

CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS

**THE SHRIVER REPORT:
A WOMAN'S NATION CHANGES EVERYTHING**

KEYNOTE

**WELCOME:
HEATHER BOUSHEY,
SENIOR ECONOMIST,
CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

**INTRODUCTION:
JUDY LICHTMAN,
WOMEN'S RIGHTS ADVOCATE**

**SPEAKER:
CONGRESSWOMAN ROSA DELAURO (D-CT)**

**MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2009
1:00 P.M.
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

*Transcript by
Federal News Service
Washington, D.C.*

(Begin video clip.)

MARIA SHRIVER: (In progress) – with men. So I don't want to give the impression that in the workforce women still are paid at an equal level. They're not.

DAVID GREGORY: Right.

VALERIE JARRETT: And I think a very important point is that 70 percent of the job losses in this recession had been in male-dominated businesses, and therefore the women are the primary breadwinners and they make less than the man. They don't have the benefits very often associated with the man's job.

So all of this – that's why all of these institutions need to change. The government can become a model employer. Best practices that businesses are, you know, putting forth, whether it's Deloitte, whether it's 10000 Women, whether it's IBM, virtual employers, telecommuting, there is a lot of really interesting stuff going on in the country but it all rests on you need to be paid equally for the work –

MR. GREGORY: Right.

MS. JARRETT: – and that the government can really step forward and set an agenda for modern workplace.

MR. GREGORY: And to that point because this is not – you know, in some couples it may be both people are working and maybe that's a choice that they're making, that it's not about money. In a lot of homes it isn't a choice. You know, you need both the husband and the wife working.

One of the polls associated with this report found what needs to change in the workplace and what do workers want to change. And look at that: Among men and women, by far the biggest demand was for more flexible work hours.

And, Maria, it was interesting. Just this week I had a conversation at NBC News with a female executive about some of the things that I'm doing – not my hours per se but some of the things that I should be engaged in. And one of the things that came up in that conversation, I said, look, I need to factor this in a little bit with my wife's schedule because she's traveling more as a lawyer.

And I thought to myself, you know, 20 years ago with – and her response, by the way, was, absolutely; well, you've got to come to me and let me know what works. And I thought, would that conversation have happened 20 years ago? You'd have a female executive and somebody in my position bringing these issues up.

MS. JARRETT: And the other point of that is that so many women in our poll also expressed a fear about asking for that in their workplace. They feel that if they do go forward and say, I need time off for elder care of child care, or I'll be late, or my spouse is traveling, or I'm a single mom, they can't ask for it or they'll be penalized –

MR. GREGORY: Right.

MS. JARRETT: – by asking for it.

MR. GREGORY: And, John, let's be fair. I mean, if we were both in that position, would we have brought that same issue up with a male executive if it hadn't been a female executive? Would we have felt safe saying, hey, listen, I've got to factor this in with my wife a little bit?

JOHN PODESTA: Well, you know, this is an ongoing conversation, David. That's why we're negotiating across this table and across kitchen tables across the country. But there is no question.

Look, the United Kingdom took the step of giving people the right to at least have a negotiation with the boss; that they have a legal right that they can raise it with their boss. And I think that one of the things that the administration could do, that the federal government could do is become a model employer with respect to this. We tried to do that to some extent during the Clinton administration and I think the Obama administration is trying to move that forward.

So that people do have a right and a comfort zone to go in and say, look, I've got a sick child, I've got an elderly parent; I need to accommodate my schedule to take care of this. Valerie mentioned in the earlier segment, if your kid is sick, make sure that they stay home if they have the flu.

Well, if you're telling that to a person who doesn't have the ability to take that day off with pay, that's a very different request than telling someone who does.

MR. GREGORY: Right.

JOHN PODESTA: So ultimately we need to alter the way we deal in the workforce. We need to provide people with more opportunities.

MR. GREGORY: But isn't it – whether it's the workplace or whether it's government, ultimately there has to be more momentum that's built up, and maybe it is more and more men saying, hey, I need this kind of flexibility too.

What really forces change – because what you see out of that graphic up there is, you know, the way we work, the way our institutions operate – you've mentioned this, John, in your writing on this – like school getting out at 3:00. It's not compatible with this desire among more

and more men and women to say, look I need to stagger this up so I can try to make more of this work.

MS. SHRIVER: Well, I think that's exactly right. And part of what we do is what we're doing right now. We're putting the spotlight on the issue. And when the president created the White House Council on Women and Girls, he put the spotlight right on the issue as well.

The fact that he has a woman who is the labor secretary, whose office is looking at these issues right now and figuring out, what's the best way to support our labor force and encourage positive behavior, not necessarily penalize the negative behavior, but let's put the spotlight on companies that are absolutely doing the right thing and who are successful, who are growing, who are expanding, and who recognize that if you give the flexibility to your workforce, you actually have a more productive workforce.

MR. GREGORY: The issue in all of this, though, Maria, that has to be factored in is, are all of these changes really the best thing for society, and there are different views about this. Look at the polling on this: The impact of fewer stay-at-home parents on society, positive or negative? Most people think it's negative.

Now, look at this in terms of the political divide. Among Republicans, 81 percent think it's negative; among Democrats a much different number – 53 percent. There are still very different views – and it does break down politically – about whether this is the right thing.

MS. JARRETT: Well, I think everybody thinks that it's a good thing that when a child comes home from school or a child is home sick to have a parent or a caretaker there. That's why the right to request flexibility is so important in this country today.

What people said in this poll over and over again is that these institutions have not kept up with the change in American life. They don't see themselves reflected in the media. They don't see enough of these kinds of conversations going on in the media. They feel government is not modern, is not smart about the way it deals with the American family.

So I think that people also overwhelmingly think it's been good that women have gone to work, but if they can go to work, come home, split their day in some way, be there for their children, then people, I would think, get the best of both worlds.

MR. GREGORY: Let's talk about this in the context of politics. You know –

(End video clip.)

HEATHER BOUSHEY: Thank you all. We just wanted to show you that clip from yesterday. That was from sort of – the first television appearance about the report was on "Meet the Press" yesterday, and it was great to have Maria and John do that.

As I was talking to folks over lunch, a number of people sort of mentioned to me the need for us to take this conversation out of places like this room and get it out there into communities

around the country. And I think it's things like this, getting this kind of issue around the need for flexibility and the kinds of policies that we've all been talking about on to "Meet the Press" and the kind of media that John and Maria are doing today is trying to do some of that.

So I also want you all to remember that the reason that John Podesta and Maria Shriver couldn't be here today is because they are trying to take that – start that conversation out there in the country and get people talking about this and take it to a far higher level than I certainly could have imagined a year ago could be done. So that's super exciting.

So we have a wonderful guest up next, and to introduce her we have yet another one of our fantastic advocates, Judy Lichtman, who has been a guiding and influential force in the women's movement for more than 30 years and is currently a senior advisor and former president of the National Partnership for Women and Families – again, I know a mentor to some of the folks here in the room and a hero, I'm sure, to most of us if not all of us. And we're so delighted that she can be here today.

In 1974, Lichtman became the executive director and first paid staff person for the Women's Legal Defense Fund, which became the National Partnership for Women and Families in 1998, and under her leadership is how we got the Family Medical Leave Act of 1993 – magnificent accomplishment. And please join me in welcoming Judy.

(Applause.)

JUDY LICHTMAN: Thank you, Heather, and hello to all of you. It is wonderful to see this room as full and as packed as it is after lunch as it was before lunch.

It is a great pleasure, and a professional, to be sure, but very personal honor to introduce to you Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro, a strong voice for women and families since she was first elected in 1990. So co-chairs the House Steering Committee and sits on two of its most powerful committees: Appropriations, where she chairs the Agriculture Subcommittee and the Budget Committee.

Rosa grew up with a very strong mom, Louisa, who was a trailblazer for women in public service. She was the longest-serving member of the New Haven Board of Aldermen from 1965 to 1998. And for Louisa and other women like her, it's always been a women's nation. And I should say a personal note, that in my contacts, if you looked for many of Rosa's very many phone numbers, one of them is Louisa's, because I know where I can find her. (Chuckles.)

Rosa followed in her mother's footsteps and took wonderful example. She worked tirelessly to improve the lives of women and family and still does. There is no reason to put that in past tense. She authored the Healthy Families Act, which will, when passed, ensure that all Americans have access to paid sick days.

With H1N1 outbreak this year, we know it's more important than ever for people to have the ability to stay home when they or their children are ill without fear of losing their jobs. And I

think that's the very point that John Podesta must have made on the TV recap that you saw of him yesterday on "Meet the Press."

She's also championed legislation to make child care more widely available, and she's a leader in the health care reform battle that's consuming us right this minute. She works tirelessly to ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work. She first introduced the Paycheck Fairness Act in '97, and when the Republican-led Congress refused to act, she never gave up the fight to ensure that women would be paid fairly for a day's work, introducing that bill in every single Congress since then.

Her hard work laid the groundwork for enacting the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, and we know that did become law – the first thing that I believe that Senator – first piece of legislation that Senator Obama signed.

Most of all, Rosa understands that issues like equal pay, like child care, like paid sick days, they're not just women's issues, but issues that are critical to the economic security of all our families. For her work on all these issues, she's been hailed – and I love this – by Tom Oliphant as a hero for working families.

She's a tireless fighter on behalf of these working families. And I know she made an enormous effort to be here today, and I'm so glad that you are with us. I am proud to introduce certainly my friend, but what's even much more important, the friend of all of you and the friend of all the issues we care about so much, Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro.

(Applause.)

REP. ROSA DELAURO (D-CT): Thank you so much. Wow, it is packed. It's great. I came in this side door and I didn't see all these wonderful people. And thanks for coming back after lunch. I appreciate that.

Let me say, Judy, thank you very, very much. You know, Washington is a strange place. You make a lot of acquaintances but you make few friends. And I've had the very, very good fortune of having Judy Lichtman to be a very good friend and a dear friend. And it's the people that you can go to in good times and in those times that are tough that are there for you and who are watching out for you in this very, very competitive environment that we all really operate in.

So thank you for the wonderful introduction and for talking about my mom. She is, at age 96 now, still an inspiration to me every day in her – some people say, well, it's her advanced years that make her so feisty and so forth. No, no, no, no, no. (Laughter.) And if she had been given the opportunities that she and my dad afforded to me, she would have ruled the world. So I have no doubt in my mind.

But I want to also say about Judy that she has been a real inspiration to me over the years, and as has been pointed out, for over 30 years –

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Microphone.

REP. DELAURO: Mike, mike, mike – thank you. For over 30 years she has headed up the National Partnership for Women and Families. She has been on that forefront of the effort to achieve equality for women in America.

She was there when we passed Family and Medical Leave, 1993. She will be there when we do pass Paycheck Fairness, the pay equity bill; the Healthy Families Act, the Paid Sick Leave Bill, and paid leave for – Family and Medical Leave Bill. So we thank you very, very much.

Thanks to Maria Shriver, John Podesta, who, as it was explained, are not here today but on the road just talking up the report. They're in New York. I want to say thank you to them for their hard work, for their vision, their leadership in compiling this incredibly comprehensive inquiry. They did an outstanding job yesterday. I guess you saw a clip. They were really dynamite yesterday on "Meet the Press."

A big thank you to the Center for American Progress for hosting this event today and for your hand in producing this seminal document. You know, I, for a long time, had hoped to see a complete picture of women's status in today's economy, and thanks to the work of Maria and John and the center's top thinkers, such as Heather, Ann O'Leary, Maria Echaveste, we finally now have it.

And as a comprehensive portrait of women in America today, the release of the Shriver Report marks an important milestone. And like all milestones, it represents an occasion for us to pause, to reflect on our long national journey towards full equality, both in how far we have come and where we are going. In fact, almost a half-century ago, Maria Shriver's Uncle John F. Kennedy lay down a similar crucial milestone by organizing the Commission on the Status of Women in 1961.

Chaired by Eleanor Roosevelt – my god, she didn't even think about the heroes and heroines of our time – the 26-member commission met for two years to examine the roles of women in our society and the continuing discrimination they face in all walks of American life.

Their final report, "American Women," or the Peterson Report, was not only used as the basis for important legislation such as the Equal Pay Act of 1963, it became the marker by which the role of women in '60s America was comprehensively understood.

Similarly, 50 years from now when scholars want to understand and access the role of women in America at the dawn of the 21st century, they will look to the Shriver Report as their guide. It is all here in great detail.

And in many ways there is real cause for rejoicing in the Shriver Report. As it eloquently puts it, "The American worker is now as likely to wear a heel as a boot. For the first time in our nation's history, one-half of all U.S. workers are women. Mothers are the primary breadwinner or co-bread winner in two-thirds of America families."

And this is not due to any sort of temporary wartime surge, such as when Rosie the Riveter and the “government girls” flocked to work during World War II. No, this simply is the way things are. And I quote from the report: “This is a long-term trend that shows no signs of reversing.”

And it is not just as workers that women have seen extraordinary gains, but as students, businesswomen and leaders. Women are more likely than men to graduate from college today. They run more than 10 million businesses with combined annual sales of \$1.1 trillion, and are responsible for making 80 percent of consumer buying decisions.

As my good friend Linda Tarr-Whelan recently noted in her new book, “Women Lead the Way,” when women assume positions of leadership, whether in Congress or in the corporate boardroom, the agenda changes. That is what this is about. It’s not about the numbers; it is about the nature of priorities and agenda setting and how we can move public policy in these directions.

Moreover, the Shriver Report finds that the battle of the sexes is over, particularly among the younger generations. Negotiations between men and women about work, family, child care and the like are now the order of the day. These days, the presence of women in the workplace on an equal footing is a fact.

Seventy percent of men are comfortable with women working outside the home. Three-quarters of Americans view the rise of women in the workforce as a positive development for society. It is indisputable. In the 48 years since the commission we have come a very, very long way.

But the process of change will not stop, even today. For as much as the findings of the Shriver Report indicate real progress for women in the past half-century, they also suggest where we have a long way to go and even mountains to climb.

While women and mothers working is arguably the greatest social transformation of our time, our political and our social institutions have not kept pace with this extraordinary change. For example, 50 years ago the problem of equal pay for equal work loomed large for America’s working women. Sadly, that remains just as true today. Forty-six years after the passage of the Equal Pay Act, right here and now in the 21st century, women still earn only 77 cents on the dollar as compared to men.

You know, it was interesting to me was on a Sunday morning after – they showed a clip at the end of “Meet the Press,” which had the panel presentation – 1972 – I think it was September 10th, 1972, with Gloria Steinem, and you would listen to the questions that she was asked; it was bizarre, totally bizarre when you’re thinking about it today.

But it was interesting – she said there that – I guess there were 36 percent of women in the workforce at that time, and women were making one-half of what men were making. We’re now at 77 cents but, you know, in ’72 it was half so we’ve made some progress. But her point was well-taken then as it is now.

And it is because society has undervalued the work that women do in our society. And that's true today. It's true today, and that's what we have to change – 77 cents on the dollar as compared to men. Women of color are even worse off. African-American women make 68 cents on the dollar compared to the highest earners. Hispanic women make only 57 cents. Mothers are paid 73 cents, single mothers 60 cents, unmarried women 56 cents.

Unmarried women have an average household almost \$12,000 lower than unmarried men. And according to the National Committee on Pay Equity, working women stand to lose \$250,000 over the course of their career because of these shortfalls. So this report increases the urgency of making progress on this and many other fronts.

I just have to tell you that – I'll do it at this juncture. Just glancing at this report, this is "Women and Employment." The policy changes have not changed. They have not changed. You've got 65 million women who have jobs. It was 23 million in 1962. The issue is then as now. And you look at this chapter starting on page 45: "Equal Pay, Flexibility, Government Contracts." So some things have not changed, my friends, in this effort.

The lingering problem becomes that much worse when you consider both the Shriver Report's findings and the state of our current economy. Women are not only working more than ever, they are also shouldering more and more of the burdens of this great recession. Make no mistake; women have felt the effects of this faltering economy with particular force and poignancy.

As a result of the extreme downturns in construction and manufacturing, two fields that are still disproportionately male, almost three out of four jobs lost during this recession have been held by men. But in recent months, women-heavy fields such as government and education are now shedding positions as well, and women now make up an increasing number of the jobless.

This past month, the women's unemployment rate rose to 7.8 percent, a 26-year high. And even those still employed face many additional burdens. Even before the recent downturn we have begun to see serious signs of stagnation for working women.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, women's median pay, the point where half make more and half less, fell in recent years to \$14.84 an hour in 2007 from \$15.04 in 2004. The similar wage for men today is \$2 more. And incomes for women-headed households are down by 3 percent since 2000.

So now we face a double-edged problem. On one hand, women are now losing jobs just like men, and given the dire situation for state budgets across the country, will continue to do so for some time to come.

On the other hand, the higher job loss rate among men has left millions of women nationwide as the primary or even sole breadwinner for their household, and they must now support their families while making only 77 cents on the dollar. And to quote Heather, she says

in a recent article, “Families will continue to rely on the earnings of working women for a long time.”

Worse, research in the Shriver Report and by Women’s Voices, Women Vote indicates that this dismal economic situation is falling hardest on unmarried women. Who are unmarried women? They’re single, widowed, divorced and separated. They run the age gamut. And they are the most rapidly growing segment of the female electorate.

Single women in America are the most likely demographic group to file for bankruptcy right now and the most likely women to be uninsured. Female-headed households have twice the likelihood of seeing a 50 percent or greater drop in their income than male-headed ones do, and these female-headed households have fewer savings to draw on.

Sixty-four percent of single women who work part-time have no retirement benefits and they are more likely to be involved in a subprime mortgage. Why are unmarried women, who are growing in numbers throughout the workforce, having such a tough time in this recession? Well, perhaps it is because, as CAP pointed out last year, unmarried women make only 56 cents on the dollar compared to married men.

Now, I suspect the question of how to restore our prosperity and bring jobs back for men and women alike across America will consume our efforts over the next few months and even years, but in the meantime, we need to get serious about this lingering pay differential and put an end to it now and forever.

Early this year we took an important first step when we passed and President signed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act into law. It’s time to close the deal now. Let’s close the deal. Let’s pass Paycheck Fairness. It puts real teeth into the enforcement provisions in fighting paycheck discrimination.

The Shriver Report makes it abundantly clear that women make up as much of the American workforce as men, and it is long past time that women’s take-home pay reflects this fact, and that in fact, society recognizes and values the work that women do in this country.

We have fought for 12 long years on this bill. We’ve had great help from CAP, from the National Partnership, the American Association of University Women. It finally passed the House. Last year it passed the House again in January, the very first week of the 111th Congress. It’s time for the Senate, my friends. Get to your Senate friends and tell them that this is a priority and the administration and the Senate need to prioritize this issue and pass it into law.

And I’m serious – I’m serious about your help. I understand about jobs and I understand about health care, but I believed early on this year we should have passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and Paycheck Fairness at the same time. We apparently couldn’t get there from here, particularly in the Senate.

It would have been – we could have done it in the House, but now is the time to do it. Let us not check a box that says we passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and we are done with pay equity for women. We, all of us together, cannot afford to let that happen.

Ensuring equal pay is only the start. Let's make sure that our labor standards and social insurance programs reflect the realities that are illuminated by the Shriver Report. We have historians such as Linda Gordon, Alice Kessler-Harris, have shown the creation of Social Security in 1935 incorporated certain notions about the role of women in the workplace that were erroneous even then.

You can see it in the split between unemployment insurance, which was expected to go mostly to men, and Aid to Dependent Children, later Aid to Families with Dependent Children, which was meant to go mostly to women.

And Gordon's memorable phrase: Women were considered – and I quote – “pitied but not entitled.” Under Social Security, as designed, men received federal money on the assumption that they were workers; women on the assumption that they were domestic providers.

Even our heroine, Secretary of Labor Francis Perkins, the first female Cabinet official in our history, then argued that women with jobs were primarily, quote, “pin-money workers who labored only to supplement their husbands' paychecks or have money for inessential items.”

This view, increasingly retrograde even in the 1930s is, as the Shriver Report reminds us, completely obsolete nowadays, and yet our entire Social Security system is predicated on these same archaic assumptions, that men work and women stay home and look after children. We must modernize our labor policies and social safety net to reflect the social transformations that are described in this report that both parents, father and mother, now spend their days in the workplace.

You know, there have been attempts – it's important to note this – to address this lingering inequity. In the 2000 presidential campaign, lest we forget, Al Gore proposed increasing Social Security benefits for women who take time off work in order to raise children in order to offset the, quote, “motherhood penalty” of not earning for several years.

More recently Heather Boushey of CAP, a key contributor, as you know, to the report, has argued for incorporating family and medical leave into the Social Security system so that workers can access Social Security benefits for income when they need paid leave for life events that are covered under FMLA.

It's a worthy initiative and one I believe we should pursue further. We need to expand family and medical leave, make it easier for workers to take advantage of it. Last year we passed into law legislation to give military family members six months of unpaid leave to care for injured service members, and that was the first expansion of FMLA in 15 years.

We need to take a look at Lynn Woolsey's legislation, the Balancing Act, which would provide paid FMLA and expand child care opportunities for working parents. Along these lines,

we recognize that child care is another important issue for women today, and for decades now women and men have struggled with the lack of access to quality child care.

You know, it was a huge problem when I served as chief of staff to Senator Dodd some 30 years ago. Whoa, that is really scary. We worked on it constantly, and culminating in Senator Dodd getting the Child Care Development Block Grant passed in 1990. It was a huge problem a decade ago, and myself, Bernie Sanders and Connie Morella at the time organized something called the Congressional Child Care Caucus to focus on this issue, and it's a huge problem today.

I believe that the Child Care Development Block Grant is a strong foundation for a federal commitment to child care. We need to do more with it. We have to expand our funding of the program to support more child-care facilities, particularly in low-income areas, double the number of children it serves nationwide.

We have to make sure that all child care in this country meets basic health and safety and child development standards. It's important not only because of working mothers and fathers, of course, but for their kids. We continue to learn more and more about the language, social, even brain development of young children and it all points to the fact that early engagement is essential for our kids' success.

Obviously child care becomes no less important as children grow. The parents of more than 28 million school-age children work outside the home and a third of those children are poor or would be poor if their mother did not work. In short, we need to help these two-income families get by.

Good child care is not only extremely expensive; it's essential. We need to look at expanding the child tax credit. I'm going to mention that because this is near and dear to my heart. You know, we passed the child tax credit, but in today's economy, if you're working and you've lost your job – you've lost your job, you've lost your health-care benefits and, yes, you've lost your child tax credit as well.

We need to drop that threshold to zero so that we can do something for families who rely on that. And if we talk about – because, you know, my colleague, David Obey, talks about, you kids, and he says, you can take – people who – and members that I serve with, if you take pictures with kids, you're posing for holey pictures if you don't put your money where your mouth is or where the photograph is in terms of turning things around for them.

We need to recognize the problems posed by a sick child in an economy where both parents work. Nearly half – 48 percent of private-sector workers do not have a single paid sick day to care for themselves or for a sick family member. So these workers, men and women both, are forced to lose crucial income and even put their jobs on the line every time they take a day off.

Fifty-seven million Americans do not have the right to take time off when they are sick or when the need to stay home to care for an ailing child or an elderly relative – completely

unacceptable. Given the findings of the Shriver Report – and Judy mentioned H1N1 – it’s wonderful when you see all these folks on television that tell you, you know, besides washing your hands, don’t go to work. Stay home.

Nice for you to say; you probably have all the health insurance that you need and you can take sick time. That goes for my colleagues. That goes for the health officials, for the president of the United States, who has told people to stay home. You know, our health care is covered. These folks don’t have a single day to take off.

That’s why we have – on the Healthy Families Act we have 109 co-sponsors. Again, get out there and tell them, you know, to do it. This is an elemental right at work. It’s common sense. We have to recognize the new realities posed by a two-income economy and find ways to help working men and women accordingly.

And the paid sick days is also part of a broader health-care debate. Here, as with equal pay – let me mention that this is where we see lingering and pervasive discrimination against women that has to be addressed.

We have a health insurance industry today that refuses to cover basic maternity care for four out of five women, but still, through the insidious practice of gender rating, charges women up to 48 percent more than men for identical coverage. Stunning. It is stunning. You’ve got an industry that refuses to cover victims of domestic violence, that kicks women out of the hospital within mere hours of a mastectomy.

It is time to bring women on equal footing when it comes to health care. Having a child, or having had a C-section, or being a victim of domestic violence, or for that matter, having been born a woman should not be treated as a preexisting condition. (Laughter, applause.)

I might add that the Obama health-care reforms, which we are about to pass in the Congress – I know you don’t believe that but we are going to pass health care reform – would put a stop to these discriminatory practices. It ensures that insurance plans recognize the health needs of women and mothers. It covers them. It outlaws gender rating, ends discrimination based on preexisting conditions. It ensures that companies cover maternity care and important preventive screenings such as mammograms.

Women are not second-class citizens and our health-care system should stop treating them as if they were. We have so much more to do as well. As women we have made ourselves heard in all corners of the American workforce, but new problems have emerged that we must now address.

Construction. The burgeoning numbers of women in the field have been held down because the Department of Labor still relies on out-of-date contract standards. The Office of Federal Contracts and Compliance Programs determines the minimum total number of work hours performed by women on a given federal contract. But the standards they use to determine this has not changed in 30 years, and the data this standard is based on comes from the 1970 Census.

As the Shriver Report makes clear, things have changed considerably in that time. Pete Stark and others and myself, about 24 of us, have written to Secretary Solis about the problem. And, you know, we look to Secretary Solis. She gets it. She understands that we are so fortunate to have her in this position. I love Hilda. I really did – you know, had a wonderful opportunity to work with her.

She's lived and breathed these issues and she gets it, and I feel confident that we are going to turn these efforts around in this new Department of Labor. And she gets it, she understands it, and it isn't beyond her intellectual capacity – (laughter) – to deal with these issues as it was in the past. (Applause.) Sorry.

And these sorts of inequities are not relegated to construction alone. This is very interesting. And you're going to say, how does this lady know this? Because I chair the Subcommittee of Appropriations on Agriculture.

New census data recently revealed that women farmers have been consistently underreported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture over the past 15 years. Worse, an estimated 43,000 women farmers have been discriminatorily denied more than \$4.6 billion in farm loans and loan servicing from USDA over the years. It is completely outrageous, and we are moving in terms of legislative remedies for this injustice in the very near future.

Construction, farming, we need to help open doors, make opportunities real for women in once untapped job markets where women are under-represented. To reflect this change, to help further this along, we have something called a Pathways Advancing Career Training Act, the PACT Act. It would provide assistance to states to scale up training programs that have proven successful in helping unemployed and under-employed women train for and thrive in high-wage, high-skill work.

There is so much on our plate, so much left to do to ensure real equality for women that it can start to seem daunting. But that is why milestones like today are so important. Yes, problems remain, and indeed new problems have emerged for women as our economic power has grown stronger.

On such milestones I do recall my 96-year-old mother, who still reads speeches on my behalf. And I tell her not to free lance – (laughter) – but who started working in the old sweat shops in the city of New Haven at sewing machine stitching collars and dresses at a time when 15 garment workers died in New Haven at the Franklin Street fire just up the street from us.

She made sure I got an education and learned something about battling for people. And she was ultimately the longest-serving member of the New Haven Board of Aldermen. She is part of the progress and change that is captured in this report.

The Shriver Report makes clear that we have made very real gains in the past few decades and that many of the struggles that we have been engaged in for generations have come

to fruition. Women now work in great numbers in every field in American employ. The vast majority of men have accepted them as coworkers, equals and bosses.

For those of us who have been around for a while, like my mother, this is not small thing. So as we pause to reflect today on the release of this report, let us take strength in our successes over these past few decades. We, the men and women in this room today – scientists, sociologists, politicians, lawyers, activists, advocates are here because generations before us believed in equality and justice and fought hard for it.

So let us celebrate this moment and this ground-breaking report, and heartened and armed with these new insights, let us recommit ourselves to push forward as the challenges grow only larger. Let us get involved and start building the next milestone, certainly less than a half century ahead of us.

Thank you very, very much for letting me be with you today. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. LICHTMAN: Thank you all very much, and thank our wonderful congresswoman for her call to action. (Applause.) Thank you.

REP. DELAURO: Questions?

MS. LICHTMAN: Anybody?

REP. DELAURO: I see a hand right here.

MS. LICHTMAN: Back here? This wonderful woman has had a couple of opportunities, I know, so I just want to see if I have any questions from somebody else way back there. Please state your name and affiliation.

Q: Hi, I'm Danielle LeClair with the Laborers' Union. And, Congresswoman, we want to thank you so much for your leadership on all of these issues. These are priorities that we have, and we're thrilled to have an advocate like you in Congress representing us on this.

REP. DELAURO: Thank you.

Q: I wanted to see, along the lines of paid family leave, paid sick leave, equal pay, how you think another piece of legislation, the Employee Free Choice Act, would help. We tend to think of it as a labor issue, not as much of a women's issue, but what you think about that.

REP. DELAURO: Well, look, I'm a strong supporter of the employee – of free trade, of EFCA, and, you know, have – this was, you know, not just in the last few months or in a campaign but prior to that, et cetera. I think there isn't any question we could pass the legislation in the House. The issue, again, is the Senate, and what is it that we have to, you know, do to move it.

I think there are very smart people trying to figure out what to do. I welcome that. I know Senator Harkin is a strong supporter and is looking for new endeavors. Rich Trumka is, you know, in the same vein. But I think people are trying to very carefully, thoughtfully reflect on how to get the best out of this as we move forward.

So I will be there. They're now on it. And I think we cannot let it go, and I think it – you know, I truly do believe, in my heart and soul, because I've watched it in my own family – I believe that, you know, labor unions created the middle class in this country. That's where I come from – (applause) – that's where I'm about.

And I think we have seen – we have seen – and this is not me; I heard Paul Krugman talk about this at one point, that we needed to go this direction because there were strong unions. They were strong for men, they were strong for women, and that makes a difference in your economic security, and that's what that's about is economic security.

MS. LICHTMAN: I'm going to have time for one more question. The woman – yeah, you.

Q: Me, thank you.

REP. DELAURO: Great jacket.

Q: Thank you. (Laughter.) Thank you. I worked hard – (laughter) – as a single woman in the workplace, yes.

REP. DELAURO: All right.

Q: It was always, well, you don't have kids; you can stay here and work. No.

My question, I really would like to, I guess, challenge the assumptions today that a lot of women are not making the same amount of money as men in certain professions. I do agree, you, know, if you're low-income, if you're a service industry, et cetera, et cetera, but if you have found your own business or a CEO or in the boardroom, at attorney, a doc, what have you – and I have been a professional – (unintelligible) – and we don't get paid much money, and that's the result of the association not advocating for us.

But don't you think we need to clarify more when we say women are not making the same amount of money as men in terms of what they're doing, and we need –

REP. DELAURO: Let's get your name and where I can reach you. I will send you the information. (Laughter.) It doesn't make a difference if you are a bus driver, a waitress, if you are – why do think the American Association of University Women are all over this? If you are an engineer, if you are a news anchor; no matter what the profession is, no matter what it is, women are paid less.

The data is there. I don't make it up. You can check on it. (Applause.) Honestly, that argument, I've heard it over and over and over again and it's not – let me just say this to you: I am a member of the United States Congress, okay? I serve with men and with women. We come from all over the country – North, South, East and West. We come with different educational backgrounds, different skill sets, different philosophical viewpoints, all kinds of differences.

And we make, in the same job – what I do and what George Miller does, it's the exact same job. We get paid the same amount of money. Now, that is not true – not true for the rest of the women in our society. It is just untrue.

That is what we have to change because that has been an argument in the past; it is not – the data just proves that argument, and the only way we're going to get there is if we put teeth and enforcement procedures in that Equal Pay Act that came out of this document all those years ago so that we can no longer discriminate in a workplace based on gender.

(Applause.)

MS. LICHTMAN: I thank all of you and I think – is there time for – Heather?

MS. BOUSHEY: Our next panel.

MS. LICHTMAN: Thank you all so much.

(Applause.)

MS. BOUSHEY: Thank you so much, Congresswoman. It's always a pleasure to have you here. Thank you.

So I think we're going to do a quick screen poll shot, yeah? Are we doing – yes. Okay, so our next poll question today is agree or disagree: Men have lost the battle of the sexes. And so I'll let you all sort of ponder that for a moment. And while you're pondering, we need the business panel to take their seats up front. Welcome to you all. Thank you all so much.

(END)