, and we will be up until the week of February 27.

One of the things about it that I found most galling is that one of the ways that the Republican majority intends to pay for the transportation bill is by charging Federal employees a fee, and really a tax, on their retirement and then using the money that they're going to gain to pay for their transportation bill.

□ 1930

When I think about people who are Federal employees, I'm thinking of people who take care of our veterans—the nurses at the VA. I'm thinking of people who make sure our roads and our parks are safe. I'm thinking about Federal employees who make sure our water and our air is clean. So I just want to ask you:

Do you think it's fair to sort of go after Federal employees, working people, to try to pay for this transportation budget we've been talking about over these last few days?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank you for that question and for leading this hour in this important discussion.

No. In fact, our colleagues in the majority want to pay for the legislation in the transportation bill, but what they want to continue to do is to refuse to touch a single hair on the heads of millionaires and billionaires, and they stand firm in their defense of the big oil companies and the corporations that ship their jobs overseas. Instead of asking the wealthiest Americans to contribute a little bit more, they want to ask Federal workers. Instead of going to the 1 percent, they want to ask people who are solidly in the 99 percent to pay the price.

Federal employees are hardworking, middle class Americans, who work for the Federal Government all across this country, not just in Washington. In fact, only about 30 percent of Federal employees are in Washington. Of course, some of them work in our offices, and they work in this House of Representatives. We all represent Federal workers.

So who are they? You mentioned a few. Yet there are also those benefit specialists who help our seniors get their Social Security and Medicare benefits, and they're the law enforcement professionals who defend our borders and our ports and our skies and us when we're here in the Capitol.

Mr. ELLISON. FBI agents who are protecting us from everything from terrorism to drugs to guns, are these people Federal employees?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Those are called Federal employees, as are the Capitol Police; and they're computer and network specialists who spend their days making sure that we're safe from cyberattacks. They're medical and scientific researchers who are looking for cures for devastating diseases. They're the nurses and doctors who take care of our wounded warriors. They're the men and women who make sure the food supply is safe and that our water is clean enough for our children to drink. They're the hardworking support staff. I just left my office, and I was having my trash and recycling taken away.

Those are all Federal employees. There are 423,000 Federal employees who earn less than \$50,000 a year; and 48 percent of them are women, but 60 percent of the employees earning less than \$50,000 a year are women. They are the people who have seen their pay frozen for 2 years while health care and other costs are going up.

Mr. ELLISON. If I may just ask the gentlelady a question.

Do you mean to tell me and the American people and the Speaker tonight that not only is this transportation bill proposing to cut into and to basically tax Federal employees' retirement benefits, but they've already had a freeze on top of this?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. For 2 years. That's about \$30 billion a year in cuts. So they've already given up, really, about \$60 billion from a normal increase in wages just to pay for the cost of things going up. Everybody knows that the cost of food and gasoline and those kinds of things are going up, and still we aren't asking millionaires—or they aren't. The Republicans who propose these cuts, these additional contributions from Federal employees, are not asking millionaires and billionaires to contribute their fair share.

Mr. ELLISON. I will say to the gentlelady that I have brought a document here with me today. I had a great meeting with some Federal employees the other day, and they said, Explain it to me, GOP.

One person, Paul here, says: I earn less than \$45,000 a year. Explain it to me, GOP, how cutting my pay creates jobs. This person, Paul, represents the Tobyhanna Army Depot workers. They do something really important.

Then there is another Federal employee: Twelve percent of my salary I earn caring for veterans goes to my retirement. Explain it to me, GOP, how cutting my retirement puts people to