



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2011

No. 137

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 15, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Most Reverend Thomas John Paprocki, Bishop of Springfield, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to You in prayer and seek Your blessing on the United States House of Representatives.

Because our vision of Your goodness is clouded by sin, we seek Your light to guide us on our way.

Because we do not always listen as we should to Your commands, help us to hear Your Word.

Because we often fail to think in accord with Your wisdom, we need Your truth to enlighten our minds.

Because Your ways are not our ways, give us prudence and courage to follow Your will.

May we take inspiration from Springfield's most famous citizen, Abraham Lincoln, who reminded us that "a house divided against itself cannot stand." May we heed his call and follow his example.

We ask You, dear God, to grant these prayers and lead us to the glory of Your Kingdom, where You live and reign forever and ever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING BISHOP THOMAS PAPROCKI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor today's guest chaplain, Bishop Thomas Paprocki of Springfield, Illinois. I've known Bishop Paprocki for over 20 years, as he served as auxiliary bishop of the Archdiocese of Chicago before becoming Bishop of Springfield.

The good bishop is also known in other circles only as the "Holy Goalie"—the man who saves souls and goals. Bishop Paprocki and I have played hockey together many times, and it's always a comfort to know I've got the bishop behind me manning the net.

But his heroics on the ice pale in comparison to his service to our community. In these years since joining the priesthood in 1978, he has shown a dedication to helping the poor and disadvantaged. With his DePaul law degree, he set forth to found the Chicago

Legal Clinic to assist these struggling communities.

His work is an inspiration to us all. I am lucky to call the bishop a good friend.

Thank you, Bishop Paprocki, for joining us here today. See you on the ice.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS FIGHTING TO PROTECT AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, with more than 14 million Americans unemployed, the irresponsible agenda of the National Labor Relations Board is destroying more jobs. In April, the NLRB filed a complaint against The Boeing Company for creating thousands of jobs in a right-to-work State, South Carolina.

The Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act will promote, today, a positive environment for job creators by developing their businesses in a State that offers the best opportunities for job growth. The new law will prohibit the NLRB from dictating where employers can relocate, shut down, or transfer employment.

I am proud of the leadership of the four freshmen from South Carolina making a difference promoting jobs, led by Congressman TIM SCOTT of North Charleston who introduced this legislation, and I'm grateful to be an original cosponsor with Congressman

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6185

TREY GOWDY of Spartanburg, Congressman JEFF DUNCAN of Laurens, and Congressman MICK MULVANEY of Indian Land.

This legislation will provide the certainty for job creators to invest in the economy and put Americans back to work.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND ITS THREAT TO FUTURE GENERATIONS

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, during our discussion of the Federal debt, we heard a lot of discussion about threats to our children's and our grandchildren's future. What we have not heard enough discussion about is another threat to our children's and our grandchildren's future, and that is the threat of climate change.

We have seen the first bitter taste of this oncoming tsunami of change with 7 inches of rain in 3 hours in Virginia, with wildfires in Texas that have been unprecedented in our Nation's history. And now our current job crisis does not give us the luxury of ignoring this long-term threat to our children's and our grandchildren's future.

I want to alert Members to a thing they can check on right now, the Climate Reality Project, which is something going on until 7 o'clock tonight—climateralityproject.org. If people are interested in what is happening to our country today, around the country and the world, check out climateralityproject.org. It is a bitter taste. Let's keep our eye on that ball as well.

REFUNDABLE CHILD TAX CREDIT

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Last year, illegal immigrants bilked \$4.2 billion from U.S. taxpayers due to a loophole with the refundable child tax credit. According to a new report, this rampant abuse has cost American taxpayers billions. That's just wrong.

It's time to close this loophole. That's why I've reintroduced the commonsense legislation, H.R. 1956, that stops the child tax credit sham.

The bill requires tax filers to provide their Social Security number to receive that benefit. With the dire need to cut government spending, I hope this simple fix gets a serious look as a way to stamp out waste, fraud, and abuse.

If you want to stop illegal immigrants from duping taxpayers for billions of dollars every year by fraudulently claiming this credit, call the

White House at 202-456-1414. Tell them to pass this bill right now. Tell them that H.R. 1956 should be a top priority.

BIPARTISAN APPROACH

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

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to draw attention to a September 8 Washington Post editorial written by the dean of the House, the Honorable JOHN DINGELL, entitled "Congress Needs a Fresh, Bipartisan Approach."

Congressman DINGELL reminds us of a time not too long ago when Members from both sides of the aisle worked together for long hours for months on end to solve the problems of the day. These were times when Members were motivated less by the reward of a good media hit and more by the reward of overcoming the challenges that confronted the Nation.

Today, we face the critical challenge of getting Americans back to work. This isn't a Republican or a Democratic problem, and the fix that will get folks back to work doesn't prefer one side or the other. Americans can no longer afford the political games that consume us now.

I encourage my colleagues to heed the advice of our distinguished colleague. Let's roll up our sleeves and work together to get our economy back on track.

□ 0910

TAX HIKES ON JOB CREATORS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, last week in this Chamber, the President challenged a joint session of Congress to pass his jobs stimulus bill. He promised the American people that it would be paid for. This week, we learned that it will be 100 percent paid for through tax hikes on job creators.

Pinnacle Asset Integrity Services is a small business engineering firm employing 100 people in the district I represent in Pasadena, Texas. Pinnacle's president told me that the higher taxes proposed by President Obama would not affect his personal salary, but higher taxes would severely restrict the funds available to him to pay employees while maintaining the reserve cash needed for monthly salaries. The result? Layoffs.

Mr. Speaker, tax hikes on job creators like Pinnacle are simply not the solution. Regulatory certainty and reasonable tax rates will do wonders for job creation. I urge my colleagues to stand with the job creators and reject this tax increase.

Let's get America back to work.

PASS JOBS LEGISLATION

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. In this Chamber, there is a lot of back and forth about who creates jobs and who doesn't. Some have suggested it's not government, only business, or vice versa. It's both.

How about the construction worker who built a Federal highway so businesses can ship their products? That's how we work together.

How about the teacher who works a 14-hour day to educate the next generation of small business owners? That's how we work together.

Tell it to a veteran that's not a real job if he spent 2 years away from his wife and child to protect our democracy and the freedom of business owners to expand their wealth. That's how we work together.

Personally, I don't think I or the American people give a dang who creates the jobs. All that matters is that the jobs are created. Let's get to work for America. We don't have to sit here and set up false choices and pit the worker at a private factory against the teacher who teaches our children. We all have a role to play in getting this country back to work. Let's end the partisanship, work together and pass jobs legislation.

HOLDING OUR MILITARY FAMILIES FISCALLY HOSTAGE

(Mrs. ROBY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROBY. Our military families are the heart and soul of our Armed Forces. Recognizing this, tomorrow in Fort Rucker, Alabama, there will be a spouse day. Army husbands and wives will run an obstacle course, fly simulators, and shoot M16s to experience life as an Army soldier.

Military families are a vital part of my district, and it is my great honor to represent them. Recently, I was in Fort Rucker and I was speaking to a soldier, and his expectant wife was sitting next to me. With tears in his eyes, he said, Don't worry about me. I'm okay. Just make sure she's okay.

Unnecessary defense cuts could change our military as we know it today. These cuts will not affect military operations as much as they could weaken viable support for military spouses and their children. Regardless of politics, our military families must continue to have the resources necessary to serve in their support role as military dependents.

LET'S PASS THE AMERICAN JOBS ACT

(Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I have a great idea. Let's pass the American Jobs Act.

It cuts taxes, it invests in infrastructure, and most importantly, it helps small businesses be more competitive in the global economy. Economists of all political stripes tell us that this act will create 1.9 million jobs, and it does it, in part, by making sure that U.S. taxpayer dollars are spent on U.S. jobs by applying the Buy American provisions.

We should pass the American Jobs Act, and then we should take the simple idea that U.S. taxpayer dollars should go to create U.S. jobs and then apply it to every corner of the Federal Government. For instance, we could create another 600,000 jobs on top of the 1.9 million if we'd just clean up loopholes that allow for thousands of defense contracts to go to overseas companies.

You see, rhetoric on the floor of the House of Representatives doesn't create jobs. Real, now-focused policies do, like the American Jobs Act and the Buy American policy.

U.S. OBJECTION TO PALESTINIAN STATEHOOD IN THE U.N.—A HOLLOW, LONE VOICE OF REASON

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Palestinians are going to the United Nations to seek some type of recognition as a state, but this decision should only be decided with direct negotiations with Israel and Palestine. The Palestinians have rejected this proper process for peace and go instead to the anti-Israel U.N. for recognition.

Dore Gold, a former Israeli ambassador to the U.N., said: "If there was a U.N. resolution whose first clause was anti-Israel and whose second clause was that the Earth was flat, the U.N. would pass it."

The U.S. has come to this issue late, and even though it will object to the Palestinian statehood through the U.N., in recent years, the United States has given mixed signals about its support for Israel. That is unfortunate. Israel is our most loyal friend and ally in the Middle East.

The U.S. objection to the Palestinian statehood in the U.N. will be a hollow, lone voice of reason. It will show once again that the U.S. has little leadership in the United Nations. However, the U.N. will reaffirm its position of bigotry against all things Israel even if it means proclaiming the Earth is flat.

This is yet another reason to cut U.S. aid to the U.N. We don't need to pay the U.N. to hate Israel. They will do it for free.

And that's just the way it is.

PASS THE JOBS ACT

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I am very worried about our country. Democrats and our President are calling on the Congress to pass the Jobs Act so that our fellow Americans who have been unemployed can go back to work; so that teachers, firemen, and police can keep their jobs; so that those whose incomes have dropped will have a little more money to spend on their families; so that our children will have schools that show we care about them; and so that struggling small businesses will get the help they need.

Building the political will to do this requires not only patriotism; it requires compassion. After watching the Tea Party debate, where the audience and some candidates indicated an uninsured person should be left to die and where there was loud applause for capital punishment, I wonder if we can still feel another's pain.

This calls out to the good people that I know who remain the majority in this country to do more, to speak louder to drown out the voice of hate, and to renew and strengthen the values that have always made the United States of America the greatest country in the world.

We are commanded to love our neighbor. As my pastor preached last Sunday, if we do, we will not wish our neighbors ill or do them harm.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2587, PROTECTING JOBS FROM GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE ACT

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 372 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 372

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2587) to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from ordering any employer to close, relocate, or transfer employment under any circumstance. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts

(Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

□ 0920

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Because the one Republican amendment submitted to the Rules Committee was not germane and because the Democrats chose not to offer any amendments at all, House Resolution 372 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2587, the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. The underlying bill would amend the National Labor Relations Act to prohibit the NLRB from ordering any employer to relocate, shut down or transfer employment beginning the date of passage. Since the NLRB filed suit against Boeing, I have been reminded of an old saying: "A government that is big enough to give you all you want is big enough to take it all away."

What you see now is exactly that, Big Government killing jobs under the guise of protecting workers. Let me be clear. Despite what opponents will say, this is not a union issue. This is a classic example of government overreach which will, in the end, destroy American jobs and encourage companies to look elsewhere in the world.

With unemployment at 9.1 percent and an economy which is best described as fragile, we do not have the luxury of being able to afford this action. Plain and simple, my legislation will remove the NLRB's ability to kill jobs.

The government, especially an unelected board, does not need to be involved in the business decisions of the private sector. In fact, it cannot be. We already live in a country where our corporate tax structure is the second highest in the world, and we cannot add another strike against us.

Today, the NLRB's overreach threatens 1,100 jobs in my hometown of north Charleston. Let me say that again: 1,100 jobs already created and filled. Who is to say tomorrow it does not preclude another company from looking to expand, not just in South Carolina, a State where our unemployment rate is at 10.9 percent, but anywhere in the country. This instability is the last thing our job creators need right now.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. This commonsense solution will help spur job creation and, more importantly, it will remove impediments to job creation.

I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” on the rule and “yes” on the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this yet another closed rule and in even stronger opposition to the underlying bill.

The difference between the two parties could not be any clearer. While Democrats continue to push for legislation that will create American jobs, Republicans continue to attack American workers.

After more than 250 days, the majority, House Republicans, have no jobs agenda, nothing. Instead, they have brought forth job-destroying legislation that could cost up to nearly 2 million jobs, and they have voted to end Medicare, cut Social Security and slash Medicaid.

Today, sadly, is no different. Instead of bringing the American Jobs Act to the floor, the Republican leadership gives us H.R. 2587, the “GOP Job Outsourcers’ Bill of Rights.”

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that my Republican colleagues detest the National Labor Relations Board. They have made that crystal clear in the past few months with their amendments to cut the NLRB’s funding and undermine its authority.

But today they have sunk to a new low. The bill before us guts the very fundamental rights of American workers to fight for better wages and working conditions, and it makes it easier for companies to outsource American jobs overseas.

Not a single hearing was held on this bill, not one. No objective assessments were done by the GAO or the Congressional Research Service, not even an evaluation on the impact on wages or job security of the millions of American workers who will be touched by this legislation.

If this is the Republicans’ idea of a job-creation plan, they are even further off base than I thought.

I would like to think that my Republican colleagues haven’t thought through the wide-ranging repercussions of this bill. So let me take a moment to educate them.

Companies in the United States are free to move their operations as they see fit, as long as it’s not in retaliation for workers exercising their right to organize, to demand better benefits and safer working conditions, or to ensure a full day’s pay for an honest day’s work.

And the plain fact is, if a company is allowed to retaliate against its workers simply for exercising their lawful rights, every worker in every other State, including South Carolina, will lose some of their fundamental rights. A year from now, if Boeing decides to move production from South Carolina

to China, to retaliate against workers who try to organize a union, the NLRB would have no power to order those jobs to be kept or transferred back to the United States. For many American workers today, the NLRB’s authority to restore or reinstate work that has been unlawfully transferred, outsourced, or subcontracted away from workers exercising their lawful rights is the only remedy they have to keep their jobs.

By eliminating the power of the NLRB to order work be restored or reinstated, a CEO may simply eliminate the work and thereby the worker. That CEO may even explain to the workforce that he eliminated the work because it was pro-union. Even worse, H.R. 2587 would apply retroactively to any complaint that has not been resolved by the time of enactment, including the Boeing case.

This is a terrible, terrible, terrible precedent. Congress has no business sticking its nose into an ongoing legal proceeding. We have no business changing the rules of the game in the middle of the game.

Republicans have sent a clear message: if you aren’t a CEO of a Fortune 500 company, you shouldn’t have any rights in the workplace. For the millions of hardworking middle class workers who are struggling to support their families and pay their bills, H.R. 2587 is a slap in the face.

Democrats will not stand idly by as this Republican Congress tries to dismantle the rights of American workers. American workers have fought hard and earned these rights. They have sweated and bled and sometimes died to secure them. I am proud to stand with those workers and their families.

I find it sad that this Republican leadership, a leadership that routinely fights to protect tax loopholes for corporations that shift jobs overseas, is now bringing this horrible anti-worker bill to the floor.

I urge my colleagues to reject this far-reaching legislation and get back to work to bring real and meaningful job creation bills to the floor. Stop this assault against American workers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. There are a couple of comments I would like to make on my good friend’s comments.

For one thing, not a single union employee, not a single employee in Washington State—Puget Sound, Washington State—has lost their job because of the new line of work being done in North Charleston, South Carolina.

Another comment that my good friend made had to do with Medicare and what the Republicans are doing to Medicare. Let us not forget the fact that without any question the legislation that has the greatest impact on Medicare and its funding for the future happens to be the national health care plan passed by the Democrats where

they stripped \$500 billion, \$500 billion, out of Medicare to pay for the debacle known as national health care.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. JOE WILSON.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. SCOTT, for your leadership.

The Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act will prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from dictating where private businesses can and cannot choose to create jobs.

The legislation ensures private businesses across America will be able to promote job growth by making decisions based on the best interests of their shareholders and workers. The act prohibits the NLRB from ordering employers to relocate, shut down, or transfer employment. It fosters a positive environment for employers to develop their businesses and the State that offers the best opportunities for growth and job creation.

It’s truly sad that this legislation must be created to counter the overreaching agenda of the job-killing NLRB. Earlier this month, the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced that the national unemployment rate is at 9.1 percent. This means there were 14 million Americans that were without jobs. So I find it bizarre that in this climate of high unemployment, the NLRB is attempting to destroy thousands of jobs in South Carolina.

In fact, as Politico has reported, the 1.1 million square-foot building is built. I was there for the groundbreaking. I was there for the topping out.

Already, as my colleague, Congressman SCOTT, has pointed out, 1,100 people are employed today. Another 8,000 people will be employed across this State of South Carolina. This is not a hypothetical issue. It is a completed plant with jobs, with families at risk today.

This year, my birthplace has served as the center of this controversial ruling by the administration that a large manufacturer that’s created jobs across the country cannot relocate.

□ 0930

This is now unprecedented. The Boeing complaint is a threat to all right-to-work States, not just South Carolina. The NLRB is chasing jobs overseas. Being a right-to-work State means employees in those States can choose for themselves whether to join a union. The NLRB complaint against Boeing is really without merit. It falsely indicates that Boeing “transferred work” of the 787 Dreamliner assembly line from Washington State. However, not a single union employee has lost a job due to the decision to locate a new, second line for 787s.

The NLRB efforts may have an unintended consequence. With the legal theory a business cannot expand from a union State to a right-to-work State, business will get the message never to

locate in a union State in the first place. The only safe location is to establish a business in a right-to-work State.

I applaud the proactive efforts of Congressman SCOTT in introducing the bill. I want to thank the chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee, JOHN KLINE, along with the distinguished subcommittee chairman of Health, Employment, and Labor, Congressman PHIL ROE of Tennessee.

I urge support by my colleagues.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to clarify a few points. I would remind my friend from South Carolina that he and every single Republican in this House voted for the Republican line budget, which basically destroys Medicare as we know it, vouchering the entire system.

I also will remind him that it is his party's leading Presidential candidate right now who is advocating eliminating Social Security. And now we have a bill on the floor that my Republican friends are supporting that will make it easier and more likely that U.S. corporations will ship U.S. jobs overseas.

Stop the assault on American workers.

At this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out and clarify a few points that have been made here this morning. Regarding the Boeing case, this is a clear overreach into the decision of the National Labor Relations Board.

The National Labor Relations Act, section 7, establishes the basic right for employees in this country to self-organize, to join, to form, and to assist labor organizations.

The Boeing workers have been organized with and by the Machinists Union since the 1970s. There has been a long and good relationship there. The union and the employees at Boeing were trying to exercise their basic section 7 rights. However, the management of Boeing, which is a good company, but clearly in this case the management of Boeing committed an unfair labor practice by threatening the employees that if they exercised their rights under section 7, they would move the work out of Washington, out of Puget Sound, and relocate it down to South Carolina, which they did.

The National Labor Relations Board followed the law. This is not a close case. This is the only decision that the board could possibly come up with under the law. We are a nation of laws. You may not like the result, but like it or not, workers in this country have a basic right to join unions. I know that that's not a popular idea lately. However, in this case, I completely support the board's actions. I think they followed the law.

I rise in strong opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill, and I ask

my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. PHIL ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of America's job creators, the rule, and H.R. 2587, Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act.

What this bill does is it simply amends the NLRA, which was passed in 1935, and prohibits the National Labor Relations Board from ordering employees to relocate, shut down, or transfer employment under any circumstances. In other words, it allows managers to make business decisions that are in the best interest of their company and their employees.

Let's just give a CliffsNotes version of this.

Boeing is a great American company. I visited that company in Washington State. I've also seen the Boeing plant in Charleston, South Carolina. What happened was they moved a second line of business there. The Machinists Union disagreed with that. Lodge 751 lodged a complaint.

What the NLRB is supposed to be is an impartial referee. It's like a basketball game. When you go into a gym, you expect the referees to be fair to both sides. And to my friend on the other side, the NLRB oversees elections, but you have a right as an employee to vote for or against a union. You have both rights.

What this is doing is: What about the people who work in South Carolina? The company has invested over a billion dollars to create good-paying American jobs. One week ago today, the President of the United States stood right where you are and made a very eloquent speech about job creation. But I guess it doesn't matter in South Carolina where those 1,000 jobs—1,100 people are working. It's not a very complicated issue. A company should be allowed to move within the borders of this country.

I was raised in a union household. My father belonged to the union. He lost his job several decades ago to a foreign country, so I know what that's like. Certainly I am very pleased that the people in Washington State have added jobs, not lost jobs out there.

So I believe that this absolutely is an egregious overreach of the NLRB, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for this rule and vote for this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to those statements.

It is a simple case; I agree with that part. And Boeing is a good company, a good American company. But in this case, if you read the facts of the case, their management made multiple threats to the employees that, if they chose to exercise their rights as em-

ployees under the law, that they would move the work away from Puget Sound and locate it in South Carolina. And that's exactly what they did. That's exactly what they did.

You can manage a company, but you cannot use your management rights to trample on the rights of those basic employees.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly love to hear a single case, a single specific comment, a single specific fact to undergird your comments, I would say to my friend from Massachusetts.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, JOHN DUNCAN.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and H.R. 2587, the bill that it brings to the floor, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Boeing Company, which operates a huge manufacturing plant in Puget Sound, has built a new production line for its 787 Dreamliner fleet in South Carolina. There has been no coinciding layoff at the Puget Sound facility. In fact, not a single job was lost in the State of Washington as a result of Boeing's decision. On the contrary, Boeing has added an additional 2,000 jobs in Puget Sound since that time; yet the National Labor Relations Board decided that Boeing was harming the labor unions in Washington, so they made this unfortunate decision.

No department or agency of the Federal Government has ever told any business that it could not or even should not move from one State to another without demonstrating the type of violation alleged in its case. For the National Labor Relations Board to tell Boeing that it cannot move from Washington to South Carolina with no substantive evidence of antiunion hostility is an unprecedented, a dictatorial power grab that makes people wonder if we still live in a free country.

If the shoe was on the other foot, Mr. Speaker, if a conservative majority on the NLRB told a company it could not move from a basically nonunion State to a heavily unionized State, those who are opposing this bill would be screaming to the high heavens.

This action by the NLRB will stifle economic growth all across this Nation and could cause more American companies to go to other countries or discourage businesses from moving here in the first place.

□ 0940

I am certain that those who created the NLRB could never have imagined that a future board would make such an extreme, radical decision such as this. The NLRB was not set up to be a one-sided, unfair, biased agency that was set up just to protect unions. It was and is supposed to be a fair, impartial, nonpolitical arbiter between labor and management, business and unions. Every Member who represents a right-to-work State, such as my State of Tennessee, should be very concerned about this decision.

Boeing had a 39-day strike in 2008 that cost the company an estimated \$2 billion. The CEO of Boeing Commercial told the Seattle Times last year, "We can't afford to have a work stoppage every 3 years. And we can't afford to continue this rate of escalation of wages."

This administration claims to be concerned about jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Just a few weeks ago, The Washington Post showed that 82 percent of the American people believe it is either very hard or somewhat hard to find a job. Now, unelected power-mad bureaucrats at the NLRB, who do not have to worry about their jobs, have made a decision that will stifle job creation and business growth and expansion all over the country. We should pass this bill and overturn this shortsighted decision that could possibly protect some jobs in Washington, but will ultimately hurt working people all through this Nation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to make it crystal clear that this Republican bill does not protect or create jobs. What it does is it forces American workers to fight over existing jobs by giving up their legal rights and underbidding each other. This is about a race to the bottom.

The problem I have with my Republican friends is their economic policies are all about lowering the standard of living for working families in this country. We should be trying to increase the living standards for American workers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Rather than bringing up a bill that makes it easier and more likely for U.S. corporations to send U.S. jobs overseas, they ought to be bringing to the floor the President's jobs bill that he talked about here in the United States Congress about putting people back to work. He came up with a series of bipartisan initiatives that will help stimulate and jump-start this economy. Rather than doing that, which will put people back to work, we're debating an anti-worker bill that's going to make it more likely that U.S. corporations will ship U.S. jobs overseas.

It is wrong, and I would urge my Republican friends to stop your assault on American workers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I would just say to my good friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, that there's no doubt about it that the President's jobs plan does one thing. And it's consistent with what the NLRB would do as well. It doesn't simply ship American jobs overseas. It ships American companies

overseas so they do not have to play in the quagmire pit called the regulations that this President and the Federal Government have imposed on businesses.

To quote from the conservative Chicago Tribune: The NLRB's worst decision, however, is its unprovoked "hit" job on Boeing. There's no question that whether you're a conservative, a liberal; whether you are a passionate believer in the future of this Nation and this world, here's one thing we all have in common: the decision for the NLRB to attack America's greatest and largest exporter is wrong and indefensible.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, we just spent several weeks back in our own districts, and I had a chance to talk to a lot of folks—and a lot of my Democrat friends. I do have some of those. They're always asking me, Why can't you just agree with the President? Why can't we go along with what the President says? And I always enjoy when I get the opportunity to come before this body and look exactly at what the President says and to look at what he says about what we're talking about today.

What do we know what the President has said? The President said in this very room just last week that he was for jobs. That's what Boeing is doing. And the NLRB is fighting them. The President has said he's for manufacturing jobs. He said that he's calling for all of us to come together—private sector, industry, universities, and the government—to spark a renaissance in American manufacturing and help our manufacturers develop cutting-edge tools. That is exactly what Boeing is doing and exactly what the Obama administration's NLRB is fighting, Mr. Speaker.

What else is the President for? He's for exports. He's called on us to double our exports. In fact, he pointed out, correctly so, that 95 percent of the world's customers and the world's fastest growing markets are outside our borders. We need to compete for those customers because other nations are. We need to up our game, and that is exactly what Boeing is trying to do in North Charleston and exactly what the Obama administration's NLRB is fighting right now.

What else has he talked to us about? He's told us how important it is to have jobs here. Again, just last Thursday night, in this very Chamber, he said, And we're going to make sure the next generation of manufacturing takes root not in China or Europe, but right here in the United States of America.

That is exactly what Boeing is doing in North Charleston. They could have opened this plant overseas. In fact, in hindsight, given the treatment of the NLRB, maybe they should have. But they didn't. They chose to create jobs here in the United States in Charleston, South Carolina, and the Obama

administration is fighting them at every particular step.

Why are we here, Mr. Speaker? We're here because the President's words don't match his actions. We're here and we are not agreeing with our colleagues across the way because they are not backing up what they say with what they do. If the President would do the right thing and do what he did last week—he rolled back—and give credit where credit is due—he rolled back the new EPA rules on the ozone emissions, he could do the exact same thing before the end of the day today on this NLRB action against Boeing. And he could do the right thing and encourage jobs here in the United States, exactly as he said we would be doing.

But since he won't match his words to his actions, we must pass this rule and we must pass this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON), who believes that it is wrong for the Republicans to pass legislation to make it easier for U.S. corporations to ship U.S. jobs overseas.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the American people are very concerned about the failure of House Republicans to help the American people get back to work. But, Mr. Speaker, it seems that we may have it all wrong. It turns out that House Republicans have been working to create jobs, just not here in America.

While the American people are suffering, H.R. 2587 gives big corporations which are already flush with profits and tax breaks yet another free pass to take jobs from hardworking American men and women and ship them overseas. Without the support of the National Labor Relations Board to help American families get a fair shake, we can only expect to see more layoffs, lower wages, and a bleaker future for America's middle class.

Instead of stripping power away from the NLRB to ensure the rights of workers are upheld and handing it to corporations to bust unions and outsource jobs, we should be working to create good-paying jobs right here in America, right in Ohio. We should be working to level the playing field for the American workers, who are the best, hardest-working, most innovative workers in the world.

It is time that the Republicans join us in that fight, and it's time that they join us in voting "no" on this rule and on this very bad legislation, H.R. 2587. Stand up for the American worker.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. My good friends on the left continue to talk about shipping jobs out of America. I want to make sure that everyone still recognizes the fact that the great State of South Carolina is still a part of the United States of America. In fact, when you think about it, you must scratch your head when in fact the Washington State employees now

have more people there working than they had when we opened the plant in North Charleston. In fact, if you're talking about creating American jobs in American States—U.S. States—South Carolina—you would simply look at the fact that 1,100 employees have been hired in North Charleston. You would think about the fact that the compounding impact of those jobs in North Charleston could create up to 12,000 new American jobs in our States.

So the fallacy of the left is nothing more than rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. JEFF DUNCAN.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Ladies and gentlemen, I rise today in support of H.R. 2587, the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act, that would end the funding for the NLRB's lawsuit against Boeing.

□ 0950

I'm an original cosponsor of this legislation because I believe that what the NLRB has done to Boeing and to the people of South Carolina is one of the most egregious bureaucratic abuses of power that this administration has perpetrated. And with this administration, honestly, that's saying something.

Earlier this year, the NLRB decided that it had the power to tell a company where it could move, what it could build, and how much. Whatever you think of the NLRB, whatever stance you have on Big Labor and labor unions, would you ever think that our government would consider such an unconstitutional power grab?

In the midst of this Great Recession, when our number one focus should be on creating jobs, the NLRB is trying to stop an American company from building American airplanes with American workers, South Carolinians, right here in America.

During a recent Congressional hearing, one of my colleagues from South Carolina, he asked the head lawyer for NLRB if he knew of a single union worker who had lost their job because Boeing decided to expand production in South Carolina. NLRB's lawyer did not have an answer.

But if NLRB wins this lawsuit—listen clearly, America: If NLRB wins this lawsuit, the decision will be made, not whether to locate in a union State or a right-to-work State, the decision American companies will make will be about whether to continue production in the United States of America or take those jobs and that manufacturing process to another country. That is the hard reality of what NLRB is doing today.

I ask my colleagues to join the South Carolina delegation, and America, today in standing up for freedom, standing up for the right to start a business, standing up for American jobs, standing up to the bullying tactics of an out-of-control bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass this bill. Let's pass it right away. This is an actual

jobs bill that you can go and read. And this is one that we can pass right now. We can pass this bill today, and we can get Americans back to work.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake. The Republican bill creates open season for CEOs to punish workers for exercising their basic rights.

My friends on the other side fight tooth and nail to protect all these corporate tax loopholes that actually encourage companies to move their jobs overseas. We can't touch them. They fight with passion on the floor to protect them.

But when it comes to protecting American workers, they're AWOL. I don't know what it is that they have against American workers, but this bill undermines the rights of American workers to be able to stand up and ask for a decent wage for an honest day's work. It undermines their ability to ask for benefits like a good retirement benefit. This is about taking away rights and powers of workers.

Granted, these workers don't give big PAC checks. They're not the leaders of the Fortune 500 companies. But these people are the backbone of our economy. We should be standing up for American workers in this Congress. We should be fighting to protect American jobs to keep them in the United States.

This bill makes it easier, in fact, more likely that corporations and companies will retaliate against workers who stand up for their rights by sending their jobs overseas to places like China. Why in the world are we doing this?

We should be trying to find a way to empower workers in this country. It shouldn't be about a race to the bottom. And it shouldn't be about States competing for existing jobs.

This is a bad bill. This is a bad precedent. And quite frankly, again, it is typical of what the Republican agenda is all about when it comes to the economy. It's about a race to the bottom. It's about lowering the standard of living for American workers while protecting the big CEOs, the heads of the Fortune 500 companies. Their rights are always protected. But when it comes to the little guy, my Republican friends are on the opposite side.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Let's be clear. Let's talk about South Carolina for a second. No one has mentioned this. South Carolina is a right-to-work State. What does that mean?

It guts the ability of workers to organize and to form unions to fight for higher wages and safer workplaces. Why do you think Boeing was going to South Carolina? Because they thought it was going to be worse for them or better for them? A right-to-work State that guts unions, that's why they went.

Millions of Americans are working today and they're looking for work. They're struggling to keep their

homes. They are out of work. They're not working. And yet we are debating legislation that tries, once again, to eviscerate unions, accelerate that race to the bottom.

This bill does nothing to create good, well-paying jobs here in America. It guts the regulatory powers of the National Labor Relations Board. It legalizes runaway shops. It allows companies to fire employees trying to start a union. It's a right-to-work State, and actually makes it easier to ship jobs overseas.

None of this is what our economy needs right now. It's like what we have seen from Republican governors in States like Wisconsin, Ohio, Indiana. This legislation represents yet another front in the majority's ideological assault against workers' rights all across the country.

I represent a community where the right to organize was hard won at the dress shops, where my mother sewed collars for pennies, at the gun factories, the aerospace industry, the government offices, and the great universities of my state.

The families of my district know from hard-won experience that labor unions fight for employee rights, higher standards, greater equality, security in work and retirement. They help ensure that workplaces and politics are driven by the dreams and the aspirations of working people, not by corporate power and the narrow agenda of the elites.

Unions were instrumental in forming the broad-based middle class in this country, and thanks to decades of systematic efforts by companies to deny their rights, as well as misguided trickle-down policies that never do trickle down, union membership has fallen in our country.

Middle class workers have been squeezed. Their wages have stagnated, their benefits cut, their job security weakened, their wage and hour protections have been violated, and all the while, income inequality has steadily risen in this Nation, to the point where even as over 15 percent of the population today lives in poverty, 1 percent of people now make 23 percent of income in America.

This Republican majority is trying to go for the killing blow. They, once again, attempt here to make a bogey man of the NLRB.

The Board's function is only to defend the rights that we consider fundamental, the right to form a union, the right to be represented by that union in dealings with employers, and the right to be free from retaliation from doing so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DELAURO. The Board also enforces laws that protect employers and third parties against practices by unions considered to be unfair or harmful. In fact, the NLRB charter and

structure were amended to meet Republican concerns in 1947 by the Taft-Hartley legislation.

Today the NLRB is simply doing its job, finding fair remedies for employees and employers in workplace disputes and prosecuting violations when they occur. Nothing radical about the NLRB.

What's radical is the anti-union message that this majority continues to try to foist on the American people. They've tried to slash funding for the NLRB. They've tried several times to repeal Davis-Bacon. They're trying now to severely limit workers' fundamental right to organize collectively.

The bill is not a serious attempt to restore jobs, restore economic growth, or address budget deficits. It's about marginalizing the labor movement—and with it the capacity for working people to find fairness in the workplace. It will harm middle class families already dealing with a tough economy. It will grease the wheels for companies to move jobs overseas.

I urge my colleagues to stand with American workers and vote against this rule.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 90 seconds to the gentlewoman from Tennessee, Mrs. DIANE BLACK.

□ 1000

Mrs. BLACK. I thank my colleague from South Carolina for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I'm here today as a member of a right-to-work State and a cosponsor of this legislation to speak out against NLRB's actions against Boeing in South Carolina and NLRB's assault on the right-to-work States. Not only are the NLRB's actions a gross intrusion of government on private business, but this suit, if allowed to proceed, would have a chilling effect on the business growth in all right-to-work States like Tennessee.

In my home State, the unemployment rate is at a staggering 9.8 percent. And in some of my counties, we are well over a double digit in unemployment. Too many Tennesseans are out of work, and I don't want companies with good-paying jobs to feel like they can no longer move a facility to Tennessee for fear that there will be an NLRB lawsuit.

The actions of NLRB set a very dangerous precedent that the Federal Government can tell a private company in which State they can or cannot locate. Policies like this could very well drive a company to leave the United States and go overseas where agencies like this don't exist. That is why I stand here today in strong support of the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act. This is an important first step not only to put NLRB on notice that their actions will be checked by Congress, but also to ensure that NLRB cannot dictate which State an employer can locate jobs in the United States.

At a time when 14 million workers are unemployed, we must get Federal

agencies like NLRB out of the way and clear the path for job creation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that it's September. When are you going to bring a jobs bill to the floor? When are you going to bring legislation that's going to help put people back to work during this difficult economy?

At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I don't mean to contradict my colleague, but the Republicans do have a jobs plan. Now, it's true that Majority Leader CANTOR kicked off the week by saying, Not a penny for infrastructure. We don't want to just build things in America. We don't want to invest. That doesn't put people to work. You know, the \$50 billion the President proposed, that would create about 1.5 million private sector jobs in the construction industry, but they're not interested in that.

They do have a jobs plan: snakes. Yes, snakes. Yesterday, in the Oversight Committee, they held a hearing similar to what we're talking about here today on a job-killing regulation being proposed by the Obama administration. Keep out invasive species. Giant pythons, which are taking over the Everglades, the Republicans say that is a job-killing restriction. Just think of all the jobs related to snakes. First, there's the importer of these invasive species. Secondly, we sell them. Then there are people who raise things for them to eat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Then when they escape, we hire people, pest control eliminators, to go out and try to find them when people abandon them. What a jobs creator.

No, we're not going to rebuild our infrastructure. We're not going to try and continue to have fair wages for people who build the best airplanes in the world. Boeing. No, those things are off the table as far as the Republicans are concerned. It's job-killing regulations, that's what's hurting America.

Come on guys, get real. Let's rebuild America. Let's invest. Let's pay workers a fair wage. You know, when a worker earns a fair wage, they can afford to go to the small business down the street and patronize them and buy their goods. And then maybe some day, if you stop these job-killing trade deals, they'll be able to buy goods that are actually made in America with their decent wages at an American company. Get real.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. MIKE POMPEO.

Mr. POMPEO. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his hard work on this important piece of legislation.

In Kansas, we build airplanes with American workers. The Boeing Com-

pany has a big facility there. Indeed, last night, on a telephone town hall, I had a worker from Boeing call in. He was very worried about his continued employment right in Wichita, Kansas, and in America. He was worried because this administration has taken actions to destroy manufacturing and aviation manufacturing here in America.

I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation because the NLRB has no business telling The Boeing Company, who wants to invest hundreds of millions of its own dollars—not taxpayer dollars, its own dollars—creating jobs in South Carolina. What next? An attack on Kansas? An attack on aviation workers all across America?

We need to pass this piece of legislation immediately and ask the President to sign it. It's too important to American workers to allow the NLRB to continue the Big Government policies of this administration.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, we should be talking here on the floor and debating and considering an infrastructure bill to put people back to work. We should be taking up the entirety of the President's jobs proposal that he delivered in a speech a week ago. We should be taking up things that will actually help this economy and put people back to work. Instead, we are dealing with a bill that will make it easier and more likely for U.S. corporations to ship U.S. jobs overseas. And this is a bill that creates a new race to the bottom for American workers' rights, wages, benefits, and working conditions, and it is bad for this economy.

Why do my Republican friends continue to insist that the only way to deal with our economic problems is to lower the standard of living and the quality of life for American workers? Why are all the tough choices being made on the backs of American workers?

We can do much better in this country. We need to be focusing on jobs, not on this stuff.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. STEVE PALAZZO.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I hear across the aisle my colleagues talking about what have the Republicans done to create jobs, and they point out where we've created a job.

Well, I don't think it's the government's responsibility to create jobs, but it is our responsibility to foster a healthy business climate in this Nation where our entrepreneurs and small business owners can go out and create jobs, expand, and increase the benefits and the pay of their employees. But you're not going to do that if you increase their taxes. You're not going to do that if you have unelected bureaucrats running around increasing job-

stifling regulations and circumventing Congress' efforts to foster an atmosphere in this country to create jobs. You're not going to do that if we continue to have frivolous litigation. All these things taken together develop a certain amount of uncertainty in our Nation, and capital sits on the sidelines or it goes overseas to a more friendly job creation environment.

I'm in one of those 22 proud right-to-work States. In Mississippi, we love the high-tech jobs we're getting and the advanced manufacturing jobs and the Department of Defense aerospace industry, shipbuilding. We like jobs in Mississippi. And this Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act will prohibit the NLRB from telling private sector companies where they can or cannot locate.

We must restrain them. We must stop this, because the industries that we have collected over the past several years in the State of Mississippi, I firmly believe these companies would not have located either to the United States or they would have not located to my State if it wasn't for the fact that we have a great workforce and we're a right-to-work State. We would have lost these jobs forever. We would have never seen them. They would have left America or they would have stayed in the foreign country they came from.

We like to work in Mississippi. We like jobs. We want more of them, not less.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talks about creating a healthy business climate. I don't know how we're creating a healthy business climate by passing a bill that makes it easier and more likely that U.S. corporations will ship U.S. jobs overseas.

After more than 200 days in the majority, House Republicans have passed no bills, none, no bills to create jobs, moving instead on job destroying legislation that could cost up to nearly 2 million jobs, with more to come.

This week, to make matters worse, we're taking up this legislation that will encourage the shipping of jobs overseas and a bill that will weaken the middle class. Instead of creating jobs and strengthening the middle class and protecting workers' rights, the Republicans are making it easier for corporations to send American jobs overseas. And it allows employers to punish their employees for simply exercising their rights to organize, to demand better benefits and safer working conditions, and to ensure a full day's pay for an honest day's work. I mean, that's what this bill does.

You know, in 2000, the National Labor Relations Board was able to force a company to bring jobs back to the United States from Mexico, as the company was charged with shipping jobs to Mexico in retaliation against workers seeking to organize a union. Under this Republican bill, American workers would lose this protection.

Again, their plan for the economy is all about lowering the standard of living, lessening the quality of life for American workers, while protecting those who are most fortunate in this country, those who head up the big companies.

□ 1010

We should be debating on this floor today the President's job bill. If my Republican friends don't want to vote for it, they don't have to; but that's the legislation that should be brought before the Members of this Congress today, not this bill, a bill that punishes American workers. Enough. You've been punishing American workers since you took the majority. Enough is enough.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. ROBERT HURT.

Mr. HURT. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding and for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2587, the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act.

Over the past 2½ years, this administration has vastly expanded the size and scope of the Federal Government and supported policies that have destroyed jobs, stifled investment and innovation, and slowed our economic recovery in Virginia's 5th District and across the country.

One of the most recent and troubling examples of this government overreach is the latest move by the unelected National Labor Relations Board to block Boeing from creating thousands of jobs in South Carolina. This kind of government intervention is a direct attack on our economic freedom and has disastrous effects on 5th District Virginians and all Americans. It has the potential to cost thousands of jobs at a time when we need jobs most.

It dangerously and unacceptably inserts the Federal Government into the business decisions of private companies, and it threatens to undermine the economic competitiveness of all States, such as Virginia, that have right-to-work laws.

Being the northernmost right-to-work State on the east coast has helped make Virginia the best place in the country to do business and has helped promote job growth and economic investment across the 5th District and our Commonwealth.

At a time when millions of Americans are out of work and unemployment remains unacceptably high, right-to-work States should not be penalized by an intrusive and overbearing Federal Government for their ability to attract new business, investment, and jobs.

As part of the House's job-creation agenda, H.R. 2587 would remove the Federal Government as a roadblock to job growth by preventing the NLRB

from dictating where employers and private businesses can set up their operations, putting our economic recovery back where it belongs—in the hands of the people instead of the Federal Government.

If we are serious about getting our economy back on track, we must support these kinds of policies that help restore certainty to the marketplace and provide our true job creators with the confidence and freedom and opportunity necessary to do what they do best: innovate, grow their businesses, and get America working again.

That is why I'm proud to cosponsor H.R. 2587. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I advise my colleague from Massachusetts that I have no remaining speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Then I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me state for the record that this bill is not a retaliation against right-to-work States. I'm not a big fan of right-to-work States in terms of how they treat workers and those who want to organize unions; but this bill is really about protecting workers from corporations that retaliate against them simply for demanding their rights and organizing for their rights.

The Republican bill changes the rules mid-trial to benefit a particular Fortune 500 company, Boeing; but this bill has wide-ranging repercussions for American workers. This bill does not protect or create jobs. It just doesn't. It forces American workers to fight over existing jobs by giving up their rights and underbidding each other. It's a race to the bottom.

The Republican bill makes it easier to ship U.S. jobs overseas. There's no question about that. And the Republican bill creates an open season for CEOs to punish workers for exercising their rights. Again, this is a further assault on the rights and protections that workers have fought so hard for for so many decades, and this bill undermines the duty to bargain in good faith. This is an anti-union bill—there is no question—among other things.

The bill also encourages law-breaking and intimidation by employers. It removes a key disincentive against employers who unlawfully threaten employees with job loss during organizing drives.

The Republican bill creates a new race to the bottom for American workers' rights, wages, benefits, and working conditions. We're going in the wrong direction with this bill.

This bill is one more assault on American workers, on the American middle class. Time after time after time the Republican leadership has stood up for Big Business and against the American middle class. Higher gas prices—Republicans protect Big Oil tax breaks and do nothing to help the average consumer. Health care coverage for

our kids through the age of 25—Republicans side with the health care companies that put profits over patients.

With this bill, Republicans are promoting job creation overseas by allowing companies to move overseas in retaliation of workers who are exercising their own legal rights. Not only that, this bill goes back in time and applies this bill retroactively. This is just like changing the value of a touchdown in the middle of the Super Bowl simply because you don't like the score of the game. This bill would be a joke if it weren't so serious.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, this is not about protecting right-to-work States. Really, this is not even about unions. This is about the rights of workers in this country. This is about protecting American jobs. This is about urging companies to invest in the United States and not making it easier for them to create jobs overseas.

We're in a difficult economy right now, Mr. Speaker. We should be debating on this floor the President's job bill. Every day we should be doing something about jobs. And, instead, here we are in September. My Republican colleagues have done nothing. They've done nothing except continue an assault on middle class families.

Today, it's workers. They're going after Medicare in the Ryan budget. Their leading Republican Presidential candidate is talking about eliminating Social Security. All the protections, all the rights that middle class families have fought for and have won that are essential to a decent quality of life they're trying to take away. Enough.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this closed rule and "no" on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Massachusetts continues to talk about the President's jobs plan that is nothing more than a brand spanking new stimulus plan spending \$467 billion by increasing taxes on everyone, including the middle class. I cannot find it in my heart to say to Mr. MCGOVERN that the President's plan has any opportunity of passing in this House, because the bottom line is simply this: we ought to spend our time focused on the things that we have in common. It is time for the games to stop.

We should look at the President's plan and pick out those parts of the plan that we agree with. We should start by talking about having an opportunity to work on corporate tax reduction, flattening the tax rate for corporations. We have the second highest tax rate in all of the world, and this environment creates an unlevel playing field for America's job creators.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'm just curious. When are we going to debate a bill on

this floor that helps create jobs? Why don't you bring the President's plan to the floor and let's have it out?

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Our President wants an up-or-down vote on this one package.

We believe that the fastest and most effective way to show the American people that partisan politics is over and that we're now focused on the American people, we will take those parts, those aspects of the President's bill that we agree with, like regulatory reform like we're doing today, and simply say to the American people that we're listening. We will take, without any question, an opportunity to debate the necessity of reducing the corporate tax structure to make America's corporations more competitive.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope we can move past the politics and the games which so often sidetrack things in Washington and pass this important legislation here today.

This is not a question of pro-union—I agree with you—or anti-union. It is a question of right versus wrong.

The NLRB has plenty of tools at its disposal to protect workers and hold employers accountable for unlawful labor practices. There is simply no reason it should have the power to dictate where a private business can establish its workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

□ 1020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 372, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2867.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 177, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 707]

YEAS—234

Adams	Boren	Chaffetz
Aderholt	Boustany	Coble
Akin	Brady (TX)	Coffman (CO)
Alexander	Brooks	Cole
Amash	Broun (GA)	Conaway
Bachus	Buchanan	Cravaack
Bartlett	Buchon	Crawford
Barton (TX)	Buerkle	Crenshaw
Bass (NH)	Burgess	Culberson
Benishek	Burton (IN)	Davis (KY)
Berg	Calvert	Denham
Biggert	Camp	Dent
Bilbray	Campbell	DesJarlais
Bilirakis	Canseco	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Dold
Black	Capito	Dreier
Blackburn	Carter	Duffy
Bonner	Cassidy	Duncan (SC)
Bono Mack	Chabot	Duncan (TN)

Ellmers	Kline	Ribble
Emerson	Labrador	Rigell
Farenthold	Lamborn	Rivera
Fincher	Lance	Roby
Fitzpatrick	Landry	Roe (TN)
Flake	Lankford	Rogers (KY)
Fleischmann	Latham	Rogers (MI)
Fleming	LaTourette	Rohrabacher
Flores	Latta	Rokita
Forbes	Lewis (CA)	Rooney
Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
Fox	Long	Roskam
Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Ross (AR)
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Ross (FL)
Gallegly	Lummis	Royce
Gardner	Lungren, Daniel	Runyan
Garrett	E.	Ryan (WI)
Gerlach	Mack	Scalise
Gibbs	Manzullo	Schilling
Gibson	Marchant	Schmidt
Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Schock
Gohmert	McCaul	Schweikert
Goodlatte	McClintock	Scott (SC)
Gowdy	McCotter	Scott, Austin
Granger	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Graves (GA)	McIntyre	Sessions
Graves (MO)	McKeon	Shimkus
Griffin (AR)	McKinley	Shuler
Griffith (VA)	McMorris	Shuster
Grimm	Rodgers	Simpson
Guinta	Meehan	Smith (NE)
Guthrie	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hall	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)
Hanna	Miller (MI)	Southerland
Harper	Miller, Gary	Stearns
Harris	Mulvaney	Stivers
Hartzler	Murphy (PA)	Stutzman
Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Sullivan
Hayworth	Neugebauer	Terry
Heck	Noem	Thompson (PA)
Hensarling	Nugent	Thornberry
Herger	Nunes	Tiberi
Herrera Beutler	Nunnelee	Tipton
Huelskamp	Olson	Turner (OH)
Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo	Upton
Hultgren	Paul	Walberg
Hunter	Paulsen	Walden
Hurt	Pearce	Walsh (IL)
Issa	Petri	West
Jenkins	Pitts	Westmoreland
Johnson (IL)	Platts	Whitfield
Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Johnson, Sam	Pompeo	Wittman
Jones	Posey	Wolf
Jordan	Price (GA)	Womack
Kelly	Quayle	Woodall
King (IA)	Reed	Yoder
King (NY)	Rehberg	Young (FL)
Kingston	Reichert	Young (IN)
Kinzinger (IL)	Renacci	

NAYS—177

Ackerman	Costello	Himes
Altmire	Courtney	Hinchee
Andrews	Critz	Hinojosa
Baca	Crowley	Hirono
Baldwin	Cuellar	Hochul
Barrow	Cummings	Holden
Bass (CA)	Davis (CA)	Holt
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Honda
Berkley	DeFazio	Hoyer
Berman	DeGette	Insee
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Israel
Bishop (NY)	Deutch	Jackson (IL)
Blumenauer	Dicks	Jackson Lee
Boswell	Dingell	(TX)
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Bralley (IA)	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Keating
Butterfield	Edwards	Kildee
Capps	Ellison	Kind
Cardoza	Engel	Kissell
Carnahan	Eshoo	Kucinich
Carney	Farr	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Filner	Lee (CA)
Chandler	Frank (MA)	Levin
Chu	Fudge	Lipinski
Cicilline	Garamendi	Loebsack
Clarke (MI)	Gonzalez	Loftgren, Zoe
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	Lowey
Clay	Green, Gene	Lujan
Cleaver	Grijalva	Lynch
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Maloney
Cohen	Hahn	Markey
Connolly (VA)	Hanabusa	Matheson
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Matsui
Cooper	Heinrich	McCarthy (NY)
Costa	Higgins	McCollum

McDermott	Polis	Sires
McGovern	Price (NC)	Slaughter
McNerney	Quigley	Smith (WA)
Meeks	Rahall	Speier
Michaud	Rangel	Stark
Miller (NC)	Reyes	Sutton
Miller, George	Richardson	Thompson (CA)
Moore	Richmond	Thompson (MS)
Moran	Rothman (NJ)	Tierney
Murphy (CT)	Roybal-Allard	Tonko
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Towns
Neal	Sánchez, Linda	Tsongas
Olver	T.	Velázquez
Owens	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Pallone	Sarbanes	Walz (MN)
Pascrell	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Pastor (AZ)	Schiff	Schultz
Payne	Schwartz	Waters
Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Watt
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Welch
Peters	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Peterson	Sewell	Woolsey
Pingree (ME)	Sherman	Yarmuth

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 Stated against:
Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 707 I missed the vote due to a personal family issue. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Enclosure.

STATE OF NEVADA,
 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
 Carson City, September 14, 2011.
 Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
 Clerk, House of Representatives, The Capitol,
 Washington, DC.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
 CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
 U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, DC, September 14, 2011.
 Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
 The Speaker, House of Representatives, Wash-
 ington, DC.

DEAR Ms. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, September 13, 2011, for Representative in Congress, from the Second Congressional District of Nevada, show that Mark E. Amodei, received 74,976 votes or 57.93 percent of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Mark E. Amodei was elected as Representative in Congress from the Second Congressional District of Nevada at this time. Please note, pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 293.403, any candidate who is defeated at any election may demand a recount of the votes within 3 working days following the canvass of the vote. At this time, the canvass has not been scheduled.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by the counties within the State of Nevada and canvassed by the Supreme Court, an official Certificate of Election will be transmitted to you as required by law.

Respectfully,

KAREN L. HAAS,
 Clerk.

ROSS MILLER,
 Secretary of State.

NOT VOTING—20

Austria	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Bachmann	Lewis (GA)	Schrader
Barletta	Marino	Van Hollen
Capuano	Nadler	Waxman
Giffords	Pence	Webster
Gosar	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)
Kaptur	Ruppersberger	

□ 1046

Messrs. HONDA, TONKO, SHERMAN, and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
 Mr. MCINTYRE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."
 So the previous question was ordered.

2011 UNOFFICIAL SPECIAL ELECTION RESULTS—SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

[U.S. Representative in Congress District 2—2 Year Term]

	Percent	Total Votes	Carson City	Churchill	Clark	Douglas	Elko	Esmeralda	Eureka	Humboldt	Lander	Lincoln	Lyon	Mineral	Nye	Pershing	Storey	Washoe	White Pine
Amodei, Mark E.	57.93	74,976	6,472	3,002	3,499	7,866	3,369	158	272	1,471	597	503	5,833	514	2,746	525	658	36,596	895
Fasano, Timothy	1.87	2,415	196	171	63	138	154	9	16	51	29	19	241	52	141	45	41	1,010	39
Lehmann, Helmut	4.14	5,354	349	216	138	444	139	13	12	133	50	12	360	80	159	82	68	3,048	51
Marshall, Kate	36.06	46,669	3,824	993	2,180	3,284	962	30	69	580	131	119	2,413	335	1,407	217	360	29,362	403

2011 SPECIAL ELECTION VOTER TURNOUT—
 CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 2

[Turnout with 100.00% of County Precincts reporting as of 11:08 PM]

Active Registered Voters	396,090
Election Day Turnout	53,724
Early Turnout	67,014
Absentee Turnout	8,865
Total Turnout	129,603
Percent Turnout—Active Voters	32.7%

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
 CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, DC, September 15, 2011.
 Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
 The Speaker, House of Representatives,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a letter received from Mr. Robert Brehm and Mr. Todd Valentine, Co-Executive Directors, New York State Board of Elections, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held September 13, 2011, the Honorable Bob Turner was elected Representative to Congress for the Ninth Congressional District, State of New York.

With best wishes, I am,
 Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
 Clerk.

Enclosure.

STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
 Albany, NY, September 14, 2011.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
 Clerk, House of Representatives, The Capitol,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, September 13, 2011 for Representative in Congress from the Ninth Congressional District of New York show that David I. Weprin received 27,599 votes, Bob Turner received 32,403 votes, and Christopher P. Hoepfner received 277 votes cast for that office.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is a court proceeding (Turner v Weprin, and the NYCBOE commissioners, the NYCBOE and the City of New York) that temporarily enjoins and restrains the respondent board of elections from certifying any candidate as the candidate duly elected to the office of Representative in Congress, 9th Congressional District.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all county boards in the Ninth Congressional District in New York an official Certification of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. BREHM,
 TODD D. VALENTINE.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE
 MARK AMODEI, OF NEVADA, AND
 THE HONORABLE BOB TURNER,
 OF NEW YORK, AS MEMBERS OF
 THE HOUSE

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Nevada, the Honorable MARK AMODEI, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York, the Honorable BOB TURNER, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but I am not aware of any reason why the House should not see him sworn today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Representatives-elect and the members of their respective delegations present themselves in the well.

The Representatives-elect will please raise their right hands.

Mr. AMODEI and Mr. TURNER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will

bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now Members of the 112th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE MARK AMODEI TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to welcome Representative AMODEI to Congress. Our new colleague is a native son of Nevada and a graduate of the University of Nevada, where he served in the ROTC program and later served on active duty in the Army, first in artillery and then as a JAG officer.

He has worked for the people of Nevada for many years as an assemblyman and as a member of the State Senate. I look forward to working with the gentleman as we represent the citizens of the great State of Nevada.

I now yield to my colleague and friend, Representative HECK.

Mr. HECK. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I too want to offer my congratulations to MARK AMODEI. I had the honor of serving alongside him in the State Senate, where he distinguished himself as president pro tempore and a member of the Natural Resources Committee, where he was the go-to guy on a lot of issues important to Nevada regarding water laws, grazing rights, and public lands issues. He's a fellow veteran. It's an honor to have him here. I wish him well, and I ask the entire House to welcome here as well.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Nevada, Representative MARK AMODEI.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. AMODEI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, brand new colleagues, for your courtesies. I will endeavor to do the best I can to bring honor to this House and help you with the work that we have to do.

I was told that the longer you talk, the less popular you are; so I yield back my time.

Thank you very much.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE BOB TURNER TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Most of us know that we are so honored to be Members of this august body

and that whenever we have an election, the winners clearly are Members of the Congress, the Constitution, and our great country.

We from New York have the special history of not being partisan and working together for our districts, our communities, our country. PETER KING has been here long enough to remember the days when adversaries could also be friends.

On behalf of the Congress and the New York delegation, we all welcome the Honorable BOB TURNER in joining our group. We in the State delegation look forward to working with him.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished friend, PETER KING, from the great State of New York.

Mr. KING of New York. Thank you, Congressman RANGEL.

As all of you know, this is not something we're used to doing in New York. But it's a great moment. It's a great moment for the people of the Ninth Congressional District. It's a special privilege for me to be able to introduce our newly elected Member.

BOB TURNER is an Army veteran. He's an extremely successful businessman. Most importantly, he's the proud husband of Peggy, proud father of 5 children, and proud grandfather of 13 children. I can tell you he's a great friend and a great human being. He's going to make an outstanding Congressman. I'm so proud to be here today with BOB TURNER, as I've been during the years I've come to know him and to respect him. He's going to be a truly outstanding addition to this body and great fighter for the people of New York.

Thank you, Chairman RANGEL.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the great privilege of bringing to you our newly elected Member, the Honorable BOB TURNER.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

□ 1100

Mr. TURNER of New York. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Congressman RANGEL. Thank you, Congressman KING.

With true humility, I accept this awesome responsibility, and I pledge not to forget how I got here. It was an important bipartisan election; it's the only way it can be done in New York City. And I will also promise not to forget why I'm here, and it's the future, which is ably represented here by these handsome grandchildren, not even the whole brood. Follow a good example and be brief.

Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentlemen from Nevada and New York, the whole number of the House is 434.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2587, PROTECTING JOBS FROM GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE ACT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 176, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 708]

YEAS—239

Adams	Foxx	Matheson
Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)
Akin	Frelinghuysen	McCaul
Alexander	Gallely	McClintock
Amash	Gardner	McCotter
Amodei	Garrett	McIntyre
Austria	Gerlach	McKeon
Bachus	Gibbs	McKinley
Bartlett	Gibson	McMorris
Barton (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	Rodgers
Bass (NH)	Gohmert	Meehan
Benishek	Goodlatte	Mica
Berg	Gosar	Miller (FL)
Biggert	Gowdy	Miller (MI)
Bilbray	Granger	Miller, Gary
Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Mulvaney
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)
Black	Griffin (AR)	Myrick
Blackburn	Griffith (VA)	Neugebauer
Bonner	Grimm	Noem
Bono Mack	Guinta	Nugent
Boren	Guthrie	Nunes
Boustany	Hall	Nunnelee
Brady (TX)	Hanna	Olson
Brooks	Harper	Palazzo
Broun (GA)	Harris	Paul
Buchanan	Hartzler	Paulsen
Bucshon	Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Buerkle	Hayworth	Petri
Burgess	Heck	Pitts
Burton (IN)	Hensarling	Platts
Calvert	Herger	Poe (TX)
Camp	Herrera Beutler	Pompeo
Campbell	Huelskamp	Posey
Canseco	Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)
Cantor	Hultgren	Quayle
Capito	Hunter	Reed
Carter	Hurt	Rehberg
Chabot	Issa	Reichert
Chaffetz	Jenkins	Renacci
Coble	Johnson (IL)	Ribble
Coffman (CO)	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Rivera
Conaway	Jones	Roby
Cooper	Jordan	Roe (TN)
Cravaack	Kelly	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Culberson	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Davis (KY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita
Denham	Kline	Rooney
Dent	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Roskam
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Ross (AR)
Dold	Landry	Ross (FL)
Dreier	Lankford	Royce
Duffy	Latham	Runyan
Duncan (SC)	LaTourette	Ryan (WI)
Duncan (TN)	Latta	Scalise
Ellmers	Lewis (CA)	Schilling
Emerson	LoBiondo	Schmidt
Farenthold	Long	Schock
Fincher	Lucas	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer	Scott (SC)
Flake	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	Lungren, Daniel	Sensenbrenner
Fleming	E.	Sessions
Flores	Mack	Shimkus
Forbes	Manzullo	Shuler
Fortenberry	Marchant	Shuster

Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)

Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
West
Westmoreland

Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

personal family issue. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM REFORM AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2867) to reauthorize the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 21, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 709]

YEAS—391

Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)

Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal

Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benshiek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buchson
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot

Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crenshaw
Criswell
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy

Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins

Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Critz
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore

Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
West
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—21

Amash
Broun (GA)
Conaway
Farenthold
Flake
Graves (GA)
Kingston

Labrador
Marchant
McClintock
Miller (FL)
Mulvaney
Palazzo
Paul

Price (GA)
Rooney
Southernland
Stutzman
Walsh (IL)
Westmoreland
Woodall

NOT VOTING—21

Bachmann
Barletta
Capuano
Crawford
Dicks
Fincher
Giffords

Gohmert
Hastings (WA)
Honda
Landry
Larsen (WA)
Lewis (GA)
Marino

McHenry
Nadler
Pence
Rush
Waxman
Webster
Young (AK)

□ 1114

Mr. HOLT changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

NOT VOTING—18

Ackerman
Bachmann
Barletta
Capuano
Cassidy
Giffords

Larsen (WA)
Lewis (GA)
Marino
McHenry
Miller, George
Nadler

Pence
Quigley
Rush
Waxman
Webster
Young (AK)

□ 1106

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 708 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 708 I missed the vote due to a

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 709, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 709, I missed the vote due to a personal family issue. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 706 that was taken yesterday on the adoption of H.J. Res. 77, I inadvertently voted “no” when I intended to vote “yes.”

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 79, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2012

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-207) on the resolution (H. Res. 399) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROTECTING JOBS FROM GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE ACT

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 372, I call up the bill (H.R. 2587) to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from ordering any employer to close, relocate, or transfer employment under any circumstance, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). Pursuant to House Resolution 372, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2587

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Jobs From Government Interference Act”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY OF THE NLRB.

Section 10(c) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 160) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “: *Provided further*, That the Board shall have no power to order an employer (or seek an order against an employer) to restore or reinstate any work, product, production line, or equipment, to rescind any relocation, transfer, subcontracting, outsourcing, or other change regarding the location, entity, or employer who shall be engaged in production or other business operations, or to require any employer to make an initial or additional investment at a particular plant, facility, or location”.

SEC. 3. RETROACTIVITY.

The amendment made by section 2 shall apply to any complaint for which a final adjudication by the National Labor Relations Board has not been made by the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2587.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2587, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Protecting Jobs From Government Interference Act is a common-sense proposal that will prevent the National Labor Relations Board from dictating where an employer can and cannot create work. Upon the date of enactment, this limitation will apply to all cases that have not reached final adjudication by the full Board.

Now, more than ever, the American people are looking for leadership out of Washington and some common sense. They want to know their elected officials are willing to take on the tough issues and make the difficult decisions needed to get this economy moving again. They need to believe Congress has the courage to tear down old barriers to new jobs, regardless of the political cost. After 31 straight months of unemployment above 8 percent, we cannot afford to cling to the status quo any longer.

This legislation represents an important step in the fight to get our economy back on track. It tells job creators they don't have to fear an activist NLRB reversing important decisions about where to locate a business. It offers workers peace of mind by ensuring no Federal labor board can force an employer to ship their jobs across the country. And it tells the American people we are serious about getting government out of the way of small business owners and entrepreneurs who are desperately trying to do what they do best, create jobs and opportunities for our Nation's workers.

On April 20, the National Labor Relations Board sent a shock wave across our struggling economy. In a complaint filed against the Boeing Company, the NLRB demanded that this private company relocate work already underway in South Carolina to Washington State. The Board has more than a dozen remedies available to protect workers and hold employers accountable. Regrettably, the Obama NLRB exercised the most extreme remedy and, as a result, put the livelihoods of

thousands of South Carolina workers on the line. Equally troubling, countless workers across the country now fear they could be subject to a similar attack in the future.

Make no mistake. Every worker deserves strong protections that ensure they are free to exercise their rights under the law. This legislation preserves a number of tough remedies for the Board to punish illegal activity. This Republican bill simply says that forcing a business to close its doors and relocate to another part of the country is an unacceptable remedy for today's workforce.

If the NLRB is allowed to exercise this radical authority, it will have a chilling effect on our economy. Businesses, at home and abroad, will reconsider their decision to invest in our country and create jobs for American workers. We have already heard stories of Canadian business leaders doing just that. No doubt, these difficult choices are being discussed on shop floors and boardrooms across the country and outside our borders.

Last month, this Board unloaded a barrage of activist decisions that undermine workers' rights and weaken our workforce. If the President will not hold the Board accountable for its job-destroying agenda, Congress will. It is time we forced the NLRB to change course. This is a sensible reform that will encourage businesses to create jobs right here at home.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. For years, the understanding in this country has been, if you show up for work every day and work your heart out and do your best, what you get in return is a good wage, good benefits, and a future that's secure as long as your company's secure, but it seems like that version of the American Dream moves another continent, another ocean, another day away each day that goes by.

□ 1120

Outsourcing is destroying the middle class in the United States of America, and this bill is the outsourcers' bill of rights. It says to an employer, if you want to use as an excuse the collective bargaining and union activities of your employees and you want to pick up and move to Central or South America or Asia, here's the way to do it.

This bill draws a map of jobs outside—rather, it draws a map as to how to take jobs from inside the United States and move them outside the United States. If an employer, under our law for decades, says that I'm gonna shut down and move my plant or my office because you dared to try to organize a union or you've spoken up

for the rights of the workers, that's illegal. The purpose of this bill is to remove the only effective remedy to combat that illegality.

If this bill became law, here's what would happen:

An employer who says, I'm tired of employees speaking up for their own rights. I'm tired of union organizing. I'm tired of collective bargaining. I'm moving to Malaysia, it would still be illegal under this bill for the employer to say that, but there would be nothing the labor board could do to stop that; because if the employer formed a shell company in Malaysia and took all of the money and put it in the shell company, and the labor board said, Well, you've got to pay backwages to the people you just laid off, there would be no money to pay the backwages.

This is the outsourcers' bill of rights. We don't need an outsourcers' bill of rights. We need a working person's bill of rights in this country. We need a bill of rights that says, if you hold up your end of the bargain, the American Dream will no longer move out of your reach.

This is a bill that overreaches, it undercuts the middle class of this country, and it should be defeated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the chair of the Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions Subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of America's job creators and H.R. 2587, the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act.

What this bill does is simple. It amends the NLRA, the National Labor Relations Act, which was passed in 1935, and prohibits the National Labor Relations Board from ordering employees to relocate, shut down, or transfer employment under any circumstance. In other words, it allows managers to make business decisions that are in the best interests of their company and their employees.

In filing the complaint against Boeing, the NLRB's general counsel has put 1,100 good-paying South Carolina jobs at risk. Mr. Speaker, I was in South Carolina about 5 weeks ago and viewed that plant. It's a huge plant with 1,100 people working today—American people working. This shot across the bow of American business sends a clear message: Don't do business in a right-to-work State.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle suggest that Boeing decided to build a plant in South Carolina as an act of retaliation against a unionized workforce, but not a single worker in Washington State has lost his or her job. They've added jobs. And I'm glad that they have. I'm left to wonder that if the fact that South Carolina, like Tennessee, is a right-to-work State has the NLRB to conclude that a job created in Washington is more valuable than a job created in South Carolina.

I grew up in a union household. My father worked in a factory making shoe heels for BFGoodrich and Co., and his job was outsourced to Mexico in the early seventies. So I've been through that as a family. I understand that very well.

Very simply what happened, Mr. Speaker, is this, is that a company wanted to expand a business line, a 787 Dreamliner, and they built a huge factory in Charleston, South Carolina. A complaint was brought by the general counsel, NLRB, against this. It's now being adjudicated very expensively in the courts. Think what a message this sends to job creators in America. If I were a business, there is no way I would move to a non-right-to-work State because you can never get out if this ruling is upheld.

And I might add also that there are over a dozen remedies that the NLRB has: awards for backpay, effective bargaining, offer of employment, placement of preferential hiring, payment for travel and moving, and on and on. Over a dozen remedies.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage us to support this bill. The fact is, with 14 million Americans out of work, 2 million more than when I came to this Congress 3 years ago, we need every job in every corner of the country. The administration's answer is more spending and more regulation. It's a recipe for failure.

It's time we recognize a fundamental truth that government doesn't create jobs; businesses do. But instead of trying to get the government out of the way of our job creators, this administration seeks to throw up more roadblocks.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The record should reflect the fact that there is an allegation that Boeing, in the case that the gentleman mentioned, because of reasons of union discrimination moved those jobs. There is nothing in this case that says, if a company uses a legitimate business reason other than discriminating against worker rights, they can't do so.

At this time I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to a lifelong advocate for the working people of the United States of America, my friend from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, in September 2010, my Republican colleagues issued A Pledge to America, stating that it is time to do away with old agendas. That much is clear.

However, what is also clear is that this pledge is not to the majority of the American people but to corporate America. To make matters worse, Republicans are taking up legislation that will encourage the shipping of jobs overseas and weaken the rights of middle class workers.

Furthermore, my Republican colleagues have fast-tracked what is more appropriately called the "Job

Outsourcers' Bill of Rights" in the interest of their cronies in corporate America.

Proponents of this bill claim that it will protect jobs by prohibiting the government from interfering with a company's ability to move its operation. However, the law that Republicans are trying to amend to do so, the National Labor Relations Act, does not restrict the location of company operations at all unless the company's location effort is an act to retaliate against workers exercising their right to organize, to demand better benefits, safer working conditions, and ensure a full day's pay for an honest day's work.

This is obviously a response to the case against Boeing, and I find it inappropriate. Change in the law in the middle of trial is irresponsible and dangerous.

The United States Chamber of Commerce wrote a letter in support of this bill. But as noted in the letter, they represent the interests of business. Well, I represent the interests of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PAYNE. I was voted into this position not by Wall Street, not by corporate America, not by those people who reside in high-rise skyscrapers, but by hardworking Americans who want to raise their families the way that we had an opportunity to raise ours rather than ratchet it down to the bottom.

I believe that this bill is foolish, hazardous to the well-being of our Nation's workers, and our economic development.

It is time for the Republicans to abandon this pledge to corporate America. I urge my colleagues to vote against this outsourcing bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a wonderful representative of the people of Tennessee and the American people, a member of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. DESJARLAIS.

□ 1130

Mr. DESJARLAIS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2587, the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act.

As I have traveled Tennessee's Fourth Congressional District and spoken with 30-plus job creators, our conversations inevitably focus on one basic complaint: that the Federal Government's overregulation of the private sector is impeding job creation in this country.

Instead of reducing the regulatory burdens on business, an act which would most certainly create much needed private sector jobs, this administration has used its labor board to make it harder to do business in America. Nowhere is this more apparent

than in its recent unfair labor practice complaint against Boeing.

If you want to talk about creating jobs, let's look at the facts: Boeing has invested approximately \$1 billion to build a plant in South Carolina, which will create new, well-paying jobs in South Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Despite the fact that not one—not one—single employee in Washington has lost his or her job due to Boeing's decision, the administration is attempting to destroy those South Carolinian jobs.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to a very persuasive voice against outsourcing, my friend from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the outsourcers' bill of rights.

This bill would be devastating to workers across this country and kick off a new race to the bottom. The outsourcers' bill of rights is a naked attempt to directly interfere in a pending Labor Relations Board case. Now, there is much to be said about workers' rights and the importance of protecting them; but in the short time I have, let me just say a little bit about what this means for the American economy.

It makes it easier to ship jobs overseas. It eliminates the only remedy to force companies to bring work back from overseas. Companies that make a commitment to the welfare of their employees—well-run companies—and make commitments to their home communities rather than shopping for the latest lowest pay scale someplace in the world actually do better in the long run.

So the outsourcers' bill of rights is not only contrary to the interest of workers; it's bad for our economy at large. We need to improve worker protections, not weaken them. Yet the majority party and the proponents of this bill continue their assault on the rights of working men and women. It doesn't create a single job.

With 25 million Americans unemployed or underemployed, the majority today continues their "no jobs" agenda, bringing to the floor a special interest that is dealing with one particular case rather than creating jobs. It is not good legislative policy to legislate on individual cases. I urge my colleagues to oppose the outsourcers' bill of rights.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman for yielding some time.

I rise to give my strong support to this measure. This straightforward legislation before us today prohibits the

National Labor Relations Board from dictating where private businesses can and cannot locate jobs in America. Mr. Speaker, let me say that again: this straightforward legislation before us today prohibits the NLRB from dictating where private businesses can and cannot locate jobs in the United States.

It's almost a bizarre situation that we're in. An American company wants to provide American jobs in America, and we have an agency of this administration that is trying to prohibit that.

Because of recent overreach by the NLRB, we, unfortunately, need to have this legislation. Businesses that want to hire Americans in America ought to be able to do so. For Americans wondering why jobs are going overseas, it's that there are too many regulations—and too many bizarre regulations—that are forcing companies out of this country just so they can stay in business.

We must continue to empower businesses to create jobs, increase investment, and keep production capabilities right here at home. Not only does that produce a strong economy; it keeps a strong middle class. This bill does just that by letting us stand strong in our commitment to America's job creators. It's just disappointing that we have to bring this bill forward over an administration and a bureaucracy that doesn't understand the success of this country's last 200 years.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

The previous speaker's claim that the National Labor Relations Board is dictating where jobs go in America is utterly incorrect. If any company said, We want to move from State A to State B because we think the State tax structure in State B is more favorable to us, they have an absolute right to do so. The issue is whether they can move because they want to discourage and undercut the right of collective bargaining. If they want to destroy collective bargaining, they can.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to a very persuasive voice for the working families of America, the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2587.

In Hawaii, we believe in fairness and respect. We believe that working men and women should be able to come to the table, have a voice in their workplaces, be able to negotiate for fair wages and benefits. This belief helped build the middle class in Hawaii and across our country.

Right now, what working men and women need most are champions in their corner, champions who are fighting for real jobs. Instead, this bill takes aim at our working families. It's another direct assault on them and on workers' rights.

Let's face it. Companies today can move their business operations for any business reason at all except for an illegal one. Today, retaliating against

workers who want to organize and join a union is illegal. This bill changes that. It says companies can go ahead. You can move your jobs to other States or even to other countries to punish your workers who want to organize and have a voice. This would have a chilling effect on any attempt by workers to ask for a seat at the bargaining table. Workers have already taken big hits in their paychecks and in their retirements over the years.

We should not make it easier for businesses to game the system. I urge my colleagues to fight against this bill and to stand with the working men and women of this country.

Aloha.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank Chairman KLINE for yielding me this time and for his leadership in moving this legislation to the floor. I thank Congressman SCOTT of South Carolina for his leadership in introducing this legislation, and I thank all those who join with me in supporting what I think is an important job-creating bill for this country.

It's important not just in right-to-work States, like South Carolina or Virginia; but it's important in States that don't have protection of workers under right-to-work laws, like Washington State, because businesses both in this country and overseas that are looking to invest are not going to look in places where they can be subsequently restrained from being able to expand their business—and that's what is happening here. They're expanding their business to another State if they locate in a place where that can happen to them.

They are also not going to locate in right-to-work States. No. When they need to expand, they're not going to have any statement about what their intentions are or why they're doing it, as is the case with most companies. They're simply going to locate in China or Taiwan or Thailand or India or in 100 other countries around the world that are very friendly and welcoming to employers who want to grow and expand businesses. Unless the United States changes this law and restrains the National Labor Relations Board from making these kinds of decisions, we're going to suffer greatly in job loss.

So this is a great job-creating bill. I encourage my colleagues to support the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act that amends the NLRA to prohibit the NLRB in future and pending cases from ordering an employer to close, relocate, or transfer employment under any circumstances.

This is an important measure. This will not just save 1,000 jobs in South Carolina. This will save hundreds of thousands of jobs across this country. It will ensure that employers have greater freedom to make one of the most basic management decisions: where to locate a business.

□ 1140

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The gentleman from Virginia just said that this bill restrains companies from growing jobs. Here's what it restrains. It restrains from saying to a worker who dares to stand up and bargain for themselves and fight for themselves, "You're fired." That's what it restrains; and it should restrain that, because that's our law.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to one of the most passionate voices for working Americans in the modern history of this country, my friend from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. The National Labor Relations Act was a New Deal initiative which helped save American capitalism by creating a process which would protect the rights of employees and employers. This was before NAFTA, GATT, and the WTO, which tore legal rights for workers apart, moved millions of jobs out of the U.S.

Yes, we stand for the workers at Boeing in Washington State, but we also stand for the workers at Boeing in South Carolina, because they will have no recourse if Boeing wants to move jobs to China.

You can't say you want to create jobs here at home while destroying the rights of workers to organize, the right to collective bargaining. These are basic rights in a democratic society.

You can't say you want to protect American jobs and not protect American workers. Take away workers' rights to free speech, take away workers' right to due process and you create a new class of slave laborers here in the United States who are helpless to stop the movement of jobs out of America.

This bill not only sacrifices the rights of Boeing workers in Washington State, it also sacrifices laws that are designed to protect workers' rights. It's an attack on all American workers.

It's one thing to take the side of the boss or the owners; it's another thing to take the side of the boss or the owners when they want to move jobs out of America.

Stand up for the American workers, stand up for workers' rights, stand up for American jobs, and stand up for employers who want to keep jobs in the United States.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another member of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Thank you, Mr. KLINE.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about jobs. The first thing I want to do is correct this ridiculous notion that this bill causes jobs to go overseas. I would argue it does just the opposite.

Just like Dr. ROE, I grew up in a union household. My father was a United Mine Worker, and that's why I am here today. I was elected to Congress to protect all workers, not just a select few.

Ninety-three percent of American workers are not in a union; 7 percent are, in the private sector. The National Labor Relations Board complaint is an attack on American job creators.

Again, I was elected to protect all workers, not just a select few.

The NLRB's decision to punish Boeing for creating 1,100 new jobs is just another example of the administration abusing its position to advance a biased agenda. I want to remind everyone no jobs were taken from Washington State.

This is a straightforward bill that prohibits the NLRB from ordering an employer to close, relocate, or transfer employment under any circumstances. This bill will create an environment necessary for employers to develop their businesses in the State that offers the best opportunity—and, I would argue, in the best country that offers the best opportunity—to grow and create jobs and not have this left up to a board of unelected bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and let's get America back to work.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to a daughter and sister in a union family who doesn't forget where she came from, the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 2587, a bill I call the "Outsourcing Bill of Rights."

Especially during these difficult economic times, we have come together to do the patriotic thing—protect and create jobs here at home.

This legislation eliminates the NLRB's already limited authority to order an employer to restore work taken away in a wrongful way. By passing this bill, we are telling our Nation's workers we cannot and we will not help them. Plain and simple, if this bill passes, it will lead to increased outsourcing of jobs. Further, the bill will make certain that employers will not be held accountable.

My colleague on the other side just mentioned that 93 percent of American workers are not unionized, and I also would like to bring up the point that we have seen wages across this country going down and yet we have seen the profits in corporations going up. That's why we are in the situation we are in right now.

I come from a union family, and I am proud of that. It was able to give us the education that we needed, for my father and mother to be able to buy us a home. That, we're not seeing today. Why? Because we're hitting the workers. Why did we have unions in the first place? To give them a voice.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. In my opinion, the corporations should be a little bit more patriotic and start hiring people so we can get this economy going and make this

great country what we are. America can go forward, but not without good pay for our workers.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to another member of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY).

Mr. GOWDY. I want to thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue and so many others on the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the NLRA is supposed to balance the rights of employees, employers, and the general public, but you would never know that from the recent actions of the NLRB. This unelected group of executive branch recess appointees has abandoned all pretense of objectivity and has become, frankly, nothing more than a taxpayer-funded law firm for Big Labor.

Boeing is the most glaring example of their overreach, but it is not the only one. At a time when union membership is at a historic low, the NLRB seeks to give Big Labor a historically high level of influence with this administration, whether it's quickie elections or mandating advocacy posters in the workplace or this, the economic death penalty. The NLRB is out of control and it needs to be reined in so it does not do even more damage to this fragile economy.

With respect to the bill at hand in which my friend and colleague Mr. SCOTT seeks to remove a single remedy from the arsenal of the NLRB, leaving a dozen other remedies, this bill simply says that you cannot force Boeing to close a billion-dollar facility, which is already being constructed in Charleston, and fire the thousand workers who have been hired and send the work back to Washington State, which is tantamount to the economic death penalty. Not a single worker has lost a job or a benefit in Washington State, Mr. Speaker, when Boeing started this separate, distinct supply line.

The NLRB thinks a company should stay in a union State no matter how many work stoppages there are, no matter how many customers have threatened to go do business somewhere else because they can't get their planes on time, no matter how many fines have been paid because of late delivery of airplanes because of work stoppages, no matter what. No matter how much money is lost, Mr. Speaker, the NLRB thinks that Boeing should have to stay in a union State because it planted a flag originally in a union State.

This Congress has limited civil remedies when they have been abused. This Congress has limited criminal remedies whether they have been abused. And this Congress must limit administrative remedies when they are being abused, as they are now. Even the Chicago Tribune, Mr. Speaker, hardly a bastion of conservative thought, acknowledges that the NLRB is out of control.

I will ask my colleagues on the other side the same question I asked Life

Solomon, the general counsel for the NLRB. Can you name me a single solitary worker who has lost a job because of Boeing's decision to start a separate line of work in North Charleston? Can you name me a single solitary worker who has lost a benefit or suffered any recrimination, any reparation because of Boeing's decision?

Mr. Speaker, if this administration were serious about job creation, they would have reined in this agency a long time ago. They did not, and we must.

□ 1150

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

My friend who just spoke indicated that this decision, or attempt by the NLRB, would destroy jobs in South Carolina. That's not accurate. On page 8 of the NLRB's complaint, it says the relief requested by the NLRB does not seek to prohibit respondent, Boeing, from making nondiscriminatory decisions where work will be performed, including work at its North Charleston, South Carolina, facility.

At this point I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), a strong, progressive voice for working people in the United States.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

When the President spoke in this Chamber last week, he urged us to focus on jobs. Believe me, this outsourcer's bill wasn't what he had in mind. He demanded that we move urgently to create new jobs, certainly not jeopardize the ones we already have. This outsourcer's bill of rights is nothing more than a gift to the majority's corporate cronies. It gives unscrupulous employers the green light to retaliate against workers, to punish them for engaging in union activities, or for fighting for their rights as workers. And they do that by saying that it is perfectly okay to pick up and leave town, and they do that after the president of Boeing actually admitted the reason they were moving to South Carolina was because there was too much union activity in Seattle. That is retaliation, my folks.

Someone tell me how exactly is this supposed to revive our economy? It's part of the Republican vendetta against workers and their collective bargaining rights. It's part of their orchestrated assault on the labor movement that built the American middle class. This is not the time to be undermining or threatening the job security of any American. It is time to defeat this bill and move immediately to pass a big, bold jobs bill, one that will put America back to work.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. KLINE. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Then at this time I will yield 2 minutes to another member of the committee, the gentlelady from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2587, the Protecting Jobs From Government Interference Act, of which I am a cosponsor. Representing a district in the State of Alabama, a right-to-work State, the current activist agenda of the National Labor Relations Board greatly concerns me.

Congress has a responsibility to ensure that the NLRB objectively applies the law written by the people's elected representatives. Congress must also work to ensure that labor interests are not undermining the employer's efforts to create jobs. At a time when millions of individuals are unemployed and searching for work, public officials in Washington should look to provide greater certainty to America's employers so they can grow businesses and create new jobs, not hinder them.

Unfortunately, the recent rulings and proceedings of the NLRB have demonstrated otherwise. I enter this letter of support of H.R. 2587 from the Associated Builders and Contractors of Alabama in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. ABC represents over 800 commercial construction companies in my State, all of whom are concerned that the NLRB has abandoned its role as a neutral enforcer and arbiter of labor law in order to promote the special interests of unions. The Federal Government, especially the NLRB, has no right to dictate where a company can or cannot create jobs. The Protecting Jobs From Government Interference Act will provide employers with the certainty they need to invest in our economy and put Americans back to work right here at home in the United States.

ASSOCIATED BUILDERS
AND CONTRACTORS, INC.,
Birmingham, AL, July 29, 2011.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBY: On behalf of Associated Builders and Contractors of Alabama (ABC), that represents 800 commercial construction companies in our state, I am writing to express our strong support for H.R. 2587, the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act. ABC urges House Members to support H.R. 2587 and will consider this vote a "KEY VOTE" for our 112th Congressional Scorecard.

Alabama being a right to work state, this bill further strengthens what your constituents feel is in the best interest of Alabama.

For more than a year, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) has moved forward with an agenda that is stifling job creation and economic growth. The NLRB's decisions, proposed rules, invitations for briefs and enforcement policies demonstrate that the agency has abandoned its role as a neutral enforcer and arbiter of labor law in order to promote the special interests of politically powerful unions.

Recent rulemakings and decisions by the NLRB will have negative implications for workers, consumers, businesses and the economy. These actions inevitably will reduce employee access to secret ballots; limit an employer's ability to effectively communicate the impact of unionization to its workers ("ambush" elections); trample private property rights; invite greater union in-

timidation of employees, consumers and small businesses; and limit the ability of U.S. businesses to quickly and flexibly adjust to the demands of a changing economy and global competition.

The NLRB has also taken unprecedented steps to mandate where and how one company—Boeing—can operate and expand its business. The federal government has no right to dictate where a company can or cannot create jobs. The Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act would encourage investment in our economy by guaranteeing that businesses and entrepreneurs retain the ability to decide where to conduct business and where to locate jobs.

At this time of economic challenges, it is unfortunate the NLRB continues to move forward with policies that threaten to paralyze the construction industry and impede job growth. With an unemployment rate exceeding 15 percent, ABC members and construction workers cannot afford this burden.

ABC urges House Members to support H.R. 2587 and will consider this vote a "KEY VOTE" for our 112th Congressional Scorecard.

Sincerely,

JAY REED,
President.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the most effective leading voice for working people in America today, the senior ranking Democrat on the Education and Workforce Committee, my friend from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for that nice introduction.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this legislation, H.R. 2587.

This special interest bill is a job killer. It is simply a job killer. It was spurred by a particular case involving a Fortune 500 corporation, The Boeing Company. But this bill is not just about Boeing. This bill is really about working Americans all across this country, and they should pay very careful attention to this bill and to this debate because it affects their livelihoods, their ability to support their families, the safety of their jobs at work, the conditions under which they work, and their ability to participate through their increased productivity in higher wages and better conditions.

This bill takes those rights away from workers, from all workers, all across the country. This isn't just about whether you belong to a union or not. This is about whether or not your employer can retaliate against you by taking your work away, by sending your work down the road or out of the country. It makes it easier to outsource because you simply, in response to a request by workers that they might share in the profits of the company, they might have higher wages, their work can disappear in an arbitrary fashion. And they have to understand that that's what happens under this legislation.

For the first time in 70 years, American workers in the workplace will not be protected. They will not be protected for the right to have a grievance against the employer for their wages or

for the benefits that they are paid because the employer, for the first time in 70 years, will have the ability to say: Well, if you need more wages and you want more wages, you know what I'm going to do, I'm going to take your jobs and I'm going to outsource them. I'm going to send them to China. I'm going to send them to India. I'm going to send them to another part of the country because I'm not going to pay higher wages. Today, that's illegal. Under this law, it will not be. They can take your job and your work away from you. We've got to understand what that means.

We just saw that wages have taken one of the largest hits in a decade in this country. We have seen, as workers fail to organize in the workplace, wages have continued to go down. And at the same time, we have seen the CEOs and the management of companies take out tens of millions of dollars a year for each and every one of them, but not share it with the workers. They have decided that they'll take the increased productivity of the most productive workers in the world, the American worker, and they'll take that increased productivity and they'll take it for themselves. They won't continue the bargain that we have in this country that if you work hard, you'll be able to improve your lot in life. And so we've seen wages have stagnated in this country. And now this. If you try to get better wages, if you seek to improve your lot in life, if you seek to improve the ability of your kids to go to school, to provide for your family, your work can be taken away. This is a first in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. This is a first in America. We must repudiate this on behalf of families that are struggling all across the country, those who are fortunate enough to continue to have a job, but they can't have a job living under this threat that they won't be able to better themselves if their employer decides to be selfish, decides to retaliate against them for seeking to organize to do something on their behalf. It's a fundamental part of the contract in America for workers. It doesn't exist in a lot of other parts of the world, but it does here. It has led to the middle class in this country, and it's the middle class that is threatened by this legislation.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say on the previous speaker that we have a czar to control these executive pays, and so if that czar is not doing his job, that's another problem we need to address.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2587, the Protecting Jobs From Government

Interference Act. After the unprecedented actions by the National Labor Relations Board early this year, I was proud to join the gentleman from South Carolina and support this legislation.

Right now, our economy is suffering, and that suffering is felt even more in the South where States like Georgia and South Carolina have unemployment rates higher than the national average. We need to encourage companies to invest in those States most hard-hit. The Boeing plant in South Carolina directly created thousands of jobs in South Carolina, and indirectly through suppliers and construction created hundreds more.

□ 1200

Instead, the President has once again overstepped his executive authority and allowed the union attack dog to threaten to shut down the plant in South Carolina, jeopardizing thousands of jobs.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2587 and stop the National Labor Relations Board from killing jobs.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

We don't have a czar controlling executive pay in this country. We have executives acting like czars outsourcing jobs around the world and ruining the middle class. That's the problem in the United States.

It is my privilege at this time to yield 3 minutes to the Democratic whip, who strongly understands the value of collective bargaining, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, the issue here has been raised by a case that is not yet concluded. Let me state that again: the issue raised in this legislation is reference to a case that is not yet concluded and seeks to interpose our judgment for the finder of fact and law's judgment. Normally, we believe that's a bad practice in a Nation of laws, not of men.

Secondly, this bill shows clearly a basic difference between many of us on this side and many on that side of the aisle, and that is whether or not you believe that working men and women have the right to come together to organize and to bargain collectively for their pay, their benefits, and their working conditions. In fact, it is my belief that the overwhelming majority of working Americans, whether or not they have joined such an organization, find their workplace safer, healthier, their pay better, and more availability of benefits than they would have if men and women had not been guaranteed the right to bargain collectively, for which they fought and some died in the 1930s and 1940s and later, because people did not want them to do that. They wanted to say: I don't care how much money we make, this is your portion.

Now, we see superathletes not stand for that if they're in the NFL or in the

NBA or the NHL. We understand that. They see their enterprises making great money because they're great players. But the owners want to pay them what they need to pay them. Why? Because they want to maximize profits. I'm for that. That's the free enterprise system.

So we set up a system where we can bargain and we can come to a fair resolution. But this bill says that the concomitant of that right, which is that the employer cannot retaliate for the exercising of a legal right, will be jettisoned. That's what this bill says pretty simply. Yes, you have the right to bargain collectively; but if we don't like what you're doing, we're taking a hike. We're going to retaliate.

I do not decide today whether or not that will be the finder of fact and law's conclusion in this case. I don't know that Boeing did that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. I do not know whether that will be the ultimate conclusion, whether Boeing in fact violated the law by retaliating. And I've told my friends at Boeing that I don't know that that's going to be the conclusion. But I do know this: I am for working men and women having the right that they've had for some 70 years. And I believe that working men and women in America, organized or unorganized, are better off because we adopted a law to protect that right. Do not jettison.

And I close with this. I quote from a letter sent by hundreds of professors with expertise in this area: "We are dismayed that a single complaint should be the basis for so fundamental a reversal of longstanding law."

Do not take this step. Reject this bill. Vote "no."

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another member of the committee, the gentleman from Nevada, Dr. HECK.

Mr. HECK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, in the past, unions have been about protecting workers. As a physician, I know that one of the major reasons for the increase in life expectancy between the first and second half of the last century was due in large part to increases in worker safety, which were brought about by actions of unions.

I grew up in a union household. In fact, when my father was injured on the job, it was his union that helped represent him in court and put food on the table for my family. Too often, today's unions are more about politics and protecting their clout than protecting workers.

This change in focus is exemplified by a Boeing union newsletter that stated that "2,100 bargaining unit positions may be lost," if Boeing located a new manufacturing plant in South Carolina. Not jobs, not employees, not brothers and sisters, but bargaining

unit positions. These employees were reduced to nothing more than a number.

Employers must have the ability to locate where they can find the best employees, period. I worry that if the NLRB takes away that ability and prevents them from creating jobs in a right-to-work State like South Carolina, what does that mean for other right-to-work States like my State of Nevada, the State hardest hit by the recession and with the highest unemployment rates in the Nation. Would the NLRB take similar action against a company trying to create jobs in Nevada? That's a risk Nevadans cannot afford to take.

H.R. 2587 maintains an employer's ability to locate where they can find the best employees; and that is why I support this legislation, and I strongly urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the leader who's leading the fight against outsourcing and for collective bargaining, the minority leader of the House Democrats, the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him for his tremendous leadership on behalf of America's workers. Thank you, Mr. ANDREWS, for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, across the country, Americans of every political party and every background—Democrats, Republicans, independents, and others—agree that our Nation's top priority must be the creation of jobs and economic growth and security. Yet for more than 250 days, the Republican majority in the House has refused to listen to them. They, the Republicans, have failed to enact a single jobs bill. And the American people do not have the luxury of waiting any longer for Congress to act to create jobs.

The President has proposed the American Jobs Act. He's called upon us to pass the bill now. We support that, as do the Democratic Members of the House. But today, instead of passing a jobs bill, we are wasting the time of the Congress by attacking workers instead of strengthening them. We are debating a bill to undermine the foundation of our middle class instead of fighting to put people to work rebuilding our roads, bridges, railways, broadband lines, schools, airports, and water systems. We are voting on a measure to send jobs overseas instead of focusing on how to keep jobs here at home through our Make it in America initiative advanced by our Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER. Make it in America—how to strengthen our economy and our national security by stopping the erosion of our manufacturing base, indeed, by strengthening our manufacturing and industrial base.

I want to recognize my colleague, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, the ranking member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for his leadership, his knowledge, and not only

his intellect but his passion and tireless advocacy on the subject of America's workers. As Congressman MILLER has said, our Republican colleagues have proposed the so-called outsourcers' bill of rights or as I prefer to call it, the Outsourcers' Bill of Wrongs—because this legislation has the wrong priorities for America's economy and for American workers.

□ 1210

The bill is about more than one company or a single case; it is about the economic security of America's workforce and families.

Rather than create jobs, this measure encourages the outsourcing of jobs and undermines the rights of middle class workers. This bill cuts the National Labor Relations Board, makes it easier for corporations to ship jobs overseas, and allows employers to punish their employees for simply exercising their rights to organize, to demand better benefits and safer working conditions, and to ensure a full day's pay for a full day's work.

For months in Wisconsin, Ohio, and States nationwide, Americans have seen Republican Governors and legislatures attack teachers and public servants. And we've seen these workers, union and nonunion alike, inspire the Nation to fight back. Now Republicans have brought their assault on working Americans to our Nation's Capitol, to the floor of the House, claiming their actions will help the economy. But it will do just the opposite. It will weaken our workers, our middle class, and our families—indeed, the cornerstones of our economic prosperity, of our middle class, and of our democracy.

The "Outsourcers' Bill of Wrongs"—or Rights—is not about jobs; it's about dismantling protections established specifically to strengthen the rights of workers. We need these protections now more than ever.

Listen to this: Last year, American companies created 1.4 million jobs overseas—overseas—while raking in enormous profits. We must create these jobs here at home.

Democrats will stand strong for our working men and women. We will stay focused on jobs and economic growth.

On a personal note, Mr. Speaker, the other night I had one of the thrills of my political lifetime. I received—such an honor for me—the Frances Perkins Award from my colleague, LYNN WOOLSEY, a champion for working families in our country.

For those of you who may not know Frances Perkins from history, she was the first woman to serve in the Cabinet of a President of the United States. She was the Secretary of Labor. And she was responsible for many important initiatives: the 40-hour workweek, the ability for workers to bargain collectively. She was a remarkable champion for working people in our country. She was largely responsible for creating Social Security. Imagine having that as her credentials. Imagine what a

thrill it was for me to receive an award named for her, especially given by Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY, a champion on the Education and Workforce Committee.

Much of what she did, the credit was given to the President of the United States, as is appropriate. More than 75 years ago, upon the signing of the National Labor Relations Act, President Franklin Roosevelt said this:

"By preventing practices which tend to destroy the independence of labor, this law seeks, for every worker within its scope, that freedom of choice and action which is justly his." I guess he could have said his or hers.

That "independence," that "freedom of choice and action" has rested at the core of a growing, thriving American workforce. It has not limited the ability of companies to move, change, or extend their operations. It has simply ensured that companies treat their workers in ways consistent with the laws of our land.

The independence and freedom of our workers have helped build and expand our middle class, which is the backbone of our democracy, and drive unprecedented prosperity for our families and for our Nation, and it must be preserved in our time. I call upon my colleagues to do just that, to preserve this right in our time.

I call upon my colleagues to oppose this legislation, to uphold the value of fairness for our workforce, and to get to work putting the American people back to work by bringing President Obama's bill, the American Jobs Act, to committee and to the floor to again give people hope and confidence and the dignity of a job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) has 8¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation on behalf of the American public that has had enough; on behalf of those tens of millions of people who pay their taxes, live within their means, and give their hand to a neighbor in need, for they have had enough; on behalf of those like Boeing, whose innovation, entrepreneurship, and technology ensures that more moms and dads will not have to witness a flag-draped coffin bringing their son or daughter home from a land far away, for they, too, have had enough. I rise on behalf of those like my dad, who fought and bled against tyranny to make sure that the future that he gave to his children would be a future of freedom, for those, too, have had enough.

Mr. Speaker, there is no defending the overzealous oligarchs at the National Labor Relations Board. Their actions are a symptom of a regulatory board gone amuck. In fact, the irony of

this is that if Boeing wants to escape their reach, their jurisdiction, the only way to do so is to move overseas, which is contrary to what any of us want when we want jobs here in America. Nowhere in America should your government be able to tell you what you can or cannot do just because they believe what your intentions are.

Mr. Speaker, this administration needs to stop reading minds and start reading the Constitution. The Boeing decision is a vivid reminder that absolute power corrupts absolutely. And we could dismiss it if it were only an isolated case, but it is not. Americans have endured an administration that fines American citizens for not buying a product, raids—with guns drawn—an American guitar manufacturer for not shipping jobs overseas, conducts aerial searches and seizures of American businesses without their knowledge, and orders Federal employees not to speak to Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, free enterprise is not the problem; it is the solution. And, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the other side may say, labor is not the enemy. Labor is the backbone of the American economy. But both should be aware of a government that can tell you what to do just because of what you think, and both should be aware of a government that can tell you what to buy just because they think that's what you need.

I pray that this legislation is the cornerstone of a renewed free market citadel called America. The reign of the regulator is over. The American people want their country back, and there are still patriots in this House.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I'm sure the gentleman did not mean to imply that those of us who take our side are not patriots. We think patriotism includes the right to freely and collectively bargain, and we stand for it.

I am pleased at this time to yield 1 minute to a widely respected advocate of the people of the State of Washington, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about this outsourcing bill and its tenor.

If you want to change what's legal or illegal, then this body should address those issues. But this bill won't change what's legal or illegal; it will simply stop current law from being enforced.

The NLRB is a law enforcement body. It follows an independent, adjudicative process.

□ 1220

If we want to change the laws it enforces, that's subject to debate, but this bill won't do that, and that's why I'm opposing it.

I haven't taken a position on the case that brings us here today, and I don't

intend to here, but I can say this firmly: Elected officials should not be politicizing an ongoing adjudicative process. Politics should not interfere with justice in this or any other case.

I won't support a bill that doesn't change the underlying law but only changes the ability of those we've charged with enforcing it with the ability to do so. Don't allow one controversy to sully Uncle Sam's ability for justice in this country.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this bill.

I want to start by making a comparison and contrasting the events recently in the great State of South Carolina with that of my home State of Arkansas.

In Arkansas, aerospace is one of our top exports. We have more jobs in Arkansas affiliated with the aerospace industry than any other sector of our manufacturing economy. With aviation manufacturers like Hawker Beechcraft and Dassault Falcon, thousands of Arkansas families enjoy high-paying jobs. Communities, schools, and small businesses are all positively impacted by the aviation industry's choice to locate in Arkansas. But, Mr. Speaker, if the NLRB had had their way, none of this would have ever been a reality in my home State of Arkansas.

The recent action by the NLRB is a case of massive overreach, overreach that attempts to tell a business where and when they should locate their businesses that employ people and create jobs. You see, Mr. Speaker, South Carolina, along with Arkansas, are right-to-work States. Right-to-work States focus on fostering economic conditions that allow the private sector to create jobs and prosper.

And again, not a single job was lost as a result of Boeing's decision to open another manufacturing plant in the State of South Carolina. Yet the NLRB chose to attack the private sector once again. And that's just indicative of this administration's economic agenda that focuses on growing government instead of creating jobs and growing our economy.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, the NLRB decision sets a dangerous precedent. This bill is the first step to limit the government overreach that threatens Arkansas companies and job creators all across the country.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a person who understands the international implications of economic growth and collective bargaining, my good friend from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. Thank you, Mr. ANDREWS.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the proponents of this legislation to look at this fact situation:

Let's assume there was compelling evidence that an employer decided to move a production line from one part of the country to another part of the country because he wanted to find a workforce that was white and not African American or not Latino, or that was much more likely not to have women applying to work on that manufacturing line than where he was located. Would anyone here suggest there should be a bill that, notwithstanding Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, should let that employer, with a discriminatory motive and a racist intention, move his plant for that reason?

This is not a bill about what an employer can or cannot do. This is a bill about motivation. The Civil Rights Act, 1964, the right of employees to organize, form unions, bargain collectively, and to prohibit employers from retaliating against that, 75 years ago.

If you really want to have the job creators do whatever they want, as you like to say, get rid of the workers' right to choose, get rid of collective bargaining, remove the protections against discrimination, against unions, but don't pretend you're trying to do something for reasons that disguise the motivation for the reason.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire again about the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. KLINE. I will inform my colleague from New Jersey that I am expecting another speaker; so at this time I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to a passionate voice to fight the ravages of outsourcing in our country, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. I stand in strong opposition, Mr. Speaker, to this bill.

The National Labor Relations Board exists to ensure that companies do not discriminate against workers who exercise their rights under Federal law. That protection prevents the illegal offshoring of American jobs.

In 2000, for example, a California jewelry manufacturing company took aggressive action to discourage its employees from organizing, a right that is protected under Federal law. When the company failed, it announced plans to relocate its operations to Mexico. The Board was able to prevent this from happening.

Using the authority this bill would eliminate, the Board prevented the company from moving American jobs to Mexico. If H.R. 2587 is enacted, companies will be able to ship jobs overseas in retaliation against American workers exercising their rights.

Unfortunately, H.R. 2587 is part of a larger campaign to attack workers'

rights. That campaign includes an investigation by the Oversight Committee into the Board's ongoing prosecution of The Boeing Company for allegations of illegal retaliation against workers in Washington State for exercising their rights under the law.

A Washington Post editorial warned that the committee should not "sabotage" this ongoing legal process. And 34 law professors urged the committee to let the Board do its job without interference. Instead, the committee issued a subpoena, threatened contempt, and even intimidated NLRB attorneys trying to do their job.

If H.R. 2587 becomes law, even if Boeing is found to have violated workers' rights, no remedy will exist to restore those rights to workers. Nobody interested in protecting American jobs should support this bill.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 2587.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a gentlelady who favors job creation over outsourcing, the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2587 should be really called the "Death of the Workers Rights Act." This amends the National Labor Relations Act of 1935. And remember why that act was created. We were in the Great Depression.

So why was it then passed? Because workers could join unions even back then, but they could be fired for joining the union and for striking. Does that sound familiar? This caused great labor unrest in this country, a country that was struggling to get back on its feet.

Remember, we are a country of workers. Workers made this country, and workers will continue to make us the great country that we are.

What the NLRA said was workers could organize to act in a concerted manner for mutual aid and protection. This act basically eliminates the remedies if that right is violated.

Now, remember, the NLRB must prove that these protected rights were violated. They just simply can't go in and act willy-nilly. They have to prove these allegations.

There will be no rights for these workers if this bill is allowed to pass.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that we have two speakers, a gentleman from Virginia and one from Texas who apparently are not going to be able to get here on time; so I will be closing when Mr. ANDREWS has exhausted his speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my honor to yield 1 minute to a gentlelady who has been a fierce advocate for jobs for New York City but, more importantly, for all of America, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to

H.R. 2587. This bill, which was rammed through committee without so much as a legislative hearing, does not create or protect jobs, in spite of its misleading title. What this bill does is give American workers an unfair choice: your rights or your job.

H.R. 2587 creates an open season for CEOs to punish workers for exercising their rights. This bill allows companies to relocate or eliminate jobs in retaliation against employees who exercise their right to organize, strike, or engage in collective bargaining activity.

□ 1230

This Republican-sponsored bill accomplishes this by eliminating the National Labor Relations Board's power to order work be restored or reinstated. In practical terms, this would mean that if a CEO wanted to punish workers for organizing or striking, the CEO could simply choose to relocate or eliminate the work and thereby eliminate the worker without fear of being held accountable.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill and vote it down today.

Mr. KLINE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, when one listens to the back-and-forth in this debate, there's a lot of different points and I'm sure some confusion that flows from that. But the debate's really pretty simple, and it's about one question: If a group of people working at a business in this country chooses to try to organize a union and bargain collectively for their wages and their working conditions, and the employer is discomfited by that and the employer comes in and says, "I don't like the fact you're trying to form a union and bargain collectively and assert your rights, so I'm moving to Malaysia. I'm out of here," should that be legal or not? We believe emphatically it should be illegal.

To say to American workers that they dare to speak up for themselves, they dare to assert their rights, they dare to bargain collectively, therefore their jobs could be moved overseas is wrong. It is illegal today to do that.

Now, in the Boeing case, a judge will decide whether or not Boeing did that. If the judge decides that Boeing didn't, the case is over. If the judge decides that Boeing did, then there will be remedies that would lie against Boeing.

But this is what this case is really about, this issue is really about, this bill is really about in the lives of daily Americans. How many of our constituents are sick and tired of making a call about their credit card or some other account and realize that the person in the call center at the other end is in Asia and has no idea what they're talking about?

If you want more outsourcing, if you think the problem in America is that too many jobs are being created here and we do more for other countries around the world, then this is your bill.

But if you've had it with outsourcing, if you want jobs to be created in America, what we ought to do is defeat this bill and rapidly bring to the floor the jobs plan the President of the United States stood in this Chamber last week and proposed.

Let's stop creating jobs around the world and start creating jobs around America. Let's stand up for collective bargaining, and let's defeat this bill.

STATEMENT OF PROFESSORS FROM COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES ON HR 2587

HR 2587, currently being considered by the House of Representatives and endorsed by a majority of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, would amend the National Labor Relations Act to take away from the NLRB the ability to remedy unfair labor practices involving the removal of work or the elimination of jobs by requiring employers to undo their unlawful actions. As scholars of law and labor policy, we are deeply concerned about the far-reaching impact this bill would have on employees' basic rights to organize, to bargain collectively, and to engage in other concerted activities protected by the NLRA.

The language of the proposed amendment to the Act is sweeping. It provides that the Board shall have no power to order an employer (or seek an order against an employer) to restore or reinstate any work, product, production line, or equipment, to rescind any relocation, transfer, subcontracting, outsourcing, or other change regarding the location, entity, or persons who shall be engaged in production or other business operations. This language has been justified by the bill's sponsors and critics of the Board as a response to the NLRB Acting General Counsel's actions in issuing a complaint against Boeing Corporation. As such, it would prevent the Board and the courts from directing Boeing to restore work to its employees in Washington State in the event that the company is found to have illegally moved the work in retaliation for those workers' exercise of legally protected rights.

But that unprecedented interference with a pending legal proceeding for the benefit of a particular employer is not all that the bill would do. If enacted, HR 2587 will eliminate the ability of the NLRB and the courts to effectively remedy any discriminatorily motivated decision to transfer work from employees or eliminate their jobs not for legitimate business reasons, but because the employees have engaged in union or other NLRA-protected activity. It will also eliminate any meaningful remedy for an employer's refusal to bargain with a union in circumstances where it is required to do so before transferring or contracting out work performed by workers the union represents.

The Board has long held that moving jobs from one facility to another or shutting down a particular operation to avoid unionization or to punish workers for engaging in protected activity violates a basic policy of the Act, that of insulating union activity from economic reprisal.¹ The same is true of discriminatorily motivated decisions to subcontract or outsource work.² The standard remedy for such a violation, regularly affirmed by the Federal Courts of Appeals, is an order to the employer to return the work that has been unlawfully eliminated or removed.³ In the interests of economic efficiency, however, the Board will not require restoration of work if the employer can show that it would be "unduly burdensome" to do so.⁴

An order to restore work that has been eliminated or removed is also the standard

remedy in cases where the employer's actions were taken in violation of its duty to bargain. In unionized workplaces, employers have a legal obligation to bargain over certain decisions affecting where and by whom bargaining unit work is performed. If the employer acts unilaterally, without first bargaining with the union until the parties reach agreement or are at impasse, the Board routinely orders the employer to rescind the unilateral action and restore the work until the duty to bargain has been satisfied, subject again to the "unduly burdensome" standard.⁵

If HR 2587 becomes law, the Board will be precluded from ordering this common-sense relief. Employers will be able to eliminate jobs or transfer employees or work for no purpose other than to punish employees for exercising their rights and the Board will be powerless to direct the employer to return the work regardless of the circumstances.

Without the ability to order a unionized employer to bring back work that has been unilaterally transferred or outsourced in violation of the duty to bargain, the Board will also be unable to insure that employees, through their union, are able to engage in meaningful bargaining over such decisions.

We are dismayed that a single complaint, not yet tried by an administrative law judge argued to the Board, or ruled on by the courts, should be the basis for so fundamental a reversal of long-standing law. The legal theory on which the Acting General Counsel's complaint against Boeing is based is thoroughly consistent with existing law. Contrary to the claims of critics, the Acting General Counsel is not seeking to dictate where Boeing assigns work, but only to insure that such actions are not taken in retaliation for workers' exercise of rights protected by the NLRA. In fact the complaint itself specifically states that "the Acting General Counsel does not seek to prohibit Respondent from making nondiscriminatory decisions with respect to where work will be performed, including nondiscriminatory decisions with respect to work at its North Charleston, South Carolina, facility."

But as we have shown, the impact of HR 2587 would go well beyond overruling the Acting General Counsel's actions in the Boeing case. If enacted, it will give tacit permission to employers to punish any segment of their workforce that chooses to unionize or to exercise the right to strike by eliminating their jobs. It will allow unionized employers who find it convenient to ignore their duty to bargain with the union before transferring or eliminating bargaining unit work to act unilaterally without concern for legal consequences. Employers will be able to eliminate lines of work, hire subcontractors, switch jobs to non-union facilities or transfer them out of the country in violation of the NLRA—secure in the knowledge that the Board will be unable to order it to undo those actions.

In the Committee report regarding the bill, the majority states, "To ensure employees can continue to exercise their rights under federal labor law, the NLRB will continue to have more than a dozen strong remedies against unfair labor practices to protect workers and hold unlawful employers accountable." However, the report does not list those remedies and we are at a loss to identify them. The Board's remedial power under existing law is already severely restrained. The Board cannot impose sanctions. It may not seek to punish wrongdoers. It cannot impose fines; it cannot require anything that would amount to a new contract between the parties. If the bill passes, the Board will have no effective response to basic unfair labor practices.

The Committee majority seeks to justify the reducing of employee rights and Board

authority by claiming that it is merely strengthening the employer's right to make basic business decisions, including where and how to invest its resources. We reject the premise that restoring work to those who would perform it were it not for the employer's unlawful action violates an employer's basic entrepreneurial rights. The policy of restoring victims to the position they would have been in had it not been for unlawful conduct is common throughout our legal system, and it represents no more than a recognition of simple justice.

ENDNOTES

¹See, for example, *Frito-Lay, Inc.* 232 NLRB 753 (1977) (employer violated the Act by shutting down plant and transferring the work to another facility in response to a union organizing campaign); *Lear Siegler, Inc.*, 295 NLRB 857 (1989) (same).

²See, for example, *Century Air Freight*, 284 NLRB 730 (1987) (employer's subcontracting of trucking work violated Act because purpose was to avoid bargaining with union). See also *Aguiyao v. Quadrtech Corp.*, 129 F. Supp. 2d 1273 (C.D. Cal. 2000) (granting the Board's request for an injunction stopping an employer from moving its California operations to Mexico in retaliation for union organizing).

³See, for example, *Mid-South Bottling Co. v. NLRB*, 876 F.2d 458 (5th Cir. 1989) (affirming appropriateness of Board order directing bottling company to reopen a distribution facility closed because employees voted for union representation); *Woodline Motor Freight, Inc. v. NLRB*, 843 F.2d 285 (8th Cir. 1988) (upholding Board order requiring employer to restore trucking operations transferred to another facility after employees engaged in union organizing campaign); *Statler Industries, Inc.*, 644 F.2d 902 (1st Cir. 1981) (approving Board order directing employer to restore office jobs relocated to another facility in order to frustrate union organizing activity).

⁴*Lear Siegler, Inc.*, supra, 295 NLRB at 861.

⁵The Board's authority to order such a remedy in refusal to bargain cases was expressly affirmed by the supreme Court in *Fibreboard Paper Products Corp. v. NLRB*, 379 U.S. 203 (1964), which upheld a Board order directing an employer that contracted out the work of its maintenance employees without first bargaining with the employees' union to resume maintenance operations and reinstate the employees. The Court said the order restoring the status quo ante "to insure meaningful bargaining" was well-designed to promote the policies of the Act and had not been shown to impose an undue burden on the employer. Id. at 216.

INSTITUTIONS AND AFFILIATIONS LISTED FOR IDENTIFICATION PURPOSES ONLY

SIGNED:

Julius Getman, Professor and Chair, School of Law, University of Texas at Austin

Richard L. Abel, Michael J. Connell Distinguished Professor of Law Emeritus, UCLA Law

David Abraham, Professor, University of Miami School of Law

Mimi Abramovitz, Bertha Capen Reynolds Professor of Social Policy, Silberman School of Social Work at Hunter College, CUNY

Doug Allen, Visiting Professor, Labor Studies and Employment Relations, Pennsylvania State University

Sally Alvarez, Faculty, School of Industrial and Labor relations, Cornell University

Edwin Amenta, Professor, Sociology, University of California

Robert Angelo, Professor Emeritus, School of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University

Fran Ansley, Professor of Law Emeritus, Law, University of Tennessee College of Law

John Archer, Ph.D., Professor, English, New York University

Elisabeth Armstrong, Associate Professor, Program for the Study of Women and Gender, Smith College

Rachel Arnow-Richman, Professor of Law & Director Workplace Law Program, Sturm College of Law, University of Denver

Steven Ashby, Prof., Full Clinical Professor, School of Labor and Employment Relations, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

James Atleson, Distinguished Teaching Professor Emeritus, University at Buffalo School of Law

Tom Auxter, Dr., Professor, Philosophy, University of Florida

Rick Bales, Professor and Director of Center for Excellence in Advocacy, Salmon P. Chase College of Law, Northern Kentucky University

Regina Bannan, Ph.D., College Professor, American Studies, Temple University

Mark Barenberg, Professor, Columbia University Law School

Bill Barry, Professor, Labor Studies, Community College of Baltimore County

Rosalyn Baxandall, Professor, American Studies, HAW

Frieda Behets, Professor, Epidemiology, University of North Carolina

Janice R. Bellace, Samuel Blank Professor of Legal Studies, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania

David Bensman, Professor, Labor Studies and Employment Relations, Rutgers University

Elaine Bernard, Ph.D., Executive Director, Labor and Worklife Program, Harvard Law School

Cyrus Bina, Distinguished Research Professor of Economics, Division of Social Sciences, University of Minnesota

Ann Blum, Professor, Department of Hispanic Studies, University of Massachusetts Boston

Ross Borden, Teacher, English, SUNY Cortland

Eileen Boris, Professor, Feminist Studies and History, University of California, Santa Barbara

Enobong Branch, Professor, Sociology, UMass Amherst

Renate Bridenthal, Ph.D., Professor (retired), History, Brooklyn College, CUNY

Ralph Brill, Professor, Law, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago Kent College of Law

Peter D.G. Brown, Distinguished Service Professor, New Paltz, SUNY New Paltz

David Brundage, Professor, History, University of California, Santa Cruz

Robert Bussel, Associate Professor and Director, Labor Education and Research Center, University of Oregon

Larry S. Bush, Professor Emeritus, University of Mississippi School of Law

Susan M. Carlson, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Sociology, Western Michigan University

Kenneth M. Casebeer, Professor of Law, University of Miami School of Law.

Ramona Caswell, Instructor, Chemistry, MNSCU

William Charland, Associate Professor, Art, Western Michigan University

Kimberly Christensen, Ph.D., Faculty member, Economics, Sarah Lawrence College

John W. Cioffi, Associate Professor, Political Science, University of California

Marc Cirigliano, Professor, Arts, SUNY Empire State College

Paul Clark, Professor & Dept. Head, Labor Studies & Employment Relations, Penn State University

Dan Clawson, Professor, Sociology, Univ of Massachusetts Amherst

Peter Cole, Professor, History, Western Illinois University
 Reyes Coll-Tellechea, Associate Professor, Dept of Hispanic Studies, University of Massachusetts Boston
 Dave Colnic, Associate Professor, Political Science and Public Administration, CSU Stanislaus
 Martin Comack, Ph.D., Adjunct professor, Government, Massachusetts Bay Community College
 Angela Cornell, Law Professor, Law School, Cornell University
 Marion Crain, Wiley B. Rutledge Professor and Director, Center for the Interdisciplinary Study of Work & Social Capital, Washington University in St. Louis Law
 Ellen Dannin, J.D., Professor of Law, Dickinson School of Law, Penn State
 Kenneth G. Dau-Schmidt, J.D., Ph.D., Willard and Margaret Carr Professor of Labor and Employment Law, Maurer School of Law, Indiana University
 Rev. Dr. E-K Daufin, Ph.D., Professor, Communications, Alabama State University
 Neill DeClercq, Professor, School for Workers, Univ. Wisconsin—Extension
 Charles Derber, Professor, Sociology Department, Boston College
 Alan Derickson, Ph.D., Professor, History, Penn State Univ.
 Amy Dietz, Lecturer, LSER, Penn State University
 Jan Dizard, Professor, Anthropology/Sociology, Amherst College
 Corey Dolgon, Professor and Director of Community-Based Learning, Department of Sociology, Stonehill College
 Kate Drabinski, College Teacher, Gender and Women's Studies, University of Maryland, Baltimore County
 Oliver Dreher, Management, Sales, Comex Melvyn Dubofsky, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor of History & Sociology Emeritus, History, Binghamton University, SUNY
 Michael C. Duff, Associate Professor of Law, University of Wyoming College of Law
 Lynn Duggan, Professor, Labor Studies, Indiana Univ. Bloomington
 Maxine Eichner, Professor of Law, UNC School of Law
 Debra Emmelman, Professor, Department of Sociology, Southern Connecticut State University
 Cynthia Estlund, Catherine A. Rein Professor of Law, NYU School of Law
 Barbara Fick, Associate Professor of Law, University of Notre Dame Law School
 Eric Fink, Associate Professor, School of Law, Elon University
 Paula Finn, Labor Educator, Murphy Institute, CUNY
 Kade Finnoff, Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, University of Massachusetts Boston
 Dr. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Krister Stendahl Professor, Harvard Divinity School
 Matthew W. Finkin, Albert J. Harno and Edward W. Cleary Chair in Law, Center for Advanced Study Professor, University of Illinois College of Law
 Michael Fischl, Professor of Law, University of Connecticut School of Law
 Catherine Fisk, Chancellor's Professor, School of Law, University of California—Irvine
 Milton Fisk, Professor Emeritus, Philosophy, Indiana University
 William E. Forbath, Lloyd M. Bentsen Chair in Law, University of Texas School of Law
 Miriam Frank, Ph.D., Professor, Liberal Studies, New York University
 Michael Friedman, Ph.D., Professor, English and Theatre, University of Scranton
 Mary O. Furner, Ph.D., Professor, History, University of California, Santa Barbara
 Rita Gallin, Dr., Professor Emerita, Department of Sociology, Michigan State University

Ruben Garcia, Professor of Law, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
 Rebecca Givan, Assistant Professor, ILR School, Cornell University
 Michael J. Goldberg, Professor of Law, Widener University School of Law
 Nancy Goldfarb, Visiting Assistant Professor, English, IUPUI
 Alvin Goldman, Professor of Law Emeritus, College of Law, University of Kentucky
 George Gonos, College Professor, Sociology, SUNY at Potsdam
 Colin Gordon, Professor, History, University of Iowa
 Jennifer Gordon, Professor of Law, Fordham University School of Law
 Stathis Gourgouris, Ph.D., Professor, Comparative Literature, Columbia University
 Jeff Grabelsky, Mr., Labor Educator, Labor Relations, Cornell University
 Lois Gray, Professor, LLRD, Cornell University
 Marc D. Greenbaum, Professor of Law, Suffolk University Law School
 Joseph R. Grodin, Distinguished Emeritus Professor, University of California Hastings College of the Law
 Anthony Gronowicz, Dr., Professor, Social Science, CUNY
 Lawrence Grossberg, Distinguished Professor, Communication Studies, University of North Carolina
 Marilyn Hacker, Professor Emerita, Department of French, CUNY Graduate Center
 John Hammond, Professor, Sociology, Hunter College and Graduate Center, CUNY
 Desales Harrison, Associate Professor, English, Oberlin College
 John Hess, Professor, English/American Studies, University of Massachusetts Boston
 Tobias Higbie, Associate Professor, History Department, UCLA
 Jeffrey Hirsch, Associate Professor, University of North Carolina School of Law
 Ann C. Hodges, Professor of Law, University of Richmond School of Law
 Alan Hyde, Distinguished Professor and Sidney Reitman Scholar, Rutgers University School of Law
 Amy Ickowitz, Assistant Professor, Economics, Clark University
 Elizabeth M. Iglesias, Professor of Law & Director of Center for Hispanic & Caribbean Legal Studies, University of Miami School of Law
 M. Thandabantu Iverson, Dr., Asst. Prof., Indiana University Labor Studies Program, School of Social Work
 Elizabeth Jameson, Professor, History, University of Calgary
 Jeanette Jeneault, College Instructor, Writing, Syracuse University
 Hilmar Jensen, Associate Professor, History, Bates College
 Tom Juravich, Ph.D., Professor, Sociology/Labor Center, UMass Amherst
 Michelle Kaminski, Associate Professor, School of Human Resources & Labor Relations, Michigan State University
 Jonathan Karpf, Lecturer, Anthropology, San Jose State University
 Kathleen Kautzer, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, Regis College
 Stephanie Kay, Senior Lecturer, University Writing Program, University of California, Riverside
 Patricia Keely, Faculty, Cell Biology, University of Wisconsin
 Robert Keohan, Associate Professor, English, Merrimack College
 Alexander Keyssar, Stirling Professor of History and Social Policy Chair, Democracy, Politics, and Institutions, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
 Assaf J. Kfoury, Professor, Computer Science Department, Boston University
 Marlene Kim, Dr., Professor, Economics, University of Massachusetts

Lisa Klein, Professor, Materials Science & Engineering, Rutgers University
 Sherryl Kleinman, Professor, Sociology, UNC, Chapel Hill
 James Korsh, Ph.D., Professor, CIS, Temple University
 John Kretzschmar, Director, Institute for Labor Studies, University of Nebraska at Omaha
 Max Krochmal, Assistant Professor, History, Texas Christian University
 Gordon Lafer, Professor, Labor Education & Research Center, University of Oregon
 Joan Landes, Ferree Professor, History & Women's Studies, Pennsylvania State University
 Frederic Lee, Professor, Economics, University of Missouri—Kansas City
 David Lenson, Professor, Comparative Literature, UMass
 Dan Letwin, Associate Professor, History, Penn State University
 Charles Levenstein, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus of Work Environment, University of Massachusetts Lowell; Adjunct Professor of Occupational Health, Tufts University School of Medicine
 Joseph Levine, Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of Massachusetts Amherst
 Penelope Lewis, Assistant Professor, Joseph S. Murphy Institute for Worker Education and Labor Studies, City University of New York
 Alex Lichtenstein, Associate Professor, History Department, Indiana University
 Nelson Lichtenstein, MacArthur Foundation Chair in History, Director, Center for the Study of Work, Labor, and Democracy, University of California, Santa Barbara
 Risa L. Lieberwitz, Professor of Labor and Employment Law, School of Industrial & Labor Relations, Cornell University
 John Logan, Professor and Director of Labor and Employment Relations, College of Business, San Francisco State University
 Stephanie Luce, Associate Professor, Murphy Institute, City University of New York
 Margaret Lucia, Professor, Music & Theater, Shippensburg Univ. of Pennsylvania
 Dennis O. Lynch, Professor of Law and Dean Emeritus, University of Miami School of Law
 Catherine Lynde, Associate Professor, Economics Department, University of Massachusetts Boston
 Jon Lyon, Associate Professor, Biology, Merrimack College
 Deborah Malamud, AnBryce Professor of Law, New York University School of Law
 Debbie Maranville, Professor of Law and Director, Clinical Law Program & Unemployment Compensation Clinic, University of Washington School of Law
 Marian Marion, Ph.D., Professor, Education, Governors State University
 Gillian Mason, Lecturer in English and American Studies, Suffolk University, University of Massachusetts, Boston
 Kent Mathewson, Dr., Geographer, Geography & Anthropology, Louisiana State University
 Michael Mauer, Professor, Labor Studies, University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign
 Joseph A. McCartin, Professor, History, Georgetown University
 John McGowan, College Professor, English, University of North Carolina
 Robert Meister, Professor, History of Consciousness, University of California
 Jack Metzgar, Professor Emeritus, Humanities, Roosevelt University
 Carlin Meyer, Professor & Director, Diane Abbey Law Center for Children and Families, New York Law School
 Peter Meyer, Professor Emeritus, Urban & Public Affairs, Univ. of Louisville
 Ruth Milkman, Professor, Sociology, CUNY Graduate Center

Angela Miller, Dr., Professor, Art History, Washington University

John Mineka, Professor, Mathematics, CUNY

Susan Moir, ScD, University Researcher, CPSC, UMass Boston

Charles Morris, Professor Emeritus, Dedman School of Law, Southern Methodist University

Tracy Mott, Associate Professor & Department Chair, Economics, University of Denver

George Muedeking, Emeritus Professor, Sociology, CSU Stanislaus

Chris Nagel, College Faculty, Philosophy, CSU Stanislaus

Ruth Needleman, Ph.D., Professor, Leadership & Social Justice, Calumet College of St. Joseph

David Nikkel, Dr., Professor, Philosophy and Religion, University of North Carolina—Pembroke

Bruce Nissen, University Professor, Center for Labor Research and Studies, Florida International University

Carl Offner, Industry Professor of Computer Science, Computer Science, University of Massachusetts Boston

Colleen O'Neill, Associate Professor, History, Utah State University

Diana Orem, Assistant Professor, Psychology, CSU Stanislaus

Michal Osterweil, Lecturer, Global Studies, UNC Chapel Hill

Henry Owen, Professor of Botany, Biological Sciences, Eastern Illinois University

David Ozonoff, MD, MPH, Chairman Emeritus and Professor of Environmental Health, School of Public Health, Boston University

Frances Fox Piven, Distinguished Professor, Graduate Center, City University of New York

Dana Polan, Professor, Cinema Studies, New York University

James Gray Pope, Professor, Rutgers University School of Law

Laura Punnett, Professor, Department of Work Environment and Co-Director, Center for the Promotion of Health in the New England Workplace (CPHNEW), School of Health & Environment, University of Massachusetts Lowell

Gretchen Purser, Professor, Sociology, Maxwell School of Syracuse University

Angela Melina Raab, Adjunct Professor, University of Texas School of Law

Robert J. Rabin, Professor of Law, Syracuse University College of Law

Liz Recko, Coordinator of Assessment and Testing and Instructor, Psychology, Berkshire Community College

Adolph Reed, Jr., Professor, Political Science, University of Pennsylvania

Chris Rhombert, Associate Professor, Sociology and Anthropology, Fordham University

Charley Richardson, Former Director, Labor Extension Program, University of Massachusetts Lowell

Benjamin Robinson, Associate Professor, Germanic Studies, Indiana University

Tom Roeper, Professor, Department of Linguistics, University of Massachusetts South College

Brishen Rogers, Assistant Professor, Temple University Beasley School of Law

Beth Rosenberg, ScD, MPH, Assistant Professor, Department of Public Health & Community Medicine, Tufts University School of Medicine

Emily Rosenberg, MS, Director, SNL, Labor Studies, DePaul University

Robert Ross, Professor of Sociology, Clark University

Mary Russo, Ph.D., Professor, Humanities, Hampshire College

Francis Ryan, Dr., Visiting Assistant Professor, History, Temple University

Marjorie Sanchez Walker, Dr., Professor, History, California State University Stanislaus

Richard Savini, University Professor, Art Department, California State University

Patrici Sawin, Associate Professor, Anthropology, University of North Carolina

Paula Schmidt Mrs., Lecturer, English, CSU Stanislaus

Jennifer Schuberth, Professor, Religion, Portland State University

Berger Sebastian, Dr., Professor, Economics, Dickinson College

Karin Shapiro, Visiting Associate Professor, History, Duke University

Jennifer Sherer, Ph.D., Director, Labor Center, University of Iowa

Snehal Shingavi, Professor, English, The University of Texas at Austin

Laurence Shute, Professor Emeritus of Economics, Economics, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Louise Simmons, Ph.D., Professor, School of Social Work, University of Connecticut

Joseph E. Slater, Eugene N. Balk Professor of Law and Values, University of Toledo College of Law

David Smith, Professor, Sociology, UC—Irvine

Betsy Smith, Ph.D., Adjunct Professor of ESL, Language and Literature Department, Cape Cod Community College

David Whitten Smith, S.T.D., S.S.L., Emeritus Professor, Theology; Justice and Peace Studies, University of St. Thomas

Carol Smith, Dr., Retired Faculty, CCNY, Dept. of Special Programs, CUNY

Jeffrey Spear, Professor, English, New York University

Susan J. Stabile, Robert and Marion Short Distinguished Chair in Law, University of St. Thomas School of Law

Theodore J. St. Antoine, Professor Emeritus of Law, Law School, University of Michigan Law School

Howard Stein, Professor, DAAS, University of Michigan

Joan Steinman, Distinguished Prof. of Law, Law, Chicago—Kent College of Law, Ill. Inst. of Tech.

Katherine V.W. Stone, Arjay and Francis Miller Distinguished Professor of Law, UCLA School of Law

Ann Strahm, Assistant Professor, Sociology, CSU Stanislaus

Jill Strauss, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Sociology of Conflict, John Jay College, CUNY

Mary Rose Strubbe, Professor, Law, ITT Chicago—Kent College of Law

Stephen J. Sullivan, Ph.D., Professor, Philosophy, Edinboro University of Pa.

April Susky, Academic Advisor/Professor, Student Success, University of Alaska Southeast, Sitka Campus

Gerald Swanson, Dr., Professor (retired), Science, Daytona State College

Kim Tan, Professor, Accounting & Finance, California State University Stanislaus

Mark Tauger, Dr., Professor, History, West Virginia University

Donald Taylor, Assistant Professor, Labor Education—School for Workers, University of Wisconsin

Daniel Thau Teitelbaum, M.D., Adjunct Professor, Occupational and Environmental Health, Colorado School of Public Health, University of Colorado Denver

Paul Thompson, Professor, Associate Professor, Film and Television, New York University

Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, Professor and Chair, Sociology, University of Massachusetts

Robert Vaden-Goad, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Mathematics, Southern Connecticut State University

Adrienne Valdez, Faculty member, Center for Labor Education and Research, University of Hawaii—West Oahu

Joseph Varga, Professor, Labor Studies, Indiana University

Steven Volk, Professor, History, Oberlin College

Paula Voos, Professor, School of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers

Katherine Walstrom, Ph.D., Professor, Div. Natural Sciences, New College of Florida

Devra Weber, Professor, History, University of California, Riverside

Eve Weinbaum, Director, Labor Studies, UMass Amherst Labor Center

Marley S. Weiss, Professor of Law, University of Maryland School of Law

Martha S. West, Professor of Law Emerita, University of California Davis School of Law

Ahmed A. White, Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Research, University of Colorado School of Law

Lucy Williams, Professor of Law, Northeastern University School of Law

John Willoughby, Dr., Professor, Economics, American University

Steve Wing, Associate Professor, Department of Epidemiology, University of North Carolina

Michael J. Wishnie, Clinical Professor, Yale Law School

Goetz Wolff, Professor, Urban Planning, UCLA

Marty Wolfson, Director of the Higgins Labor Studies Program, Department of Economics, University of Notre Dame

John Womack, Jr., Robert Woods Bliss Professor of Latin American History and Economics, Emeritus, History Department, Harvard University

Nan Woodruff, Professor, History, Penn State University

David Yamada, Professor of Law, Law School, Suffolk University Law School

Alex Zukas, Professor, Social Sciences, National University

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

There is always an interesting debate on the floor. This has been another example. We have some fundamental differences in how we view the problems and, more importantly, the solutions facing our country.

Both sides recognize that we have high unemployment, historically high, with 30 months of unemployment over 8 percent, 14 million Americans out of work. Both sides want the economy to grow and people to get back to work. But one side believes that more regulations—by the last account some 219 in the pipeline coming from this administration—more regulations, more spending money that we don't have, more government interference will somehow get Americans back to work; and the other side, Mr. Speaker, believes that employers, the private sector, small businesses, entrepreneurs, middle-size businesses and large businesses create jobs, put Americans to work.

Now, the National Labor Relations Act, as has been discussed, has been around for a long time. Neither side is suggesting that Americans don't have the right to organize and to bargain. I beg to differ with my colleagues on the other side. That's not what this is about.

But what we have here is a case where the act creates a board which, by

its nature, changes back and forth, depending upon who's in the White House, so that it has more Democrats one time and more Republicans another. And so I would argue and have argued that for some time, the board, in enforcing the act, is causing some whipsaw of the economy. I'll concede that.

But right now with this board, I would argue that, as one of my colleagues on the other side said, there was an agenda over here. I agree, there is an agenda. The board has an agenda.

There is a rainfall, a torrent of rulings coming out of this board that strike at the heart of American job creators that create jobs. One of those rulings—and I agree that it's an interim ruling. It's a ruling by the acting general counsel. One guy looks at the actions that a major American company has taken to create more jobs, to spend a billion dollars, build a plant in South Carolina, hire over a thousand people. One guy says, No, I don't think so. I think, says he, this is a transfer of work and it's in retaliation; I think that.

So it's been pointed out this is an ongoing process. And one of my colleagues in the committee said, Well, nothing bad has really happened here. Let's let this play out.

No, no. I beg to differ.

Go to Charleston, South Carolina. Talk to those thousand employees about their future and the uncertainty that this brings. Talk to the companies who are looking at creating jobs, starting businesses in this country and are looking at this ruling and the threat this poses and reconsidering their actions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a choice. We can stand, we can sit, we can watch, or we can step up and try to help Americans get back to work in America by stopping this action and the threat that it poses to companies across America.

So I encourage my colleagues to vote for this legislation. Let's get Americans back to work in America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called "Protecting Jobs From Government Interference Act." It's a nice name for a bad bill.

This bill is not about protecting American jobs or American workers. It's about protecting big businesses who want to move jobs out of American communities without consequence. It's about forcing American workers to accept the lowest common denominator rather than standing up for fair pay and safer working conditions.

For more than 75 years, federal law has guaranteed employees the right to organize without threat of retaliation. If workers decide to form a union, the company can't punish them by moving operations down the street or out of the country. But this bill would allow companies to retaliate with impunity by stripping the National Labor Relations Board of its power to enforce that law.

Today's legislation is a response to an ongoing dispute between the NLRB and Boeing.

I understand that many of my colleagues have strong opinions on that issue, but it is not the business of this Congress to legislate on an individual case. It is not appropriate to dismantle the enforcement mechanism to secure a result for any party.

This bill makes sweeping changes to worker protections and would have severe consequences. Rather than creating a single job, it would give employers free rein to eliminate jobs or move them overseas to punish workers for exercising their rights.

Mr. Speaker, this bill strips fundamental protections from American workers, leaving them and their jobs less secure. It turns back the clock on 75 years of employment law. It is the wrong direction for America, and I urge my colleagues to reject it today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed by the bill the Republican majority is bringing to the floor today. While I am used to the Republicans attacking new protections for American workers, this bill attacks and removes long-standing enforcement provisions of the National Labor Relations Board, virtually eliminating its protection for U.S. workers.

This bill prohibits the National Labor Relations Board from carrying out its mandate to prevent unfair labor practices and would even allow companies to move outside of the United States to avoid union organizing. In other words, this bill makes it easy for companies to outsource jobs to other countries in order to avoid paying our workers family wages, providing health benefits, and meeting basic safety and environmental obligations.

Under current law, it is illegal to retaliate against workers for union activity or to threaten workers to discourage union activity. Not only does the bill remove the power from the National Labor Relations Board to block such retaliation or threats, but the bill even prevents the Board from seeking such an order. Our laws may set forth strong worker protections, but this bill prevents the exercise of those protections, reducing those promises to empty words.

It is appalling to me that the Republican majority is considering rolling back provisions that have protected workers for decades. I urge my colleagues to vote against this ill-considered legislation.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2587, the misleadingly named "Protecting Jobs From Government Interference Act."

This legislation, if enacted, would gut key provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, a law which has ensured the right of working Americans to fight for better working conditions, a better salary, and better benefits for themselves and their families for more than 75 years.

H.R. 2587 would strip from the National Labor Relations Board the ability to take action against any employer that has been found to violate the law by closing an office, relocating a plant or firing workers in retaliation for exercising their rights to organize or petition for fairer benefits.

Even worse, passage of this legislation would open the door for companies to engage in the practice of illegally moving jobs overseas. In the past, the NLRB has been able to take action against companies that have attempted to move their operations overseas who do so with the clear goal of punishing

employees for exercising their fundamental organizing rights.

This legislation would open the door to wholesale off-shoring of U.S. jobs at a time when this Congress should be discouraging such behavior.

A bill of this magnitude, which would set back decades of established labor law and precedent, should be considered in a much more deliberative manner.

I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisles to vote in favor of working Americans and to oppose this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in unequivocal opposition to H.R. 2587, the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act. This devious legislation carries on in my Republican colleagues' fine tradition of masking hard truth with pithy and inaccurate turns of phrase. H.R. 2587's goal is not to protect jobs, but rather to neuter the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) and the protections it affords America's working men, women, and their families.

In point of fact, H.R. 2587 will prohibit the NLRB from reinstating production lines closed as retaliation for union activities. The bill will also prevent the Board from issuing any order that rescinds any relocation, transfer, subcontracting, or outsourcing of work by a company as retribution for union activities. As I have said, this bill does nothing to offer increased protections to American workers. It will, however, protect union-busting activities by businesses that are still sitting on billions of dollars and asking for a tax holiday for repatriated profits, yet all the while making precious little effort to add new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle are using a pending dispute between the NLRB and a certain airplane manufacturer to justify the supposed need for this abominable legislation. H.R. 2587 is explicit proof of the Republican Party's strong desire to wipe out the very unions that built this country's middle class and make sure American workers have no better protections than their brethren in third-world countries.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation is critical to prevent the National Labor Relations Board from disrupting business and job growth by ordering an employer to relocate.

The purpose of this board is to protect workers, not to leave them in fear that their jobs may be relocated on the whim of the Board's members.

The NLRB has no place in telling businesses where they can operate.

Businesses create jobs, not the government.

In this economic climate, the last thing we need is for businesses to have any more anxiety preventing them from hiring more workers.

Boeing, who the NLRB has attacked, is creating jobs in both South Carolina and Washington.

With the attempt by NLRB to force Boeing to move the newly created jobs in South Carolina to Washington, jobs will now be lost in South Carolina.

Texas like South Carolina is a Right to Work State.

Businesses that operate in non-Right to Work States should not have to be intimidated from opening up locations in Right to Work States like South Carolina and Texas because of concerns that moving to these states will be considered "transferring" work.

The NLRB should not have the power to force the relocation of a business.

It has over a dozen other remedies to protect workers.

The National Labor Relations Act needs to be amended to prevent this.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill which is an attack on the fundamental rights of working men and women.

We are debating this bill at a time when roughly 13½ million Americans are unemployed and the labor force participation rate is still at a low—not seen in over a generation. This House should be focused on paying our bills, creating jobs, strengthening the middle class, and protecting workers rights. Instead, the Republican Majority has brought a bill to the Floor that does nothing to help our economy or create jobs, but instead makes it easier for corporations to send American jobs overseas and allows employers to punish their employees for exercising their rights to organize and ensure a full day's pay for an honest day's work.

H.R. 2587 will strip the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) of its authority to enforce basic labor protections, and will allow employers to openly discriminate against union workers. With this bill, companies will be allowed to outsource jobs and intimidate and fire workers without repercussions in retaliation for American workers who exercise their rights under current U.S. law.

Mr. Speaker, the assault on union employees is happening across the country from Wisconsin, to Ohio, and now right here in the House of Representatives. We must not let it continue if we want to preserve our nation's middle class which is in serious decline. There is no question that the unions have contributed to building the middle class in this country.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, union workers are more likely than non-union workers to be covered by health insurance, and receive pension benefits and paid sick leave. We must not ignore the critical role that unions have played in building America by helping improve the wages and working conditions of union and non-union jobs alike.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for working families, for a stronger middle class, and a growing economy. For more than 75 years, federal law has provided Americans the right to join together in unions and bargain for fair pay and benefits and safer working conditions. I pledge to fight to maintain those rights and protections and urge a no vote on this harmful legislation.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives passed H.R. 2587, the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act. This legislation, should it become law, would destroy a pillar of America's economic prosperity when we need it most. The bill strips the National Labor Relations Board of its ability to sanction companies that retaliate against employees seeking to exercise a basic constitutional right.

The facts of the case, though often misrepresented or obscured by partisan disdain for working people, are clear. Under a federal statute that has been in force since 1935, workers at the Boeing Corporation complained that the corporation moved a manufacturing plant to a different state in direct retaliation for labor strikes. The National Labor Relations

Board, as is prescribed in the same statute, investigated the case. As part of their investigation, NLRB investigators collected evidence from both parties. The NLRB has not yet determined whether this evidence warrants a complaint against Boeing. In short: the process which has been in place for more than 75 years is working as designed, but it has not been completed. This bill would halt the investigation of this legally introduced complaint, and it would gut the statute that governs the relationship between workers and bosses.

At a time when the President and others have correctly argued that the U.S. government should not be assisting corporations to ship jobs overseas, we are gutting the U.S. government's role in ensuring that workers have a fighting chance to improve their lives, provide for their families, and keep quality jobs.

We should all be in this together: workers, corporations, and the federal government. We ought to be working as a team to boost U.S. efforts to remain competitive in a tough global economy. The American middle class today faces devastating attacks on its health care, retirement security and real wages, while corporate profits and CEO salaries are skyrocketing. I strongly oppose this misguided effort to gut protections for America's workers.

The fact is that under the NLRA, a corporation may outsource jobs for practically any reason, just not for an illegal reason. Under the law, due process protects corporations and workers, ensuring that both sides have their say. In fact, even if the NLRB rules that Boeing has acted illegally, a decision would not infringe Boeing's—or any corporation's—right to open manufacturing facilities anywhere. They just can't do it to punish the workers they rely on to compete.

This legislation throws those critical worker protections away for the short sighted purpose of rewarding one Fortune 500 company that has been able to compete globally in a tough business environment by hiring qualified workers to build the best planes in the world. Now Republicans in the House of Representatives want to turn those workers and their families out on the street for exercising their right to bargain.

In order to recover from the recession, the United States needs to address the growing disparity in wealth in our country. Despite the recession, corporations today are bringing home more profit than ever before. Tax rates are the lowest they have been in decades. What corporations need is consumers, and if we don't protect the middle class through sensible, longstanding safeguards such as those set out by the NLRA, the economy will never recover.

Sadly, those on the other side of the aisle are desperate to return to policies that created the recession. They want tax cuts for the richest and deregulation across the board. We have seen this before, and we know where it leads.

Future prosperity calls for a different approach. Collective bargaining is part of one of the foundational rights set out in the First Amendment of the Constitution, the right to free assembly. It has worked for America's workers, it has been essential to the creation of our broad middle class, and it is essential that we preserve it.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2587, or the

“Outsourcers’ Bill of Rights.” This bill would encourage businesses to ship jobs overseas and weaken the rights of American workers. There's never a good time for this kind of misguided legislation, but it's hard to imagine a worse time than right now.

This bill would prohibit the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) from directing an employer or company to restore or reinstate work that has been unlawfully transferred, outsourced, or subcontracted away from workers in retaliation for exercising their rights, such as organizing a union.

Furthermore, it would apply retroactively to any complaint that has not been resolved by the time of enactment. Its impact is dangerous and wide-ranging. Simply put, this bill strips away the authority of the NLRB to effectively remedy unlawful practices against workers.

This ill-timed legislation would effectively encourage companies to outsource their jobs overseas. In 2000, the National Labor Relations Board was able to force a company to bring jobs back to the U.S. from Mexico, as the company was charged with shipping jobs to that country in retaliation against workers seeking to organize a union. If this bill passes, American workers would lose this critical protection.

For more than 75 years, federal law has provided Americans the right to join together in unions and bargain for fair wages and safe working conditions. As President Obama stated earlier this month, when it comes to labor relations, “we shouldn't be in a race to the bottom . . . America should be in a race to the top.”

Mr. Speaker, the priority of Congress should be to raise the living standards of the middle class and working families in America. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and join the race to the top.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2587, which is a misguided attempt to intervene in an ongoing labor case and which has much broader and serious consequences for American workers and American jobs.

Last April, the National Labor Relations Board general counsel issued a complaint in response to a petition alleging that Boeing Corporation had located an aircraft production line in South Carolina. The charge is that Boeing made the move to retaliate against Washington state union workers who had exercised their legally-protected rights.

The April complaint didn't result in a final outcome—it just sent the case to an independent administrative law judge who is now considering arguments and evidence from both sides in the dispute. Even if the judge finds that Boeing did discriminate against workers for exercising their legal rights, Boeing could still argue that it would have made this business decision anyway or that moving production back to Washington state would impose an undue burden.

The bill before us is a response to a case that has not even been decided and where the burden of proof is high. Congress—which passed the laws under which the case is being adjudicated—should not intervene to determine the outcome of this ongoing judicial proceeding. More than that, Congress should not pass a bill with impacts that would go far beyond the Boeing case and allow companies to ignore labor laws by shipping jobs not just to another state but to another country.

In the past, the National Labor Relations Board has acted to prevent companies from shipping jobs to countries like Mexico in order to avoid legal organizing efforts by American workers. Such actions would be impossible if this legislation were to become law. Union workers who want to use legally-protected rights to improve workplace safety or to maintain middle-class wages and decent benefits could see their jobs shipped overseas—away from an American economy that is in desperate need of more jobs, not fewer.

By creating these disincentives, H.R. 2587 would encourage a “race to the bottom.” Even the threat of a plant shutdown would be a significant disincentive to workers, who would have no remedy to ensure enforcement of their legal rights. Workers could face a Hobson’s choice—either exercise legally-protected rights and risk their jobs being shipped overseas, or forgo those rights and accept jobs that may come with low wages, inadequate benefits, and dangerous working conditions.

Rights are not rights unless they are enforceable. Workers will not have a voice at work if any time they seek to speak out, they can see their jobs disappear to another country.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this legislation. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt said about the National Labor Relations Act, which created the National Labor Relations Board, that “by preventing practices which tend to destroy the independence of labor, it seeks, for every worker within its scope, that freedom of choice and action which is justly his.” This legislation today would seek to undermine that freedom of choice and action by giving employers the ability to penalize workers who choose to exercise their right to organize and encouraging companies to move their jobs overseas. Make no mistake, the majority is using a disagreement with one decision made by the NLRB as an opportunity to make sweeping changes at the expense of the rights of workers across the country. This is not what the American people want and is not the direction we should be heading as a country.

Instead of the opportunity we must take advantage of is the mandate that the American public has given us which is to work together to ensure that we are doing everything we can to create jobs and get our economy going again. This divisive piece of legislation will only hinder that effort to work in a bipartisan manner to reach the goal of reducing the unemployment rate and thus reducing the deficit. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and to get to work on creating jobs and growing our economy.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 2587, the misnamed Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act.

This bill dismantles key functions of the National Labor Relations Board and guts more than 70 years of established labor law in our country. If this legislation becomes law, it would eliminate nearly all worker protections when companies illegally fire workers and close or move plants in retaliation for union activities.

The proponents of this legislation claim that it will create jobs, but it does no such thing. Instead, it creates a race to the bottom with regard to workers’ rights. This bill sends a message that we’ve abandoned the American worker.

H.R. 2587 will encourage employers to move jobs to states with less worker protections. It will also make it easier to outsource jobs to other countries. In my district, we’ve seen plants close, thousands of workers lose their jobs, and communities hurting as a result. We should be creating good jobs in this country and ensuring that hard working Americans don’t have to give up their rights when they go to work in the morning. One way we can do that is by voting against this misguided bill and demonstrating that many of us in Congress still stand with the American worker.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2587. In Hawaii, we believe in fairness and respect. We believe that working men and women should be able to come together to have a voice in their workplace, to be able to negotiate fair wages and benefits. This belief helped build the middle class in Hawaii and across the nation.

Right now what working men and women most need are champions in their corner: champions who are fighting for jobs. Instead, this bill aims its fire at our working families. It’s another direct assault on workers’ rights.

Because companies today can move their business operations for any business reason at all, except an illegal one. Retaliating against workers who want to join a union is illegal. This bill changes that.

It says companies can go ahead and move jobs to other states or even other countries to punish their workers. This would have a chilling effect on any attempt by workers to ask for a seat at the bargaining table. And that’s just wrong.

Working men and women have already taken a big hit in their paychecks and retirements over the last few years. We shouldn’t be making it easier for businesses to game the system.

I urge my colleagues to stand with working men and women to fight this bill and end these attacks on workers’ rights.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago the National Labor Relations Act was passed to give workers a say in the workplace—the right to organize and bargain collectively. It was a key to the building of the American middle class: a decent wage, health care, a pension.

The Republicans want to repeal the legislation of the last half of the 20th century—Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. And now with the bill before the House, the majority party begins to repeal the National Labor Relations Act.

This bill’s scope is monstrous. It prohibits the National Labor Relations Board, in cases where an employer illegally acts against an employee’s right to organize, to “rescind any relocation, transfer, subcontracting, outsourcing” anywhere.

This bill is part of the Republican effort to destroy the rights of workers to be represented in the workplace. It is an open invitation to the further outsourcing of jobs. It is vital to defeat this dangerous piece of legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 2587, the Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act. This legislation does absolutely nothing to protect jobs; in fact, it puts them at risk. A more accurate title for this bill would be the Outsourcer’s Bill of Rights.

This legislation is an assault on working Americans. H.R. 2587 guts the National Labor Relations Act, renders the National Labor Re-

lations Board (NLRB) powerless and undoes decades’ worth of improvements for worker’s rights.

The National Labor Relations Act provides workers with essential protections; protections that have resulted in a strong middle class. This law prevents companies from retaliating against workers who exercise their rights, such as the right to strike, petition for better pay, demand safer working conditions, and form a union.

It is the National Labor Relations Act that prevents companies from outsourcing or transferring, subcontracting or relocating jobs for discriminatory reasons. The Act protects jobs by prohibiting employers from taking work away from anyone—union or non-union—because they have exercised their rights. Current law does not dictate where companies can and cannot run their businesses; it merely ensures that companies are not permitted to relocate to another state or to another country in order to pay workers lower wages.

The National Labor Relations Act protects the rights of American workers, and keeps American jobs from being shipped overseas, so long as the Act has an effective enforcement mechanism. The Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act strips that mechanism, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) of its ability to enforce the law by ensuring jobs that are unlawfully outsourced are returned to America. The NLRB, for example, was able to order jobs back to America from Mexico in 2000, when the jobs were relocated overseas to prevent workers from unionizing.

H.R. 2587 would not only prevent the NLRB from protecting jobs from illegal outsourcing, it would also allow companies to subcontract work away from unionized workers, and eliminate jobs done by pro-union employees.

This legislation undermines American workers by eliminating laws that prevent employers from discriminating against workers that exercise their rights to competitive wages, benefits, and safe working environments.

I am extremely disappointed that my Republican friends are willing to create an atmosphere that forces hard working Americans to compete for jobs based on who will accept the lowest wages, worst benefits, and harshest working conditions. This bill creates a race to the bottom that is simply not worthy of a great nation, and certainly not worthy of America.

Time after time, throughout the 20th century, the nation turned to the labor community to build infrastructure, supply the Armed Forces, and manufacture the materials that constructed our great American cities, and time after time, hard working Americans answered the call and made this country great.

It appears that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have decided to repay the American workforce by forcing them to choose between their rights and their jobs. The Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act protects nothing but special interest and corporate profits by undermining the law that prevents discrimination against Americans who simply want to exercise their rights.

This bill forces Americans to compete for lower wages instead of strengthening the middle class by providing employees with competitive wages, fair benefits and safe working conditions. I will fight, as I have throughout my tenure in Congress, to protect the middle class by protecting American jobs.

My Republican friends have not passed a single bill to create jobs, and the Protecting

Jobs from Government Interference Act is no exception. In fact, this reckless legislation threatens American jobs and undermines workers' rights while safeguarding special interest. I urge my colleagues to oppose this harmful legislation, and instead focus our efforts on a bipartisan jobs bill that will foster a new age of American ingenuity and prosperity.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2587. H.R. 2587 would severely undermine the intent of the National Labor Relations Act, which is to give workers and their employers a fair and level playing field, and it is another flagrant attack on the fundamental rights of the American worker. If this bill becomes law, the National Labor Relations Board will be unable to impose a meaningful penalty on an employer who violates the law by moving work elsewhere solely to avoid employees who exercise their rights. This bill sends a signal to American workers that the rights of multinational corporations to outsource their jobs are more important than their fundamental right to organize.

Mr. Speaker, the American Middle Class made this country great, but predictions for its future are dire. We have had forty years of wage stagnation for Americans, coupled with record corporate profits. Yet, over 5 million manufacturing jobs have been lost in the past decade, and since the start of the Recession alone, we have lost more than 7 million jobs. American workers today are already more vulnerable to being fired without cause, more vulnerable to not getting severance, and more vulnerable to being part of a mass layoff with little notice than any worker in any other comparable western country—countries like the UK, Australia, Canada, Ireland, France and Germany.

This legislation will make the situation worse. This goal of this bill is to snuff out the right of the American worker to seek justice when their fundamental rights are trampled upon.

Do not be fooled. This bill is not about some lofty economic principle of "free movement of capital to invest where it sees fit." This is not about "big government interfering with job creation." No, this bill is about destroying unions and about interfering with an ongoing legal proceeding brought by an independent agency tasked by the United States Congress with protecting both employees and employers against violations of our nation's labor laws. If you care about the future of the American middle class and American workers, I urge you to reject this bill.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2587, the "Protecting Jobs from Government Interference Act."

This bill is before us because of an ongoing dispute between the International Association of Machinists and the Boeing Company that stems from an issue involving my district in Washington State.

The case is proceeding through a well-established process where the facts of the case and the application of the law to those facts will be determined by an Administrative Law Judge, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), and possibly the federal courts.

This case should be determined based on the facts and the law—not on politics.

For this bill to come to the floor while this case is ongoing is troublesome and threatens the independence of the NLRB.

Congress should not be attempting to influence the NLRB process for political gains.

The NLRB is an independent adjudicatory agency.

We need to protect the independence of the NLRB and allow it to do its job.

Instead of playing politics we should instead be focused on creating jobs and getting our economy back on track.

Last week, the President challenged this Congress to put aside partisanship and get to work on creating jobs.

The single biggest action Congress could take to save and create jobs is make significant investment in our transportation infrastructure that will create private sector construction jobs, invest in the repair and maintenance of highways, roads, bridges and transit, and set the foundation for future economic growth.

This is what we should be talking about today. Not attacking an independent agency that is simply doing its job.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill and allow the NLRB to determine this case based on the facts and law—not on politics.

And let's get back to work doing what the American public wants us to do—creating jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 372, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BISHOP of New York. In its current form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bishop of New York moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2587, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
SEC. 4. PROTECTING U.S. JOBS FROM OVERSEAS OUTSOURCING.

Nothing in this Act or the amendment made by this Act shall limit the National Labor Relations Board's authority to order an employer to maintain or restore jobs within the United States that have been or will otherwise be outsourced to a foreign country in violation of the National Labor Relations Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today would prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from ordering any employer to close, relocate, or transfer employment under any circumstance. Any circumstance? What about jobs that are illegally outsourced to foreign coun-

tries like China, India, and the Philippines?

Under the Republican bill, if a company sends an American job overseas illegally, the NLRB is stripped of its authority to do anything about it.

Why would any Member of this House intentionally want to allow corporations to ship American jobs to China in violation of the law amid the largest American jobs crisis in a generation?

Mr. Speaker, my amendment is very simple, and it does not kill the underlying bill. This final amendment simply maintains the National Labor Relations Board's ability to go after corporations that illegally outsource jobs overseas.

□ 1240

This is just good old-fashioned common sense.

Again I ask, why would we say to corporations, "Go ahead. Violate the law. Ship good jobs to India and China. We'll just turn our heads the other way"? That doesn't make any sense, and it would certainly kill jobs here in America. Yet section 2 of the bill clearly states that the board shall have no power to order an employer to restore or reinstate any work product, production line, or equipment to rescind any relocation, transfer, subcontracting, or outsourcing.

Let me say that again, "or outsourcing."

The bill makes no exception for violations of the law. Why would we want to undermine enforcement of the law rather than address violations of the law?

Chairman KLINE just said that we have some fundamental differences. He's right. We do. But if we can agree on nothing else, we should be able to agree that outsourcing American jobs to foreign countries like China and India is a scourge on our current efforts to create jobs here at home and that we should do everything in our power to stop outsourcing.

Mr. Speaker, outsourcing is a real problem for our economy. The relentless pursuit of a less expensive workforce to the detriment of the American worker is deplorable. Corporations all over the country are moving the jobs of hardworking Americans overseas. Estimates indicate that American jobs are being sent overseas at a rate of 12,000 to 15,000 jobs per month.

According to a study by Duke University, more than 50 percent of companies have offshoring strategies in place, up from 22 percent in 2005. Furthermore, 60 percent of companies currently offshoring say they have plans to aggressively expand outsourcing activities.

Finally, the Commerce Department tells us that the American companies cut their workforces in the U.S. by 2.9 million workers over the last decade while increasing employment overseas by 2.4 million.

Mr. Speaker, this final amendment does not kill the bill. It simply allows

the cops to go after the robbers. It allows the NLRB to enforce the law when someone violates the law. The amendment does nothing to prevent private businesses from making decisions about where their operations are best located as long as that activity is not in violation of the National Labor Relations Act.

Again, this is just common sense. A vote for this final amendment is a vote to protect American jobs from outsourcing. I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting American jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINE. I appreciate the words of my colleague from New York, but if he and others on the other side of the aisle are looking for a way to stop jobs from going overseas, I've got really good news for him. H.R. 2587 is a step in the right direction.

Right now, the National Labor Relations Board is exercising an extreme remedy that has a chilling effect on job creators here and potential job creators who would like to come here from abroad. And right now, Members of Congress have an opportunity to say, "Stop."

But don't take my word for it. Listen to the employers, themselves.

Recently, the National Association of Manufacturers asked thousands of American manufacturers a simple question about the Boeing complaint, which was: Could this NLRB complaint negatively impact your decisions on hiring or workforce expansion plans?

Sixty-nine percent of those manufacturers who responded to the survey said, yes, this complaint could negatively impact decisions to grow their businesses and hire new workers.

At a recent hearing of the Education and the Workforce Committee, former NLRB Chairman Peter Schaumber described an encounter with 60 Canadian business leaders. Mr. Schaumber told us, "A few with whom I had an opportunity to speak with afterwards expressed real concern about doing business in the United States as a result of the agency's complaint against the Boeing Company."

Thanks to the NLRB's actions, efforts by manufacturers to hire workers are being undermined, and international employers are concerned about doing business here in the United States. This is the hostile environment to new jobs and economic growth that is created by this decision, and it must end.

So, as I noted earlier today, we can stand by or sit by, or we can stand up and do something about it. My friends had ample opportunities to offer amendments in committee. They chose not to do that. It was a procedural step. I understand that. It doesn't go to fix the hostile environment that has been brought forward by this activist NLRB.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion to recommit and "yes" on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 189, nays 235, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 710]

YEAS—189

Ackerman	Fudge	Neal
Altmire	Garamendi	Olver
Andrews	Gonzalez	Owens
Baca	Green, Al	Pallone
Baldwin	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Barrow	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Payne
Becerra	Hahn	Pelosi
Berkley	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Heinrich	Peterson
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Pingree (ME)
Blumenauer	Himes	Polis
Boren	Hinchey	Price (NC)
Boswell	Hinojosa	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Hirono	Rahall
Braley (IA)	Hochul	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Holden	Reyes
Butterfield	Holt	Richardson
Capps	Honda	Richmond
Cardoza	Hoyer	Ross (AR)
Carnahan	Inslee	Rothman (NJ)
Carney	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Rush
Chandler	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Ciilline	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Clarke (MI)	Jones	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clay	Keating	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kildee	Schiff
Clyburn	Kind	Schrader
Cohen	Kissell	Schwartz
Connolly (VA)	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Langevin	Scott, David
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Costello	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Courtney	Levin	Shuler
Critz	Lipinski	Sires
Crowley	Loebsack	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lowey	Speier
Davis (CA)	Luján	Stark
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Sutton
DeFazio	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Markey	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Matheson	Tierney
Deutch	Matsui	Tonko
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Dingell	McCollum	Tsongas
Doggett	McDermott	Van Hollen
Donnelly (IN)	McGovern	Velázquez
Doyle	McIntyre	Visclosky
Duncan (TN)	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Edwards	Meeks	Wasserman
Ellison	Michaud	Schultz
Engel	Miller (NC)	Waters
Eshoo	Miller, George	Watt
Farr	Moore	Welch
Fattah	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Filner	Murphy (CT)	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Napolitano	Yarmuth

Adams	Goodlatte	Nunnelee
Aderholt	Gosar	Olson
Akin	Gowdy	Palazzo
Alexander	Granger	Paul
Amash	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Austria	Griffin (AR)	Pence
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Bartlett	Grimm	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Guinta	Platts
Bass (NH)	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Benishek	Hall	Pompeo
Berg	Hanna	Posey
Biggert	Harper	Price (GA)
Bilbray	Harris	Quayle
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Black	Hayworth	Reichert
Blackburn	Heck	Renacci
Bonner	Hensarling	Ribble
Bono Mack	Herger	Rigell
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Rivera
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Roby
Brooks	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Hurt	Rogers (MI)
Buerkle	Issa	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Jenkins	Rokita
Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Rooney
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Campbell	Jordan	Ross (FL)
Canseco	Kelly	Royce
Cantor	King (IA)	Runyan
Capito	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kingston	Scalise
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Schilling
Chabot	Kline	Schmidt
Chaffetz	Labrador	Schock
Coble	Lamborn	Schweikert
Coffman (CO)	Lance	Scott (SC)
Cole	Landry	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Cravaack	Latham	Sessions
Crawford	LaTourette	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Latta	Shuster
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Denham	Long	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Lucas	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Stearns
Dold	Lungren, Daniel	Stivers
Dreier	E.	Stutzman
Duffy	Mack	Sullivan
Duncan (SC)	Manzullo	Terry
Ellmers	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Farenthold	McCaul	Tiberi
Fincher	McClintock	Tipton
Fitzpatrick	McCotter	Turner (NY)
Flake	McHenry	Turner (OH)
Fleischmann	McKeon	Upton
Fleming	McKinley	Walberg
Flores	McMorris	Walden
Forbes	Rodgers	Walsh (IL)
Fortenberry	Meehan	West
Fox	Mica	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Gallely	Miller, Gary	Wittman
Gardner	Mulvaney	Wolf
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Gerlach	Myrick	Woodall
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Yoder
Gibson	Noem	Young (AK)
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	Young (FL)
Gohmert	Nunes	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Bachmann	Giffords	Nadler
Barletta	Lewis (GA)	Waxman
Capuano	Marino	Webster

□ 1312

Messrs. CARTER, TERRY, MULVANEY, AMODEI, BILLIRAKIS, TURNER of Ohio, LOBIONDO, and RUNYAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, CONYERS, GARAMENDI, and OLVER changed their vote from "nay" to yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 186, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 711]

YEAS—238

Adams	Frelinghuysen	McMorris
Aderholt	Galleghy	Rodgers
Akin	Gardner	Mica
Alexander	Garrett	Miller (FL)
Amash	Gerlach	Miller (MI)
Amodei	Gibbs	Miller, Gary
Austria	Gingrey (GA)	Mulvaney
Bachus	Gohmert	Murphy (PA)
Barrow	Goodlatte	Myrick
Bartlett	Gosar	Neugebauer
Barton (TX)	Gowdy	Noem
Bass (NH)	Granger	Nugent
Benishkek	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Berg	Graves (MO)	Nunnelee
Biggert	Griffin (AR)	Olson
Bilbray	Griffith (VA)	Palazzo
Bilirakis	Guinta	Paul
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Paulsen
Black	Hall	Pearce
Blackburn	Hanna	Pence
Bonner	Harper	Petri
Bono Mack	Harris	Pitts
Boren	Hartzler	Platts
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)
Brady (TX)	Hayworth	Pompeo
Brooks	Heck	Posey
Broun (GA)	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Buchanan	Herger	Quayle
Bucshon	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Buerkle	Huelskamp	Rehberg
Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert
Burton (IN)	Hultgren	Renacci
Calvert	Hunter	Ribble
Camp	Hurt	Rigell
Campbell	Issa	Rivera
Canseco	Jenkins	Roby
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Roe (TN)
Capito	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Cassidy	Jones	Rogers (MI)
Chabot	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Chaffetz	Kelly	Rokita
Coble	King (IA)	Rooney
Coffman (CO)	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole	Kingston	Roskam
Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross (AR)
Cooper	Kline	Ross (FL)
Cravaack	Labrador	Royce
Crawford	Lamborn	Runyan
Crenshaw	Lance	Ryan (WI)
Cuellar	Landry	Scalise
Culberson	Lankford	Schilling
Davis (KY)	Latham	Schmidt
Denham	Latta	Schock
Dent	Lewis (CA)	Schweikert
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Scott (SC)
Diaz-Balart	Long	Scott, Austin
Dold	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Dreier	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Duffy	Lummis	Shimkus
Duncan (SC)	Lungren, Daniel	Shuler
Duncan (TN)	E.	Shuster
Ellmers	Mack	Simpson
Emerson	Manzullo	Smith (NE)
Farenthold	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Fincher	Matheson	Smith (TX)
Flake	McCarthy (CA)	Southerland
Fleischmann	McCaul	Stearns
Fleming	McClintock	Stivers
Flores	McCotter	Stutzman
Forbes	McHenry	Sullivan
Fortenberry	McIntyre	Terry
Fox	McKeon	Thompson (PA)
Franks (AZ)		Thornberry

Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden

Walsh (IL)
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—186

Ackerman	Gonzalez
Altmire	Green, Al
Andrews	Green, Gene
Baca	Grijalva
Baldwin	Grimm
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez
Becerra	Hahn
Berkley	Hanabusa
Berman	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Heinrich
Bishop (NY)	Higgins
Blumenauer	Himes
Boswell	Hinchev
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa
Braley (IA)	Hirono
Brown (FL)	Hochul
Butterfield	Holden
Capps	Holt
Cardoza	Honda
Carmahan	Hoyer
Carney	Inslee
Carson (IN)	Israel
Castor (FL)	Jackson (IL)
Chandler	Jackson Lee
Chu	(TX)
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)
Clarke (MI)	Johnson, E. B.
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur
Clay	Keating
Cleaver	Kildee
Clyburn	Kind
Cohen	Kissell
Connolly (VA)	Kucinich
Conyers	Langevin
Costa	Larsen (WA)
Costello	Larson (CT)
Courtney	LaTourette
Critz	Lee (CA)
Crowley	Levin
Cummings	Lipinski
Davis (CA)	Loebsack
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe
DeFazio	Lowey
DeGette	Lujan
DeLauro	Lynch
Deutch	Maloney
Dicks	Markey
Dingell	Matsui
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)
Donnelly (IN)	McCollum
Doyle	McDermott
Edwards	McGovern
Ellison	McKinley
Engel	McNerney
Eshoo	Meehan
Farr	Meeks
Fattah	Michaud
Filner	Miller (NC)
Fitzpatrick	Miller, George
Frank (MA)	Moore
Fudge	Moran
Garamendi	Murphy (CT)
Gibson	Napolitano

NOT VOTING—9

Bachmann	Giffords	Nadler
Barletta	Lewis (GA)	Waxman
Capuano	Marino	Webster

□ 1322

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 711, I was attending a memorial service in Florida. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, this week I missed several rollcall votes and I wish to state for the RECORD how I would have voted

had I been present: rollcall No. 699—yes; rollcall No. 700—yes; rollcall No. 701—yes; rollcall No. 702—yes; rollcall No. 703—no; rollcall No. 704—yes; rollcall No. 705—no; rollcall No. 706—no; rollcall No. 707—no; rollcall No. 708—no; rollcall No. 709—yes; rollcall No. 710—yes; rollcall No. 711—no.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), for the purposes of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon in pro forma session.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. on Friday.

The House will consider a few bills under a suspension of the rules on Tuesday and possibly Wednesday. A complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow afternoon.

The House will also consider a short-term continuing resolution to fund the government, and Members are advised that the rule debate for that measure may take place on Tuesday. I do not expect the resolution, itself, however, to be debated until Wednesday.

Finally, we will take up H.R. 1705, the bipartisan Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation, otherwise known as the TRAIN Act, which will measure the full consequences of regulations on job creation and, in particular, the Utility MACT and Cross-State Air Pollution Rules.

If any additional legislation is added to next week's schedule, it will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information. I note that he has indicated the CR will be considered sometime next week, either Tuesday, but most likely on Wednesday. It's my understanding that the supplemental for emergency requirements of FEMA will be included in the CR; is that accurate?

Mr. CANTOR. I'd say to the gentleman that what will be in the CR is the budgeted amount for all of fiscal year 2012, which is \$2.65 billion, will be in the CR, front-loaded. In other words, the agency will have access to all of those funds prior to the expiration of the CR November 18.

In addition to that, we have, as the gentleman knows, funded out of this

House the emergency supplemental, which was \$1 billion more than that which the agency had requested, all of which was offset. That, too, will be in the CR.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

When you say all of that has been offset, it is my understanding that in fact in the CR for 2011—not for 2012, but for 2011—there is a \$1.5 billion offset included; is that accurate?

□ 1330

Mr. CANTOR. Yes, that is accurate.

Mr. HOYER. And it's further my understanding that that offset, which is unusual in that, as the gentleman knows, during the Bush administration, as happens, we had natural disasters and emergencies—hurricanes, floods, even earthquakes—that require local governments and local agencies and individuals to respond, and we have responded to them with assistance, but the eight times that we did that during the Bush administration, we did not offset it. We did not offset it on the theory that this was an emergency that occurred that was unplanned for and that we would, in fact, obviously pay for it, but pay for it in subsequent years.

It's my understanding that the offset that is being considered is \$1.5 billion from the Advanced Technology Vehicle fund. The problem with that, as I see it, is we are talking about creating jobs, and the President has presented a jobs bill. I'll talk about that in just a minute. But the fund that is in question to date has created 39,000 jobs, and the loan applications in progress are projected to create 50,000 or 60,000 additional jobs.

Therefore, if we use this as an offset, which would set a precedent, although I understand that precedent's not being followed for 2012, what we are doing, in my view, Mr. Leader, is undermining a specific item in the current scheme of things that is, in fact, creating jobs, as I said, 39,000 jobs, with the loan applications that are in progress now expected to create an additional 50,000 to 60,000 jobs, that we undermine that effort.

Frankly, on our side, we would hope that we could return to what is precedent, and that is, in an emergency, respond with emergency funding as we did throughout the Bush administration, not with the concept that we wouldn't pay for it. You and I both agree that paying for this is critically important, and in fact, I think you and I are both of the opinion that, hopefully, the committee of 12 is set up to look at how we get our finances back in line with our revenues and expenditures, that that needs to be done.

But certainly, this is a new precedent. And, unfortunately, it appears that you have targeted—I don't mean you, personally, but the CR would target a particular item that is exactly what we want to do, and that is creating jobs.

Would the gentleman like to comment on that?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Sure, I do. And, Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman is committed to paying for what we spend, and he, if anyone, would put as a priority that we ought to act accordingly.

I find it somewhat ironic that the gentleman is defending what occurred during the Bush administration, as I will posit what occurred during the Clinton administration, because President Clinton, under his administration, actually signed four separate supplementals that were offset, including flooding and the Oklahoma City bombing.

So the gentleman is correct; there's precedent on either side. I think he would agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that now is the time for us to begin to really put forth a concerted effort to act responsibly, not just say we're going to act responsibly and attempt to off-lay the obligation to the Joint Select Committee. We have an opportunity to do so now.

And the gentleman refers to the offset that some on his side have raised as an objection. I would say to the gentleman, the facts are: There's currently \$4 billion in unobligated budget authority remaining under the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan program, and this so-called pay-for just rescinds a billion and a half of that total, and the program will have remaining in it \$2.5 billion.

I think it's worthy of note, Mr. Speaker, that this money has been laying around since September 30, 2008. That is 3 years.

So I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that anyone is intending to do anything damaging to potential job creation here. What we're trying to do is finally face facts. We in this body, in this town, must stop the Federal Government from continuing to spend money it doesn't have.

And I yield back.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Of course it's money the government doesn't have. As you know, revenues are at the lowest point they've been in some six decades in America—on one hand because we are not collecting revenue and, on the other hand, because people don't have money in their pockets to pay revenues. They're not working; therefore, they're not paying taxes, and therefore, revenues are down for those two reasons.

I would say to my friend that it's my understanding that the account that you have targeted has some \$3.9 billion in pending requests, which are the items that would lead to 50,000 to 60,000 new jobs.

Now, at a time when we're not creating sufficient jobs for our people—let's assume, for the sake of argument, you want to offset this money. You and I both agree it ought to be paid for. The question is: When do you pay for it? Do we pay for it right now?

The fact of the matter is, if you target this particular fund, you are tar-

geting a fund which has demonstrably grown jobs in America. Some 39,000 jobs have been created as a result of loans out of this fund. There is \$3.9 billion. You indicate there is still money in the account. You're absolutely right on that. But there are pending requests, again, which would result in 50,000 to 60,000 new jobs, which would be revenue creation for the Federal Government.

So, in fact, it appears that we may be cutting off our nose to spite our face here, and I would urge the gentleman to perhaps revisit this.

The gentleman mentioned the Clinton administration. As the gentleman will well recall, the concerns were not as high then because, during the Clinton administration, of course, we were creating over 3 million jobs per year on average so that the private sector was humming along very well and created 22 million jobs during the Clinton administration.

Unfortunately, that was not the case in the last administration, nor has it yet been the case in this administration, although there were 2 million jobs, as the gentleman knows, created in the last 20 months. However, the last 2 months have been stagnant, and that's not good for anybody. It's not good for Republicans or Democrats, but, more importantly, it's not good for the country. Therefore, I would urge us to make sure that we do not target a fund which has already demonstrably created jobs.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, if I could respond to the gentleman.

First of all, the gentleman knows good and well that the situation with the Federal debt was entirely different back under the Clinton administration times.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time. I do know that very, very well. We had surpluses, not deficits.

Mr. CANTOR. And there was also a Republican Congress that was at work trying to help job creation then at that time as well. So if one wants to claim, we both can claim credit. But as the gentleman knows, I prefer to look forward to see if we can work together.

So with that in mind, the gentleman, of anyone in this body, has been committed to trying to take a fiscally responsible approach, and that's what we're trying to do here. I would say to the gentleman, instead of just trying to claim numbers, as if there is some panacea going on here and as if the move to offset using funds obligated for this program would somehow threaten job creation, if you look at the numbers, this year, all that has been allocated from the available \$4 billion is \$780 million. That's all that's been allocated and approved under this program. Again, remember, the money has been laying around since September 30 of 2008. That's 3 years.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I'd say to the gentleman, the gentleman claims the 33,000 jobs that were actually created by this program, but many would

say that these jobs already existed at existing Ford Motor Company plants. And the administration, I know, has claimed that these jobs have been saved when there's no indication that, in reality, that is the case.

So, again, instead of trying to make all these claims and trying and continue to make promises that, frankly, can't be substantiated, what we're trying to do is do what every family's got to do around its table and every small business person has got to do at the end of each pay period—figure out how they're going to make it through the end of the month.

□ 1340

Just as if a family was facing a situation where they had saved \$25,000, \$30,000 and they wanted to use that money to buy a new car, and God forbid somebody got very sick that needed that money in their family. Most families are going to take that money and decide not to buy the new car and instead help the family member who needs it.

That's what we're trying to do here, Mr. Speaker. We're not trying to suggest that perhaps there isn't some laudable intent under this program. What we've identified is moneys unspent that have been obligated, moneys that apparently do not go out as quickly as the gentleman may suggest to, as he says and claims, create jobs, and take that money and prioritize it by saying it belongs to help the people in a disaster so they can get the relief they need.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that response.

We could go back and forth on how many jobs were, in fact, created. My belief is that there were substantial numbers of jobs created by this fund and the prospect of those 50,000 or 60,000 jobs is real, not ephemeral, not just a debating point.

But I would say to my friend, my friend has been recently quoted, I'm sure accurately, perhaps—and correct me if I'm wrong—in saying that during the first 8 months we focused on cuts of our “cut and grow,” and now we need to focus on grow. I would tell my friend, assuming that quote is accurate, that, in fact, here we are again focused on cut, not on grow.

Clearly, whatever the specific number is, I think that is, frankly, not refutable, that the investment in advanced manufacturing technology vehicles is, in fact, going to make us more competitive globally, is going to enhance the ability to make it in America, not only to succeed in America but to make “it”—in this case, advanced vehicles which are competitive in the international markets.

This is a specific area where we have tried to invest in making sure that we make “it”—in this case, advanced technology vehicles—and I don't think it's good policy for us to be focused on cutting back on those areas which have the promise of growth and jobs. That is what I tell my friend.

Obviously, the gentleman is correct, but I want to tell the gentleman also that if you keep cutting revenues, as we did in 2001 and 2003, and then you keep escalating spending, as we did over the last 10 years, inevitably you're going to get to the point where that family is not going to have any revenues to pay its bills, as the gentleman points out.

But it's inevitable that when you continue to cut revenues and if you don't cut spending, you're going to be in trouble. That didn't happen in the last decade. It didn't happen in the last administration. In fact, as you know, exactly the opposite happened. We escalated spending more than we did under the Clinton administration; and, therefore, we find ourselves in a hole. The economy went into the tank, and it's struggling.

I agree with you. It doesn't matter why it's struggling, who's to blame. It's struggling. As a result, what the President has done is come before us and said, Look, here's a jobs bill. We need to build jobs. I'm not going to go through all the polling data. I'm sure my friend has seen it. There's a recent CNN poll which shows that the public, by big numbers, wants us to focus on creating, building, expanding jobs. And very frankly, the public believes that you need to invest to do that, by pretty good numbers.

I'm for disciplining spending. I will vote to discipline spending, but I don't think that targeting job-creation projects is the way to discipline it when Americans all over this country are really hurting because there are not jobs available for them.

I want to thank the gentleman for what I think are very measured and positive responses to the President's suggestion on how we create jobs in this country. I would ask the gentleman what plans the gentleman has and his party has to move forward on the legislation that the President has asked to create jobs, to invest in growing our economy, and to help those small businesses expand and create jobs and to help those who do not have any job and who are worried about how to put food on their family's table, as well as investing in infrastructure and keeping teachers on the job.

We think this legislation is critically important. We think the American people in the most recent CNN poll have responded very positively. They think this is a productive way to go forward.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not there are plans to have the committees move forward or for us to move forward on this legislation?

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman may have seen remarks I made earlier in this week and last week about the President's job plan. What I said is there is a lot of area I think that we can actually work together on. I do reject the President's demand for an all-or-nothing approach, that perhaps his way is the only way, because there are items in the Presi-

dent's plan that we take strong disagreement with.

So I do think the American people do want us to try and drive towards results here, and I do think there are some areas we can work on together.

We support the extension bonus depreciation. We support removing the pending application of the withholding on government contractors. We support facilitating and increasing small business access to capital. We support incentives to hire veterans. We support reforming the unemployment insurance system in this country, free trade agreements. We would love to entertain serious discussions on how you reform this system so that we can get a better return and improve infrastructure spending in this country.

There are many areas. Small business tax relief, the President discussed. We have our own ideas. As the gentleman knows, the House is proceeding on our agenda for job creation. It's rolling back regulations that are impeding job growth, the one that was just passed prior to the Members leaving the Chamber today. We will have one every week that we believe, after having consulted with small businesses around this country, are getting in the way of their jumping back in the game of job creation.

So we all have ideas. It's not just the President's plan that will come up in this House. We are going to work together to find areas of agreement.

So I look forward to working with the gentleman to achieve that end so that, yes, the middle class in this country can get back to work as we see small businesses beginning to rev up again towards an economic recovery.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I also want to say that, yes, I have seen his comments. I think they have been positive. I think the gentleman has just gone through a list on places where we can, perhaps, find common ground. What we need, of course, is a vehicle, hopefully on this floor in the very near future, in which to find common ground and also to offer alternatives that each of our parties or individuals in this House think will, in fact, grow the economy and create jobs. I think that would be very useful.

The President indicated in his speech a sense of urgency that the American people feel. They gave us that message very loud and clear. I think all of us share that message. To think about somebody being unemployed for 3 months or 6 months or 18 months or 2 years, not want to, and have the ability to work and can't find a job is a crisis, is in fact a depression in that person's life—not only psychologically but actually.

So I would urge the gentleman to bring something to the floor as soon as possible that incorporates that on which we can agree and gives us an opportunity to offer solutions that, perhaps, the House will agree on. And if not, we won't agree.

I also welcome the gentleman's rejection of the philosophy of "my way or the highway." We welcome that recognition, that, in fact, we have to reach compromise if we're going to move this country forward.

If I might in closing, let me, perhaps, ask you about the schedule longer term than next week.

□ 1350

Obviously, we have a special committee. I think the gentleman and I are both committed to—I know I am committed to—the success of that committee. I think it is absolutely critical to give our business community confidence, to give our people confidence, and to give the international community confidence that this government can, in fact, work and can address very serious problems—in this case, the debt and deficit—but also confront the problem of growing our economy. As both the Bowles-Simpson Commission and the Rivlin-Domenici Commission said, we ought to address both. That's what the jobs bill is about, and that's what the special committee is about.

Does the gentleman have any thoughts in terms of the probability of the schedule that you have issued that indicates that we'll get out on December 8? As we know, the committee has to be voted on by December 23. That doesn't mean we have to wait until the 23rd, assuming the committee comes out with a positive report.

Could you elaborate somewhat on what you see the schedule to be and the certainty with which Members can plan based upon the schedule that has been issued given what faces us?

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. I think, as the gentleman knows, we've been really trying to stick to the schedule and to afford Members some certainty so that they can schedule their business and their time with their constituents in their districts. The hope is at this point for us to absolutely stick to the schedule. We, at this point, have no changes in the recess times.

As for whether we are going to go longer than December 8, obviously the work of the joint select committee bears greatly on that. As the Speaker and as the gentleman knows, the joint select committee is expected to report by November 23. If all goes well, we should be able to live up to the schedule as printed. Again, it all depends on the work of the joint select committee.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I thank him for his time today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2011

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1380

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1380.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATIONS TO LANDAU EUGENE MURPHY, JR.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, America has voted. The Nation voted for a winning combination of humility, hard work, a lifelong dream, and finely tuned talent. Today, I join with my friends and colleagues from Logan County, West Virginia, in congratulating Landau Eugene Murphy, Jr., this year's winner of NBC Television's "America's Got Talent."

Landau's journey is a true American success story. Coming from humble beginnings, he worked hard, never lost faith in his Lord, and always remained determined to pursue his dream.

I believe what Landau accomplished last night should stand as an example to every young person throughout this great Nation. He has shown them that they should always set their goals high and work until they get there; and indeed, if you should take some blows, just let the record show you did it your way.

I send my very best to Landau, his lovely wife, Jennifer, and their family as they begin this new and exciting journey in their lives. I know that Landau remains as humble today as he was when he first took the stage at the Logan County Arts and Crafts Fair's annual talent show some years ago.

I commend the Logan County Chamber of Commerce, the Hatfield-McCoy Convention and Visitors Bureau, and Diana Barnette, and all the fine folks at Fountain Place Cinema 8 in Logan, West Virginia, for their support of their hometown hero. As we have always done in West Virginia, we stand behind and support our own, and the work these organizations and individuals have done is phenomenal. Undoubtedly, their efforts were instrumental in Landau's victory.

Mr. Murphy accepted his victory with the high fives of his competition—the hallmark of good sportsmanship. Throughout the weeks of competition, he often spoke of his respect, compassion, and friendship with his opponents—a timely lesson for us all.

I hope my colleagues will congratulate all those whose talent carried them to the final weeks of a long competition. I thank America for recognizing a true talent in this fine son of West Virginia. Thankfully, we will be

hearing a lot from him in the many years to come.

HONORING CORPORAL DAKOTA MEYER

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my fellow marines and a truly brave and heroic American, Corporal Dakota Meyer. This week, Corporal Meyer is receiving the highest military honor our Nation has to offer, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

As a scout sniper with the Third Battalion, Third Marines, Corporal Meyer ran through enemy fire multiple times in an attempt to save fellow U.S. servicemembers in Kunar province, Afghanistan. Facing enemy fire, Corporal Meyer killed at least eight bad guys, personally evacuated 12 friendlies, and provided cover for another 24 of his fellow marines and soldiers during the 6-hour battle.

Corporal Meyer had, no doubt, distinguished himself above and beyond the call of duty, and truly is an American hero. He knowingly risked his own life to save the lives of others. I congratulate him on this honor.

Semper Fi, Corporal Meyer.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. On the 17th of September in 1787, the United States Constitution was ratified. Senator Byrd in the year 2005 introduced the House-passed Constitution Day. So, this weekend, we'll be celebrating Constitution Day.

When I think of the Constitution, I think of Dr. Martin Luther King and the right to peacefully assemble, which is enshrined in the First Amendment. That meant he could go to Selma, that he could come to Washington and fight for civil rights and secure those rights for the people of this Nation.

I also think of women's rights embodied in the 19th Amendment. Women were given the right to vote—Tennessee being the perfect 36th State to give women that right to vote.

I think of a woman's right to choose, which is given through the Constitution and the Bill of Rights—in the Ninth Amendment, the Fourth and through the First and Third as well.

But that is just the tip of the iceberg. The Constitution embodies the fundamental values of this Nation: freedom, fairness, justice, and equality. We haven't always lived up to the Constitution's ideals; but with the rights it guarantees and the freedoms it protects, we can continue to move forward and be the more perfect Union that it promises.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER-
PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, of the following Members of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. DREIER, California
Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN, California
Mrs. MILLER, Michigan
Mr. SMITH, Nebraska
Mr. HUIZENGA, Michigan
Mr. HIGGINS, New York
Mr. MEEKS, New York
Ms. SLAUGHTER, New York
Mr. WELCH, Vermont
Mr. LARSEN, Washington

HONORING THE SERVICE OF HIS
EXCELLENCY YASHAR ALIYEV,
AMBASSADOR OF THE REPUBLIC
OF AZERBAIJAN TO THE UNITED
STATES

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the Speaker. Today, I rise to honor the distinguished service of my good friend, His Excellency Yashar Aliyev, who in October 2006 was appointed by President Ilham Aliyev as Ambassador of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United States of America.

I am proud to serve as the cochairman of the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus.

Azerbaijan is an important strategic partner of the United States. Located in a geopolitically dynamic region between Europe and Asia and sandwiched between Russia and Iran, Azerbaijan is a secular country with a predominantly Muslim population that has also been home for more than a millennia to vibrant Christian and Jewish communities. Azerbaijan has opened Caspian energy resources to development by U.S. companies and has emerged as a key player for global energy security.

On the security front, immediately after 9/11, Azerbaijan was among the first to offer strong support and assistance to the United States. Azerbaijan participated in operations in Kosova and Iraq and is actively engaged in Afghanistan, having recently doubled its military presence there.

Ambassador Aliyev has made an indelible mark on deepening U.S. and Azerbaijan relations.

□ 1400

Bilateral trade is expanding as Azerbaijan diversifies its economy, enabling it to increasingly contribute to the economic growth of the United States.

Baku and Washington cooperate on counterterrorism and nonproliferation

of weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, this continued development of Azerbaijan's natural resources contributes greatly to the energy security of the United States and Europe. Working with Ambassador Aliyev, we have more than doubled the size of the Azerbaijan Caucus in Congress and continue to bring attention to this vital strategic partner.

Prior to his appointment as Ambassador, Aliyev served as Azerbaijan's permanent representative to the United Nations from 2002 to 2006. During this period he was chairman of the Fourth Committee of Special Political and Decolonization of the 60th U.N. General Assembly, vice president of the 59th General Assembly, vice president of the Economic and Social Council from 2004 to 2005, and vice president of the U.N. Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects in 2001.

Ambassador Aliyev began his diplomatic career at the United Nations in 1992, serving as political affairs counselor and charge d'affaires of Azerbaijan's permanent mission. He was also Azerbaijan's first delegate to the First and Fourth Committees at the 47th through 56th sessions of the United Nations General Assembly.

Having joined the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Azerbaijan in 1989, Ambassador Aliyev held the posts of political officer, first secretary and deputy director in the Ministry's Department of Information and Political Analysis, as well as director of the Department of International Organizations.

Ambassador Aliyev took up oriental studies at Azerbaijan State University in 1972 and received the school's highest degree in 1977. He pursued postgraduate research at the Oriental Studies Institute of Russia's Academy of Sciences in Moscow from 1980 to 1982. In the early 1990s, he also studied for a year at the Diplomatic Academy of Russia's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He is fluent in English, Arabic, Russian, and Turkish.

On a personal note, I will miss Ambassador Aliyev, and I extend to him my highest regards and well wishes, to him and to his family in all their future endeavors. In our years working together, the Ambassador has become a truly valued friend.

It has been my pleasure to visit Azerbaijan twice with him and also to host him in my district in Pennsylvania on two occasions, including sharing a recent birthday celebration together.

Ambassador Aliyev, best wishes in all your future endeavors. I look forward to building on our future partnership with Azerbaijan and continuing our friendship in years to come.

I yield back the balance of my time.

STATE OF OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 55 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives for the minutes allocated, and I have enjoyed this privilege many times over the years. I think this is the greatest deliberative body in the world, and sometimes we can do a little better than we actually do, but in the end, the voice of the American people does come here.

I look back on the intense debates that we had when we went through the throes of a national debate. Over one summer, it was cap-and-trade, or we called it cap-and-tax, the idea that we would limit American industry, chase American industry over to places like China and India where they would pump smoke up into the atmosphere and send us back goods that were built more cheaply than we would build them under American regulations here. That legislation did pass this House. It was killed in the Senate, but that consumed a summer.

The next summer, we had the debate of ObamaCare. I could go into that quite deeply, Mr. Speaker, but I will say that it was an intense debate that took place on the floor of the House of Representatives, on the floor of the Senate, and on the floor of almost every home in the United States of America, in the streets of America and on the grounds surrounding the Capitol and then, of course, in all the office buildings around the Capitol.

For the first time that I know of in history, a Member of Congress called people from all 50 States to come here to petition the government for redress of grievances, peaceably petition the government for redress of grievances. That was the plea of the American people; 40,000 to 60,000 people surrounded this Capitol in November, on a Thursday in November, November 5 of that year. Later on in the spring, they came back again and again and again.

For the first time in history, the entire Capitol grounds were surrounded by people, not just a human chain touching their fingertips or holding hands all the way around, but a human doughnut six and eight deep everywhere, with thousands of people standing in the curves and the corners. They came here to say to the people that were duly elected representatives of the American people here in this Congress, Keep your hands off of my health care; we don't want Obama administration care. That message echoed in this building.

On that night that ObamaCare was poised for passage, the people doing business up here in the Rules Committee couldn't do business for a time because the echo in the windows from the people outside was so great that they couldn't have a conversation to be able to actually conduct the business of passing a rule that brought ObamaCare here to the floor.

And there was hokum involved in the process even down to the point of circumventing the filibuster in the Senate

and going through a reconciliation package and passing legislation on the promise that other legislation would be passed, and passing legislation on the promise that the President would issue an Executive order to—get this, Mr. Speaker—amend the legislation that was on the floor. That's how bizarre this process became.

For a couple of years, a Member of Congress didn't have an ability to bring an amendment to the floor to even force the debate or a vote trying to perfect legislation. That's how far the wheels came off of this Congress. The American people were delivered something that they had resoundingly rejected. That was ObamaCare.

In the aftermath of those shenanigans that took place that consumed the summer and the fall and the next spring and longer, the American people went to the polls the following November. They sent 87 new freshmen Republicans here to Congress in exactly the fashion that the Founding Fathers imagined, and that fashion was to have the House of Representatives, with elections every 2 years, be the quick reaction force, that in the period of 2 years—at that time, history didn't turn as fast as it does today, but it's still, I think, soon enough to bring people here to start to reverse the mistakes that are made by the previous Congress.

Now, we are not in a position to undo some of those bad things that have come upon this Congress right now. I thought we had that leverage a couple of times already in this Congress. Those moments have passed. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that now, if we can find and create that opportunity, I am all for it, and I am looking for somebody to lead us into a way that we can undo some bad legislation.

But where we are today in this deliberative body is that we put the brakes on most bad things that have been happening here in this Congress, and we are laying the groundwork to call in the reinforcement within the visioning of the Founding Fathers so that we can undo the bad things, and it's going to take some help in the United States Senate and in the White House.

So here's America, as we had a conversation here on the side earlier. There was, a couple of years ago, I would say now, a serious discussion about whether I would go back to Iowa and run for Governor, and the questions that I had, Mr. Speaker, in front of me were this: that we were looking at what turned out to be the Dodd-Frank bill, the financial regulation bill. We were looking at cap-and-trade, or cap-and-tax, which is a more accurate way to describe it. We were looking at ObamaCare. I am thinking, I would have to spend 14 months back in Iowa campaigning for that job. And if I carried my luggage into the Governor's mansion and looked out the window onto an America that had been saddled with this burden, the burden of Dodd-Frank, the burden of ObamaCare, and

the burden, perhaps, of a cap-and-tax piece of legislation, it would be impossible to undo, and it would be impossible to fix America from a State office such as I have mentioned. Those things weighed heavily on me.

Today, here's where we are. This process has moved forward. Cap-and-tax has been essentially killed, temporarily killed, I will say, in the United States Senate, thanks to the filibuster and thanks to the work of the people on that side. It did pass through this House under the Pelosi Speakership.

□ 1410

ObamaCare is now the law of the land; but it is repealable, Mr. Speaker, and that gives me great hope. And Dodd-Frank also is repealable. So when I look at the Presidential candidates, who also are poised, seeking the nomination to challenge the White House, the Senators that I am convinced will come into the United States Senate, the new blood that will come into the House of Representatives with even deeper convictions on the Constitution and constitutional conservatism, the idea across America is this: Government has mismanaged so much of what has come out of this Federal Government, they want a smaller, more responsive Federal Government. They want a government that does less with less, a government that balances the budget, and they want to have their freedom back. The American people want to have their liberty back, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask this question, and it's this that Ronald Reagan asked in 1980. He said: Are you better off today than you were 4 years ago? And the American people answered with a resounding "no." And they voted "no" on Jimmy Carter and "yes" on Ronald Reagan, and we got the greatest President of the century, who served two terms and put us back on track and got us believing in ourselves again.

Today and throughout this 14 months or so until the next election, we have to be asking not the question of are you better off today than you were 4 years ago—not a lot of people can say they are—but the question really is, Mr. Speaker, are you more free today? Do you have more liberty today than you had 4 years ago? Do you and your children and your grandchildren have more potential to enjoy the fruits of their labor? Is this society more open to success? And is America moving along and continuing to be the dominant economic force in the world, the dominant cultural force in the world, the dominant foundation for Western Civilization? Are we going to continue to be that, or are we going to watch the continuum of this history wind its way down, and will we trail in the dust the golden hopes of all humanity? Is that the future for this country?

Now, there's not an image that I can see that the President has laid out for us on a direction on where we can go. I have watched what he has done. I

think I know what he believes in. I have looked him in the eye when he has told me what he believes in, and one of those things is Keynesian economics.

The President told a group of us on February 10, 2009, to be precise, that Keynesian economics works. He said to us that Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal actually did work but that Roosevelt lost his nerve, and he pulled back in the second half of the 1930s when he should have been borrowing and spending more money. And because he pulled back, according to the President, it brought about a recession within a depression. Unemployment went up, and then along came World War II, the greatest economic stimulus plan ever.

That was a little classroom lecture. Well, it was a statement, not necessarily a lecture, to be fair, Mr. Speaker. But that was the President's position on that day, and I'm sure that's something he has held for a long time. He didn't make it up while he was standing there. It came out of him as a conviction. That's how it sounded to me.

I'm of the exact opposite conviction, Mr. Speaker. I'm of this conviction: that Keynesian economics always was a mistake. Oh, and for the record, John Maynard Keynes was the most influential economist of his time. He came to prominence in the 1920s and then even more prominence in the 1930s as he proposed that the Federal Government should get money into the hands of people so that people could spend the money. And if they spent the money, it would stimulate the economy. That's the Keynesian approach.

Even though he said this facetiously, I believe it illustrates the Keynesian economic theory, this narrative. And this is a narrative told by John Maynard Keynes, himself. He said, I can solve all of the unemployment in the United States of America, and here's how I would do it. Just give me an abandoned coal mine and I will go out into that coal mine—he'd send other people, actually—with drilling rigs, and they will drill holes down all over the coal mine. And then we'll stuff them full of cash. And then we'll fill the coal mine up with garbage and heap it full of garbage and then turn the entrepreneurs loose, which would then solve all of the unemployment in America.

Just to flesh that out a little bit, Mr. Speaker, if you turn the entrepreneurs loose on an old coal mine that is full of garbage and has holes drilled with cash in it, they've got to go in and move the garbage off. They've got to locate the holes. They've got to clean out the holes. They've got to get down to the cash, and doing all of that will require somebody to rehandle the garbage again, somebody to set up the showers, somebody to take care of the medical needs and the food needs, and after awhile the banking needs when they start to come up with the cash. See, he

understood how the economy goes when you get money flowing in the economy, how that actually happens.

But what Keynes missed was, where was the cash going to come from in the first place? You can't go out and borrow money and bury it and have people dig it up and think you're doing something productive. That's the equivalent of paying each other to do each other's laundry. You've produced nothing extra from it; you just trade dollars.

What has built America, the strength of this country economically has been free market capitalism competition. And because of the competition, we have had inventors and entrepreneurs. We have had more patents, trademarks, and copyrights per capita, at least, than any other country in the world. And the reason for that is because Americans are natural entrepreneurs. We're natural creators, and we have the resources to do it. And I don't just mean gold and oil, and I always have to put corn in there as a natural resource, Mr. Speaker. I know you use it for grits; but for us, we feed most of it to livestock and turn some of it into ethanol.

But all of those resources that we have in this country, Americans have developed them. We've grown them. We've mined them out of the Earth. We've turned our timber into valuable products. We've cut trees and turned them into ships, and we traded around this world. And we did that early in this country. American clipper ships were the class of the world.

We have had this success because we produced. We produced goods and services that had a marketable value both domestically and abroad. That is still what will bring America out of the economic doldrums, producing goods and services that have a marketable value both domestically and abroad, not spending money, not the little sugar high of handing somebody money and saying here are your food stamps, here's your unemployment check. Do nothing except go out and spend the money. That is only at best a sugar high. And for the economy, it's temporary.

Even if Keynes was right on any part of it, it would be this: Dump in billions, hundreds of billions, and in the case of the President of the United States, we're talking about trillions of dollars dumped into this economy. The best you can hope for with a Keynesian economist on steroids, which is our President, is this: that he might have diminished the depths to which we otherwise could have fallen to some degree. We will never know how much, but what I guarantee you is the depths that might have been diminished, certainly the breadth of this trough of the economic downward decline that we're in is much broader, and it's going to take us a long, long time to recover.

And a way to explain that, Mr. Speaker, is this. If you are a small business, a large business, or a government and if you go out and borrow too

much money and you have a revenue stream coming in and now you have to service the debt, you have to pay the interest and the principal on the debt. The banker's in there. He's going to collect his money. So you have a fixed income and you have borrowed more money, which means more interest has to go, and it has to also pay off the principal or you can never stop the drain, and it weighs you down.

There are businesses—I'll actually say many of them in my State—that have actually, literally, not figuratively and not virtually but literally, been under water all summer long in the floods of the Missouri River. If all they have for relief is a small business disaster loan and they can get a preferential interest rate of maybe some number approaching 4 percent interest, still if they get stacked with too much debt, they can't have the income to service that debt.

The same with the country. The United States of America borrows money and hands it to people and tells them: You don't have to work for this. You don't have to produce anything for this. We just want you to spend it. That's your patriotic duty, to take the money that we've borrowed from the Chinese and the debt burden we put on our grandchildren, and put it into people's hands and say it's the patriotic thing. Take your food stamps and take your rent subsidy and your heat subsidy and your unemployment check, and go engage in commerce. That's patriotic.

No, what's patriotic is carry your own weight. I mean, John Smith said clear back in the 1600s: no work, no eat. That's also part of the New Testament. Where he lifted that from, I believe, was in Galatians: He who would not work would also not eat. That doesn't mean that we don't want to take care of people that can't help themselves, but people that can help themselves need to help themselves and all of the rest of us.

We're hearing the statements come out of people that generally sit over on this side of the floor, Mr. Speaker, this belief of economic stimulus. The former Speaker of the House, Speaker PELOSI, has consistently said that unemployment checks are one of those reliable and immediate forms of economic recovery.

□ 1420

You get a lot of bang for the buck when you pay people not to work, and they will go out and spend that money immediately. Therefore, we should pass out unemployment checks and stimulate the economy.

That statement is ridiculous where I come from, Mr. Speaker, to pay people not to work and somehow in that formula it stimulates the economy.

Another statement came from our Secretary of Agriculture, Tom Vilsack, who consistently—at least it shows up in the media hits consistently—has said that food stamps are also an eco-

nomical stimulator, that for every dollar in food stamps that you hand out, you get \$1.84 in economic activity. Well, that may be, but if you had somebody actually producing something in exchange for that food stamp, you would have the economy growing. You would be building capital within your economy.

We have this massive amount of capital here in the United States of America, and it's built within—part of it is cash. Part of it is the real estate value that's been improved by putting buildings and fixtures out. Part of it is the equipment that we've manufactured, and it's the utilization of that. All of that is part of the capital base of America. Our knowledge base is part of the capital base in America. And here we have the Federal Government and the President's proposal with his jobs plan, by the way, continuing to want to extend unemployment benefits another year, believing that that's an economic stimulus plan.

Now, if I were a younger man, or let's just say a boy who was looking at this economy from the simplistic way of what pays and what doesn't, and if someone said to me when I was 16 years old, "Well, here's how we stimulate the economy. We're going to hand out unemployment checks and food stamps," that's what we're hearing, Mr. Speaker. We're hearing this out of the people that speak for the White House. Handing out unemployment checks and handing out food stamps is an economic stimulus plan.

I'm back to: Produce goods and services that have a marketable value both here and abroad. When I say that, we have to compete with the value, the prices of those goods other countries can produce so that we have an opportunity to outsell them when they want to sell here and we have an opportunity to outsell them in their countries. We have to be better at some of those things.

But this economy will not recover if we're going to continue to borrow money, put the debt on the heads of our grandchildren, and think that spending money solves anything.

I have a little granddaughter that's closing in on a year old now. She's just taken her first steps, about 10 or 12 of them last night as a matter of fact. Her name is Reagan Ann King. When she was born into this world, her share of the national debt, what she owes to Uncle Sam when she took her first breath as a new American citizen and a miracle from God, was \$44,000, her share of the debt.

And we worry about a college student that has a degree with a \$40,000 student loan to pay off. I'll submit, Mr. Speaker, they at least have a diploma, in a likely case, and they have an education in every case and an opportunity to earn that back. And from the time they leave college and the toll starts to ring on their student loan, they have an opportunity to go to work and to stop the interest and pay the interest

and start to pay the principal on their student loan.

But this little girl, Reagan Ann King, that's just taken her first dozen steps last night, this little girl doesn't have a chance to start earning that back. Her \$44,000 worth of debt is accumulating interest every day, every day of her little life until—she's turned around a year old—until she's 10, until she's 20, until she gets an education that's good enough for her to start actually earning her share and paying taxes and starting to pay down this national debt.

How much is that \$44,000 going to be before she gets a chance to stop the bleeding just for her? By the time she's 10 and starts fifth grade, it will be not \$44,000, but \$88,000. That's an actual calculation rounded to the nearest thousand. It's not just 44 times 2. That's \$88,000. Welcome to fifth grade, Reagan Ann King. Now your share of the debt is \$88,000. How does that make you feel? Study hard.

We'll give you another Republican approach here, Mr. Speaker, that I think illustrates the right attitude. It caught me a little off guard. I had a conversation with my oldest son and his little 6-year-old daughter, who was telling me her favorite subject is math. Our family is in the construction business. We do a lot of work that requires engineering. And so I immediately said to her, Study hard; focus on your math. That means if you're good in math, you can be an engineer, and your daddy needs an engineer. Her daddy said immediately, I don't need another mouth to feed. She can study hard and carry her own weight and make a living in the world.

Now, think about the difference in that. Rather than opening up the door and saying, Study hard; become an engineer; I can use one in the company—which I think he could—he said, She can make her own way.

The attitude when you're 6 years old, growing up, that you're going to go out into the world and make your own way, even though by then there's maybe a third generation company, it surprised me that he saw the world so clearly and instantly directed his child to, Stand on your own.

Mr. Speaker, we need more young Americans growing up being told on a daily basis, You're going to have to carry your own weight. You're going to have to make your own way. You're going to have to build an education and plan your future and control your own destiny.

When you do that, the most patriotic thing you can do is serve God and country, in that order. Take care of your family. Take care of your State. Do your thing to contribute to our society and our economy.

There is—well, there is, but there should not be—a free lunch.

Mr. Speaker, I'm listening to the Presidential campaign and listening pretty closely and talking to a number of the candidates. What I'm not hear-

ing is any of the candidates really addressing the situation we have of, in the United States, there are 72 different means-tested welfare programs, Federal welfare programs. Seventy-two. There's not a person on the planet that can even name them all from memory, let alone read, learn, understand, and draw judgment on how they interact with each other, let alone whether or not they motivate people to take care of themselves, go to work, do the right thing, be responsible. We like to think so. Seventy-two.

Why does the Federal Government have 72 different means-tested welfare programs? That's because there were 72 different constituency bases out there that certain Members of Congress decided they could slip into one bill or another and send a press release back to their district and say to somebody, Look what I did for you. Here's your rent subsidy. Here's your heat subsidy. Here's your ADC check. Here's your TANF money. Here's your food stamp money. And then they have the audacity to come to the floor to ask for more and more money for rent and heat subsidy at the same time.

I don't want anybody to go cold. I don't want anybody to go hungry. But neither do I want to see generations of Americans who have been conditioned and trained that they don't have to contribute to this society.

I will give you an example. It was written up in the Des Moines Register about 15 years ago where they went into a residential area in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Odd that they would go from Des Moines to Milwaukee. But I remember the article. And they did a study in a six-block by six-block segment; 36 square blocks, six squared. It was a residential area of families whose predecessors in the thirties had moved up to Milwaukee from the gulf area in Mississippi—generally in that area, Mississippi and Alabama—to take on the brewery jobs that blossomed in Milwaukee when prohibition was over. These families that had moved in had moved up there for the jobs.

Three generations later, they surveyed all of those residences in a residential area 36 square blocks, and there wasn't a single employed male head of household in any of those homes in 36 square blocks. And as I read through that article twice, because I wanted to see what I missed, the lament by the author was—seemed to be, at least—that we couldn't bring jobs to the people that lived in that neighborhood in Milwaukee, so wasn't that the failure of government that we couldn't get jobs established there. I read it completely differently. If your granddaddy moved to Milwaukee to get a job, why can't you, as a grandson, move somewhere to get a job?

□ 1430

Why don't people migrate to take a job? And the answer to that question is: seventy-two different means-tested welfare programs. They're being paid

not to. The safest thing you can do is stay in a home that's maybe been in your family for two or three generations, that may well be paid for. And you've got the system of the public benefits all figured out, and so those checks come in once a month and take care of all of your worldly needs. And if you need a little cash aside from that, then you can go out and work in the black market, work in cash, or trade on the side. That's what we have for economies. I've sat in those areas in those communities and just watched the traffic.

And what does this trace back to? Well, I have a viewpoint that I think is completely objective, and it's just illuminated a little more because I come from farm country, but it's this: All new wealth comes from the land. If you watch any dollars that are flowing anywhere, if you trace them back through the economy, whoever has that dollar in their hand, if you could trace it back to the person that handed them that dollar and the person that handed the second person the dollar, and go on back, where does it take you if you trace each one of those transactional exchanges? It will take you back to the land.

In the world, all new wealth comes from the land. You can mine it out of the Earth in the form of gold or platinum; you can pump it out in the form of oil; you can bring out limestone and aggregate of all kinds. That's a new wealth. It sits there, waiting to be developed, and then you turn that into concrete and steel from iron ore, and the list goes on. Or as an exception, I guess, would be if you could seine some fish out of the sea and maybe you can raise a little algae in the sea; but, otherwise, it grows out of the soil.

New wealth comes from this Earth in one form or another, and we use it to produce the necessities of life. Those necessities which were simplified down to food, clothing and shelter, all that comes out of the Earth. Those are the necessities. I used to get into this debate with former Congressman Tom Feeney from Orlando, Florida, Disney World territory—a very smart and effective Member of this Congress and a good friend whom I admire and respect. When I would tell him all new wealth comes from the land, he would say, oh, no, it comes from the airport. Well, they do, Mr. Speaker, fly down to Orlando—and it's a refreshing injection of capital into the economy in the Orlando area, but that's not the new wealth. It's just newly arriving in Orlando.

When you trace it back, it's the disposable income that comes from the people that are producing goods and services that have a marketable value both domestically and abroad. And they're producing it from the raw materials as are mined out of the Earth or are value adding to the crops that grow from the soil. That's what this country is, and that's how this economy works. And if you don't understand that and

you're trying to manage a country that has about a \$15 trillion gross domestic product and you believe that spending money is a solution rather than producing goods and services, you can understand then why we're in the situation that we are in.

I think the Speaker and I agree completely on what I'm about to say. And I'm going to take this back again to Ronald Reagan, who once said that what you tax, you get less of. Well, I look around the United States and I look at our tax policy that we have, and I start looking for productivity, and that's earnings, savings and investment. They identify the productivity in this country. And if you have any earnings, any savings, or any investment, the first lien on all of that, the one who holds the mortgage collateral on it is Uncle Sam.

The Federal Government has the first lien on all productivity in America. So if you walk in and you punch the time clock on a Monday morning at 8 o'clock and you hear that thunk, just think of that as Uncle Sam's arm going out and his hand is out. He will take every dime you earn until he's satisfied—and that might be before noon and it might be after.

Then when Uncle Sam puts all that in his pocket, then you can start to earn a little money for the Governor—he doesn't take as long. You can pay him as a rule, and he gets his hand in his pocket, and now you can start to work for yourself and your children and your families.

The first lien on all productivity in America is held by Uncle Sam, the Federal Government. Earnings, savings, and investment is all taxed in this country unless they have found a way to get you through this loophole. So because what you tax, you get less of, that means that you get less production because we tax it all. If you produce and the Federal Government taxes it, it's a disincentive for production, so we produce less.

If we're going to come out of this economic decline that we're in, if spending were going to solve this problem, we would have solved it by now—this Keynesian economic experiment of the President's.

But it's production that will solve it. We need to take the tax off all production in America, which is all earnings, savings and investment, so that it will thrive and it will prosper. And when we tell people in this country, you can invest all the capital you want to invest, you can earn all you want to earn, you can save all you want to save, and when you do that, we're not going to tax any of it; you can pile up as much cash and capital and savings as you want, not one dime of Federal tax will be on any of that that you earn, when we do that—and I pray one day we will do that—the average worker will get 56 percent more in their paycheck.

There will be a lot more production in this country; it will be a lot more competitive. And then people can pay

their tax with a national sales tax, the option of paying taxes, which is a decision that you make when you consume. That's what the Fair Tax is. And that's what brings us out of this mess that we are in, and it needs to be a very high priority.

I need to hear the Presidential candidates talk about their position on a national sales tax. They talk around it, and they will say, I'm for a Fair Tax or a flat tax or anything that taxes us less. That's not good enough. If you want to lead this country, lay out a tax proposal that actually solves this problem that we're in.

I have looked at this proposal, Mr. Speaker, for more than 30 years now. And I don't know how many years ago it was when they invented the Rubik's Cube, where you could turn that thing around and arrange the colors on all the sides of the cube, but I have turned the Rubik's Cube of the Fair Tax over and over, every possible way that I can look at it.

And the more I look at it—usually when you get to looking at something, it starts to look a little worse the longer you look at it. The longer I look at this, the Rubik's Cube of the Fair Tax, the better it looks to me. And that's more than 30 years of looking at the proposal; and, actually, that's more years than we've had the proposal, but I've advocated for a national sales tax since about 1980. And that was back when I got audited one too many years in a row and I decided, why do I have the IRS in my life? Why are they making Monday morning quarterback decisions? Why am I looking at paying interest in penalty on a tax liability that, to this day, I do not believe that I legally owed? It's because the IRS has so much power that you can't fight them. You can fight them, but you're going to lose.

That was a painful thing for a person of principle to come to, a realization that I had to go to the bank and borrow money to pay the IRS, because even though I'm right, it would cost me my business if I stopped producing long enough to fight the IRS. That was the equation that I was faced with.

So I want to challenge anybody in this House of Representatives that wants to debate tax policy on the Fair Tax. I would be real happy to yield to anybody that would come down here on the floor, set up a Special Order for the purpose, go just about anywhere I can logistically get to face off with somebody that thinks the Fair Tax is a bad idea. It is a great idea.

I sat down with Alan Greenspan within a month of the time that he stepped down as chairman, his retirement, and I said to him, Here are all the things that the Fair Tax does, and I went through the list. I said it eliminates personal income tax and corporate income tax and payroll income tax, including Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. It puts a check and a prebate into everybody's household to reimburse them a prebate for the taxes that

they would pay on their spending up to the poverty level. It provides an incentive for people to invest money, and it will attract capital from all overseas.

I went through all of that, and I said, I need you to challenge me on any point that I have made. I don't want to be making this argument across this country and have a position that I can't sustain. Test me. Challenge me. He listened as I went through the list, and he looked up at me and he said, You left out provides an incentive for savings and investment. This country needs an incentive for savings and investment. Add that to the list and keep saying it. You're right on all of those points. Well, I had actually just forgotten to say it provides an incentive for savings and investment.

But it illustrated to me how carefully Alan Greenspan was listening to that presentation, how he identified the omission that I had left out. And it was an astute response. And I said to him, I need you to advocate for this. And he said to me, You will not find serious economists that disagree with you on this position.

□ 1440

The fair tax does all the things that you say it does. It's not an economic question, because serious economists will not disagree. It's a political question, and you are the politician, meaning me, Mr. Speaker, and you need to solve the political question. It's not an economic argument.

So it comes back to the same thing over and over again. Here we are in this great country. We are a wealthy country. We are also a productive country, and we do have a good work ethic even though it's being undermined by 72 different means-tested Federal welfare programs.

We're a great country, and we have the resources to solve any problem that can be solved. We can come up with the money to do it. We either have the technology or we can develop the technology. We've got the man-and-womanpower. We've got the work power to do all of that. We can solve everything.

But when I look at the problems that are unsolved and unresolved in the United States of America, invariably it comes back to the political question. It's politics that stick in the middle of this. It's not because we don't have enough people with common sense. We have people with competing interests, and we have people that confuse the issue, and they bog this thing down, and they make it a lot harder than it needs to be because they're looking for some kind of political benefit from it.

But we have the solution here at our fingertips. This Congress, if we were able to get a fair tax bill to the floor of the House of Representatives for an up-or-down vote, I would say there'd be a Vegas line on whether that would pass or not, Mr. Speaker, but I believe it would. I believe this House of Representatives would vote to scrap the

entire Internal Revenue Code and scrap the IRS, itself, and replace it with a national sales tax. I believe this House of Representatives would vote to take all the tax off of productivity in America and put that tax over on a revenue-neutral basis onto consumption, instead, of goods and services, goods and services that have a marketable value both domestically and abroad.

I believe the House of Representatives would pass that legislation if we could get it to the floor for a vote. And I believe, in the process of doing this, they would be granting to American manufacturers, in the stroke of a pen, a 28 percent marketing advantage over foreign competitors when it comes to manufacturing.

If you take a Mazda that's presumably built 100 percent in Japan, compared to a Ford built 100 percent in America, and each of them were sitting on a dealer's lot, perhaps across the street from each other and the sticker price on these two comparable valued vehicles was each \$30,000, then competition would have set that.

Well, into that Ford is embedded 22 percent of Federal taxes that are built into the price of that Ford, because corporations don't pay taxes; consumers pay it. Corporations aggregate them, and they put it into the price of the products that they produce. So your \$30,000—you pass the fair tax, competition drives out of the Ford the embedded Federal tax. So your \$30,000 Ford becomes \$23,400. That would be the new sticker price.

Now, it would take 12 to 18 months to turn the inventory over and get competition to drive that down. \$23,400 would be then the new sticker price on your Ford, with the fair tax passed. But your Mazda's still going to be \$30,000 because its tax structure is Japan, not the United States.

So then you add in an embedded 23 percent sales tax into both vehicles, and your Ford price, to drive it off the lot, presuming it's not a deductible business purchase, goes from what was \$30,000, knocked down to \$23,400 because the embedded Federal tax comes out of the price, and you add in 23 percent tax. You drive your Ford off the lot for \$30,400. But your Mazda needs to also pay the 23 percent embedded tax. It comes off the lot at \$39,000. So you end up with an \$8,600—28 percent—marketing advantage, the Ford over the Mazda.

Now, what does that bring about, Mr. Speaker? Instead of \$800 million worth of Mazdas coming to the United States aboard ships on an annual basis, you've got Fords being sent to Japan and to Korea and to China and to Europe and all around the world. We're making more and more cars, and we're shipping them all around the world because we now have a tax structure that ceases to punish production and provides an incentive for savings and investment and gives those workers that are making the Fords 56 percent more in their paycheck. And those people that run the

manufacturing plants, whether it's cars or whether it's trailer axles or whether it's the modern version of the widget, all have a competitive advantage now that gains 28 percent.

We've reached a static level in the things we produce, and sometimes a half of a percent is enough to make the difference on whether you sell large volumes into foreign countries. A half of a percent, maybe even a tenth of a percent.

Well, can you imagine sitting there, let's just say—I'm just thinking shipping product over into a place like Asia, and you're there where the margins are so tight sometimes you can sell, sometimes you can't, and you've got to ratchet your price down a little and try to get it sold. This goes on every day, people that are looking for that tiny little edge that lets them get in there and export something to a foreign country.

With the fair tax, they're sitting there with a tiny little edge or no edge. Maybe they're behind the curve, and all of a sudden here comes a 28 percent marketing advantage. Whoosh, it goes overseas. We light this country up. We light this country up. We become the manufacturing center for the world again. We find jobs for people. They're out there for American labor to produce a high return so that their highly productive workers—we're the most productive workers in the world today, and we will increase our manufacturing. We will increase our exports. We'll reverse this trade imbalance, and it will be a surplus of exports. And instead of us being a debtor nation, we will become a prosperous nation.

By the way, if exports are working, think what can happen. We've got a dollar that's being devalued by the White House and by the Fed. They're printing money and dumping the currency in, and the value of the dollar is dropping. And what is one of the reasons? It's because, if a dollar doesn't buy much, then people in foreign countries can buy more things from the United States.

Look how it works the other way. When we get this 28 percent marketing advantage, we can start to tighten up our currency and start to give it value again. Maybe we can get to that point where we can put a gold standard under it or a basket of currency, a basket of commodities that would be used in lieu of a gold standard so that our dollar has a value that can be anchored to commodities that actually can be exchanged for, rather than the full faith and credit of the Federal Government.

The fair tax solves everything good that can be solved by a tax policy. It does everything that anybody else's tax policy does that's good. It does them all. And it does them all better. And I will stand on that statement, Mr. Speaker. And I will challenge any Member of this Congress or anybody that has a legitimate reputation out across this country to stand up and we'll take this issue on anywhere.

This is one of these times when I'll just say that this is one of the things that I have been right on for a long time. A lot of others have been right on this for a long time, and it's getting to the point where it's high time that we move a fair tax.

We had a little hearing in the Ways and Means Committee here a few weeks ago. I'm glad to have that. I don't know if the Earth shook when we did that or not, and I don't know how much it illuminated the knowledge base of the Members. But I will tell you that the public would be disappointed if they knew how shallow the knowledge base is among many of the Members of this Congress when it comes to a national sales tax. It's shallow. They can't pass the test. They don't want to spend the time to do that. They're just navigating themselves away from the political liabilities that come up every day in this trade. They don't have the time to dig down into it. And so you need to focus them, and the public needs to focus them, Mr. Speaker.

The fair tax needs to move. We need to have it in the debate of the Presidential race. I want to do all we can to bring it up in that debate.

And as the clock ticks down, I want to shift the gear a little bit because it's important for me to address what's going on with the natural disasters in the country, primarily the floods that we've had on the Missouri River.

We have been underwater since early or mid-June. We have more water that's come down the Missouri River than at any time prior to this year in history. This is from Sioux City, downstream. And they can talk about it very well up into the Dakotas. KRISTI NOEM and RICK BERG are very knowledgeable on what the disaster has done to them upstream.

But where we are, Sioux City on down, that river has been, since June, and I will say mid-June, it's been about—the narrowest typical place that you would see would be the water would be a mile and a half wide. This is a river that, I wouldn't recommend it, but it can be swum across. And about a mile and a half wide downstream from Sioux City, and as you go further south it gets to be 4, 5, 6, 8 miles wide at Glencoe, and north of the Omaha airport, 11 miles wide. Water 11 miles wide, and it narrows up downstream from Omaha to 4 to 5 miles, maybe 6 miles wide, all the way down into Missouri and into SAM GRAVES' district, typical, on down.

□ 1450

We have seen more water come down that river this summer than ever before. And it is a flood of massive proportions. And when I tell you a river that's 11 miles wide for 3 months long, it gives you a sense of what it is, but people have to be thinking it's stagnant water that's sitting there that can't escape. But it's really not. It's water with a velocity of 3-5 miles an hour, even out away from the central

stream of the channel; and in the central stream of the channel it's 11-12 miles an hour but out a way at the base of the hills, and it's flooded hill to hill. The water is moving along at a clip that's, oh, a fast pace if you're walking, is what it would be.

And we have watched business after business, farm after farm, residence after residence go underwater. They sandbag, set up pumps, and then they lose the battle. And then the house and buildings fill up with water, sometimes clear up to the eaves, sometimes halfway up on the windows of the living room.

And we have miles and miles of trees that have been standing in water that is 10-, 12-, 16-feet deep for the better part of the summer. I'll say all summer. And when the wind blows and the water starts to go down, the trees just tip over. Miles and miles of huge trees laying down, the swath of them just fallen over by wind and gravity and nothing for their roots to hang on to, and hundreds of thousands of farm fields that are underwater, and flooded with huge sand bars that are created by the current and all kinds of junk washed out into the middle of them.

This is what we're dealing with on the Missouri River.

The Corps of Engineers has built in the upper Missouri River six dams. They're known as the Pick-Sloan Program. That began sometime in the '40s and '50s. They looked back on the historically highest flood, which was 1881, and they had a large flood in 1943. It wasn't as much as 1881, but it was a heads-up wake-up call that started Congress working. And they began working on this Pick-Sloan Program to prevent flooding in the Missouri River.

In 1952, there was a huge flood, and that accelerated the construction. They completed in the late 1950s and early 1960s the six-dam reservoir complex of the Pick-Sloan Program that goes clear on up into Montana.

They wrote a master manual for the Corps of Engineers that guides them on how they shall manage the reservoirs and how they shall manage the Missouri River. The master manual, Mr. Speaker, has been amended. I believe there have been five different versions. But in each of those versions, the Corps of Engineers says use the same amount of storage capacity for flood control.

There is a permanent pool, and above that permanent pool they have always kept 16.3 million acre feet for flood control. The reason that they have 16.3 million acre feet is because that was the amount that was calculated that was necessary to protect from the floods of the largest run-off ever experienced, which was 1881. In 1881, 49 million acre feet of water came down. In 2011, the number will be 61 million acre feet of water.

So I have a bill I trust was introduced this afternoon or will be before the fall of the gavel today, Mr. Speaker, that requires the Corps of Engineers to manage the Pick-Sloan Program, to

protect from serious downstream flooding, and to adjust those flood levels to the largest amount ever experienced. And that language then means 2011 run-off rather than 1881 run-off.

So if we get another year of this kind of run-off, we will be using the storage rather than having it be part of the permanent pool so that all of this downstream flooding that has wiped out hundreds and hundreds of square miles and set it under a flowing current of water for the whole summer can all be protected.

They easily have the storage capacity to protect all of us downstream from that type of serious flooding. The legislation that I have that has been sponsored by representatives from at least four States along the Missouri—and I'm not sure who else might have signed on it this afternoon—just simply says to the Corps of Engineers: Adjust the flood storage from the 16.3 million acre feet to an amount that will protect from serious downstream flooding.

That's the message in the bill. That's what I'm going to ask this Congress to pass. That's what I think we have a reasonable chance of having unanimous support among the States affected by the Missouri River floods all the way up to the headwaters and all the way down to St. Louis. I'm hopeful every Member will sign on. It's bipartisan. We have about the same number of Democrats as we do Republicans on that bill, and it's something I feel the need to notice this Congress that is something that I'd ask for support, and hopefully we can start to move it through.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we get close to wrapping up business in this Congress for this week, I think about what we have ahead of us.

Of course one of the things we have ahead of us is how do we fund this government beyond September 30. That will be ultimately, I believe, a CR, a continuing resolution. We have the debt ceiling debate behind us, at least for now. We have the pressure points that are set up by the debt ceiling bill. I have never been a fan of a supercommittee of 12 apostles sitting in a room, deciding for all of the rest of us what they think is best. The product that may come from there, if it's used right, can be useful, and it can produce a happy ending here.

I'm hopeful that they will make suggestions and work with the committees. And the cuts that we must get in this Congress, I believe, need to be produced by the committees that have the most and the best knowledge about the subject matter at hand, that it's not just a slash-and-burn from inside the—perhaps, and maybe not—closed doors of the supercommittee. And I think this country has got a long ways to go.

But in the end, here's what gets us where we need to go. Pass the Fair Tax, Mr. Speaker. That turns this economy back around and does all the things that I've said. It does every-

thing good that everybody's policy does. It does them all. It does them all better.

It gives people back their freedom. It gives them 56 percent more in their paycheck. They decide when to pay taxes when they make a purchase. And it rewards production. It stops punishing production. And in the end, it inversely rewards production. People will produce more. They'll earn more. They'll save more, will export more. Our dollar will be worth more. People's labor will be worth more.

And the 80 million Americans that are of working age but are simply not in the workforce need to be put to work. We can't have a Nation of slackers and then have me have to sit in the Judiciary Committee, listening to them argue that there's work that Americans won't do so we have to import people to do work Americans won't do and borrow money to pay the welfare of people that won't work. That is a foolish thing for a Nation to do.

We've got to get this country back to work and get those people out of the slacker roles and on to the employed roles. That and revalue the dollar.

We've got to balance the budget. That means pass a balanced budget amendment that actually is a legitimate balanced budget amendment with a supermajority required to waive the balance, a supermajority required to raise the debt ceiling, a supermajority required to exceed 18 percent of the GDP, and a supermajority required to, as I said, raise taxes, balance the budget, and exceed the debt limit.

So if we can do those things—repeal ObamaCare, pass the Fair Tax, pass a balanced budget amendment out of this Congress, ask the States to save us—that would be a pretty good foundation to build this country on, and it would be a good foundation for little Reagan Ann King, who's just taken her first steps in the last 24 hours, to look ahead and think, Grandpa actually is doing something here in Congress. It's going to open the door up for her and all of her generation to come in and contribute to this country and still have something left for themselves and start to get to the point where we can one day start to pay down this national debt.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention here this afternoon, your service in this Congress as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

AMERICA'S SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. We're at the end of another week of session here.

You know, the President's been traveling around the country. I know that costs millions and millions of dollars to put Air Force One in motion, hopping all over the country. I've also seen what it takes from a security standpoint to prepare for a President to come anywhere. Because of the sniper weapons available these days, they have to be so thorough.

□ 1500

The Secret Service has to go along and check. Anything they can see, they have to check out. Well, that takes several days.

So, to the average person, you think, Well, gee. The President just comes in. He's gone in 30 minutes. No big deal. But for those whose life's work it is in the government to make sure that things go properly, it is an extremely onerous task. We owe so much to those who protect those who are leaving the country, not so much the people in Congress. I know we had people in Congress who were advocating that we all ought to have our own security detail; but as one of my constituents said one morning at 2 a.m. in Wal-Mart, "Wow, you really don't have any security," and I said, "No. It's just you, me and the syrup here." I don't think we should have to have security. If it comes to that, this country is in such trouble that I'm not sure we'll have it back in any proper form anyway.

In the meantime, I am an advocate of letting people in Washington, D.C., who aren't prior convicted felons and who meet the requirements, of being able to carry. Let folks carry. Not here in the Capitol, of course. You don't need one here. We've got the finest we could hope for, Mr. Speaker. I know you know the Capitol Police are fantastic. We've got some up in the gallery who make sure that things are orderly up there; and as we know from the last 20 years, there are times they've had to lay down their lives to protect the public here.

So we are greatly blessed, but it all comes back to this, that we're talking about millions and millions of dollars for the President to go anywhere. Ever since 1 week ago, we were chastised by the President here on the House floor, as he spoke from the podium here, that we needed to pass his bill. Somebody else counted them. I didn't. We've got to pass this bill right now, right away, right now. Pass this bill now. It turns out the whole time the President was saying "this bill," there was no such bill, which brought back memories of exactly 2 years before when at that time the President demanded to come address a joint session of Congress.

Under the rules of Congress, the laws of the land, no one can demand to come speak to the Senate or House unless they're invited, but that was overlooked back in September of 2009. The President was not doing well in the polling with his health care ideas. He

figured, if he came and spoke here on the floor, because he is such a gifted reader, that he might be able to persuade people to support a bill they otherwise didn't like.

So he came and he spoke. He spoke of this bill, my bill, this plan, my plan. I couldn't find a bill. I couldn't find a plan anywhere. It was even 2 weeks later that I asked the Cabinet member charged with Health and Human Services—it's her area—since the President was so accusatory and said, If any of you misrepresent my bill, I am going to call you out, I wanted to make sure I didn't misrepresent anything. I asked the Secretary of Health and Human Services: Where do I get a copy of the President's bill? She said these words: I think he was talking about a set of principles.

Ah, it couldn't have been. He said this bill, my bill, this plan, my plan. He didn't have a plan. He didn't have a bill. He was talking about a set of principles? How could he condemn us for misrepresenting a bill or a plan that he didn't have? Not then. It turns out he didn't.

So, as I heard the President say repeatedly to pass this bill, pass this bill, to do it right now, right now, I wondered if, yet again, 2 years later, he was making the same error—demanding we pass a bill that didn't exist. It turns out my concerns were well-founded. He had no bill. He had no plan. He had a speech.

But as we've learned from CBO, generally speaking, unless they're chastised sufficiently by the President or the White House, CBO cannot score a speech. If they're chastised sufficiently, then CBO will give them some sort of scoring because there are pressures that can be brought to bear from the White House that somehow, apparently, make them sensitive, which is another whole point. I really don't believe that we will be able to fix the problems of the massive overspending, the overtaxing, the dramatic problems with the overexaction, the overburdensome laws and regulations until we change a number of things.

One of those is we eliminate the Congressional Budget Office and eliminate the rules under which bills are scored. Those rules were put in place in 1974 by the same Congress that forced the military to rush out of Vietnam, leaving, many report, around 2 million people who had helped us to be wiped out—murdered, killed—because the Congress didn't care. That same Congress put in rules that would require that a bill be scored as to the effect it would have on our economy, on spending, on revenue. It required it would be scored under rules that do not allow the scorer to take into consideration reality, history, facts. All they're allowed to do is to consider the formulas—the rules under which they're bound by that 1974 Congress. That's it.

Now, we've gotten horrible scoring, and it can't be blamed on CBO or on the Joint Commission on Taxation. It's

the rules that are the problem. But when a group comes back with a score of around \$800 billion and then later they have to confirm in reality it's more like, say, \$1.1 trillion, then you realize on an \$800 billion bill that the score really should put boldly that you have to consider that with a 30 to 40 percent margin of error, plus or minus. So here is the score, plus or minus 30 or 40 percent, and that's about the best we can do.

Since that is the best that CBO can apparently do, it's time to have some massive changes in this place. It's time to use reality. It's time to use history and not some 1974 liberal Congress' idea of how we get the government taking over everybody's lives. That's no way to run government unless you're in some country besides the United States of America.

There's an old saying in this town, Mr. Speaker: No matter how cynical you get, it's never enough to catch up.

In my 6½ years here in Congress, I've found that's certainly true because you want to trust everybody. You want to believe that when people say things in this town it's true, but then you find out, for example, that you can have a leader of the country tell everybody that we need to go after the Big Oil companies. They're having massive profits, and we're going after those companies. Then you find out that the bill that's produced to go after those companies has no adverse effect on those companies whatsoever, and in fact, it will make them even bigger profits than they might have ever imagined.

Now, I know there have been some issues about the bill title, "American Jobs Act of 2011," and yes, I am the one who filed the American Jobs Act of 2011.

□ 1510

I think it will be a wonderful thing when we in this body can work together. We can have our disagreements. I found, in a deacon body, even though there was a lot of nasty, mean things said, that if we had prayer together and we came together, we had meals together, we could work together.

One of the things that's so troubling on this floor is when people come so close to impugning the integrity of other people. I know some people that have diametrically opposed views of how this country should work, but I know in their heart they want the country to work well and succeed. I just believe from history they're wrong, but there are people in this body who you might think we were so far from each other politically that we wouldn't want to have anything to do with each other.

DENNIS KUCINICH is one of those people that is quite far afield from me on so many political issues, but DENNIS has never lied to me; he has always been up front. I find him to be a man of conviction, and I find him refreshing. MARCY KAPTUR and I disagree on many

issues, maybe most issues, but I know she is a person of integrity. She has never lied to me; she has never been anything but honest with me.

There are numerous people. Bill Delahunt and I would spar in Judiciary Committee many, many times, other committees, subcommittees, here on floor; but I always found Bill Delahunt—what I would call a liberal from Massachusetts, a Democrat—to be an honorable man, a man of integrity, and I believe with all my heart that he had a heart for this country and he wanted to see it work.

We ought to be able to work together when people realize that we have got common goals, the common goal being the good of the country. So let's at least find things we could agree on.

When I was engaged in trials—and I have been involved in many trials as an attorney, and as a judge, and then oversaw them briefly as a chief justice, but engaged as a lawyer—there were many times when we started in the discovery process that I told opposing counsel, We can do this one of two ways. We can fight, scrape and fuss over every question, over every interrogatory, over every deposition, but we both know the rules require certain things will need to be produced, that certain things will need to be disclosed.

So I would prefer to do it that way, amicably, and the people that win are the clients because they don't have to pay near as much money. Because it doesn't take near as much time if you can agree on the things that you know you are going to have to produce and quit having a motion to compel, a motion to protect, all this kind of stuff.

Sometimes we had attorneys that could work together well, and sometimes they would hit me with a discovery demand out of the blue that was so grossly unfair, but not illegal, that you would find out, okay, this is the way you want to go. I didn't want to go this way, but I believe so strongly in the interests of the person I am representing and believe so strongly in the process, itself, that if you want a fight, you will have a fight.

If somebody is going to travel around the country, condemning me and other people in this body for refusing to pass a bill, knowing that that bill does not exist, it is not in existence because legally it has not been filed, then we are going to do some battle over that. If I am going to be condemned for a week for refusing to pass an American Jobs Act of 2011, well, after 6 days or so, it's time to have an American Jobs Act that we can pass or at least that I could go along with.

I would certainly like, Mr. Speaker, the President and others to know I am flexible, but the corporate tax is one of the most insidious taxes that we have in this country because it's not an honest tax. Governments had represented to voters for years and years that we have got this tax over here. We go after the mean, evil, greedy corporations—and some do have greed as a material

factor in their business—but the thing is, that's not what a corporate tax is about.

A corporation cannot stay in existence if they don't have their customers or clientele pay the corporate tax. So a corporate tax is not actually a tax on a corporation. A corporate tax is, instead, requiring the corporation to be the collection agent. Oh, make no mistake, that tax will come from the rank-and-file people across this great country. They're the ones that are going to pay that tax. The corporations are a collection agent. They collect the tax from their customers, and then they pass it on to the Federal Government.

The trouble is, in this country now, we have the highest corporate tax in the world, any developing nation for sure, 35 percent; in China, 17 percent, and they do cut deals where they will reduce it to zero tax for 5 years, I have been told by some people there. You get a deal—zero tax for 5 years and then gradually work up to 17.

Not here in the United States. We are going to slap a 35 percent tax on anything a company in America produces. That sure makes it tough to compete in the global market.

Now that we have got planes, ships that move so quickly, rail that goes across borders, it is important that we be able to compete in the global market. And if we are going to slap a 35 percent tariff on everything an American company produces in this country, they are going to have to move and go to a country where there is not such a high collection fee that corporations are required to collect in this country. They are going to go to a country like China that charges a lot less for a collection fee from the customers.

But if people could get their mind around the fact that it isn't making the greedy corporations pay, in fact, the greediest corporations are the ones that don't pay anything. You know, we found out that the close cronies of the President at GE are able not to pay any tax, but the mom-and-pop-type small business corporations, they are having to pay the tax.

Gibson is employing a lot of people. I got a Gibson guitar when I was 8 years old, a fantastic guitar. We are going to send in armed agents to harass those people. That's no way to draw business back into this country.

You reduce the corporate tax. If you reduce it at all, the more you reduce it, the more jobs are going to come back because that means more and more corporations will be able to compete in the global market, and they'll be able to come back here, union members, not the government union members—and that seems to be where union leadership wants to go these days. Forget the manufacturing unions. We are driving those jobs out of America. But any historian will tell you, when a nation that is protecting other nations—and we are; we are protecting the free world—that requires that nation to have a military.

Any nation that cannot provide its own military with the things it needs to protect itself—that means steel; it means all kinds of metal; it means gunpowder; it means, actually, uranium as we have nuclear subs and ships; it means wood products; it means tires. We are buying tires for Humvees from China these days. Excuse me? We have to be able to have no supply line to be able to provide the things that we in this country need to defend ourselves and provide them in this country. It's time to quit driving companies, including manufacturing jobs, out of the country. This bill drives more jobs out.

You have got to have energy. Those that are familiar with the Battle of the Bulge can dispel the myth that some think, gee, the war was won before the Battle of the Bulge.

□ 1520

Some say they buy into the Russians' explanation that we had whipped the Germans all by ourselves, we didn't need the allies otherwise, but if you really study the Battle of the Bulge, what won that for the Allies was the fact that the Germans were running out of gasoline.

So what does the President do to help us? He said go against and take the profits of these massive, big oil companies. Instead, page 151 through 154, he rips the heart out of the independent oil and gas industry.

In order to drill a well in America, you have to raise capital. If you're one of the majors like Exxon, like British Petroleum, the dear friends of the President, if you're one of those big companies, you've got enough money of your own. You're capitalized; you can do these things. But for over 94 percent of the wells drilled in the continental United States, they're raising money. They have to raise capital. Well, this knocks the fool out of their ability to raise capital. Not only that, it repeals the deductions that are not even available to any company that produces more than a thousand barrels of oil a day. That's the majors.

So all this will do is eliminate over 94 percent of the wells drilled in the continental United States. The result will be a higher cost of oil. It will make even more profits for the President's friends at British Petroleum. British Petroleum is friends of the President, they love the cap-and-trade idea, and they're going to love this bill by the President.

Also, we know, we've heard complaint after complaint from State after State, and they're saying, You are giving us so many unfunded mandates. We just can't take this any more. Stop already. We just can't stand this kind of help much longer.

So if you look through this bill, you end up finding out there is a little provision—and, like I say, I was up until about 5 a.m. Tuesday going through this lovely thing, but there is a provision at the bottom of one of the pages, rather obscure, and my staff made copies. I've got the best staff in the world,

but I don't believe they got my tag back on that page. The title of the little section is Federal and State Immunity, but then you read the section, it has nothing to do with Federal immunity. Under the law, the Federal Government and the State government are immune from being sued, but in that provision it actually says that, gee, if a State accepts any money at all from the Federal Government, any money at all, then they have effectively waived their sovereign immunity and are therefore subject to suit.

I just found it. It's page 133:

"A State's receipt or use of Federal financial assistance for any program or activity of a State shall constitute a waiver of sovereign immunity, under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution or otherwise, to a suit brought by an employee or applicant for employment of that program or activity." It goes on.

So at a time when States say we can't afford any more unfunded mandates, the President proposes a bill to let them get sued a bunch more by people who are unemployed. That's just got to be great news.

And we're seeing the hearings go on about Solyndra. This administration, it appears from the evidence, we'll get the final verdict later, but they rushed in to give them \$500 million of stimulus money so crony capitalism could occur and certain people could engorge themselves, and all at the taxpayers' expense, and it turns out that probably future generations will be paying for that.

If you like the way that was handled, you've got to be reassured, because in this bill there are a number of references that green programs, like Solyndra, will have priority, and we'll rush a lot more money out there.

There are a lot of things we could agree on in that bill that the President never had anybody willing to file. There was a provision for a payroll tax holiday. Well, you would figure I'd support that. I'm the guy who proposed it 3 years ago and personally explained it to the President and Larry Summers in January of 2009. But it sure would've been better if we did it before this administration squandered \$4.5 trillion more than we brought in. We could've given everybody in the United States who pays income tax a tax holiday for 3 years, and it would've only run up \$3.6 trillion. We would have saved \$900 billion. If you don't think that people having all of their own income tax from 3 years would've stimulated this economy, then you need to embrace this President's bill because you'll love it.

Nonetheless, there are things that we could agree on. Both Houses, both parties, I think, agree that we were willing to sell some more broadband spectrum. That's there in the bill, but then he uses that as a platform to create another bureaucracy, a Big Brother coming into your computer, because it's the Public Safety Broadband Corpora-

tion that's created and will just really make sure that Big Brother government intrudes in your life.

When you boil it all down, we have a moral problem in America. The Founders continually pointed to God and said that's where we need to have our focus. As Ben Franklin said, without His concurring aid, we will succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel. We'll be confounded by our local partial interests, and we, ourselves, shall become a byword down through the ages.

So whether anybody believes in God or not, as the Founders did, over a third of the Declaration of Independence signers were not just Christians, they were ordained ministers, to take one's eyes off of self and put them on something higher and greater avoids the kind of engorgement, the self-satisfaction, the self-emphasis that we've gotten into. That's the reason you run up trillions of dollars of debt without any regard for the children, the grandchildren, and the generations to come.

I have to make this personal note reference. It breaks my heart to see that in college football. Nobody loves college football more than I do. I attended Texas A&M, and I know a lot of people are excited about Texas A&M perhaps going to the Southeastern Conference for money. All about money. The traditions of Texas A&M make it unique and I think the greatest public institution of higher education in the country. I'm very proud of it, but it's the traditions. And now we see that over a hundred years of tradition, going back to 1876, are ready to be thrown away for money. Just money. Greed money. Forget tradition that makes your institution great. Forget it all. Forget the State rivalries. Forget it all. We're talking about cash.

Isn't that what got us in trouble in this country in the first place, when we put cash, greed for ourselves above the interests of the country or the institutions we represent?

To close with this example, my senior year in the Corps Cadets, I was the second level below the Corps commander. I was one level right below the commander. There were four of us at that level, major unit commanders. There was a Corps commander. He didn't get along very well. He didn't play very well with others. And the first meeting we had, all of the senior leaders in the Corps Cadets, he had his staff put together tables end to end. He got up there with a corncob pipe like MacArthur, walked up and down and descended and cajoled all his classmates like they were 2-year-olds.

□ 1530

I approached him after the meeting and I said, Man, these guys have seen you naked. We're all classmates. We're all friends. You need to try to work together. Don't just condemn everybody. And I think if we could get to that level in here—not that we run around naked together—but just where we can

work together as friends, disagreeing on issues.

But unless one person has a 100 percent lock on God's truth 100 percent of the time, we should listen to each other, not condemn each other; and we can get these things worked out, put greed aside and help this country last 200 more years.

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

REPORT REGARDING ICELAND'S COMMERCIAL WHALING ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112-54)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Natural Resources and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On July 19, 2011, Secretary of Commerce Gary Locke certified under section 8 of the Fisherman's Protective Act of 1967, as amended (the "Pelly Amendment") (22 U.S.C. 1978), that nationals of Iceland are conducting whaling activities that diminish the effectiveness of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) conservation program. This message constitutes my report to the Congress consistent with subsection (b) of the Pelly Amendment.

In 1982, the IWC set catch limits for all commercial whaling at zero. This decision, known as the commercial whaling moratorium, is in effect today. Iceland abided by the moratorium until 1992, when it withdrew from the IWC. In 2002, Iceland rejoined the IWC with a reservation to the moratorium on commercial whaling. In 2003, Iceland began a lethal scientific research whaling program. In 2004, Secretary of Commerce Donald L. Evans certified Iceland under the Pelly Amendment for lethal scientific research whaling. When Iceland resumed commercial whaling in 2006, Secretary Carlos M. Gutierrez retained Iceland's certification, which remains in effect today.

Iceland's commercial harvest of fin whales escalated dramatically over the past few years. In addition, Iceland recently resumed exporting whale products. Of particular concern to the United States, Iceland harvested 125 endangered fin whales in 2009 and 148 in 2010, a significant increase from the total of 7 fin whales it commercially harvested between 1987 and 2007.

Iceland's sole fin whaling company, Hvalur hf, suspended its fin whaling due to the earthquake and tsunami in Japan, where it exports its whale meat. Despite this suspension, Iceland continues to permit whaling and has a government issued fin whale quota in effect for the 2011 season that continues to exceed catch levels that the IWC's scientific body advised would be sustainable if the moratorium was removed. This continues to present a

threat to the conservation of fin whales. Further, Icelandic nationals continue to hunt minke whales commercially and Iceland's exports of whale meat to Japan reportedly increased significantly in both March and April 2011.

Iceland's actions threaten the conservation status of an endangered species and undermine multilateral efforts to ensure greater worldwide protection for whales. Iceland's increased commercial whaling and recent trade in whale products diminish the effectiveness of the IWC's conservation program because: (1) Iceland's commercial harvest of whales undermines the moratorium on commercial whaling put in place by the IWC to protect plummeting whale stocks; (2) the fin whale harvest greatly exceeds catch levels that the IWC's scientific body advised would be sustainable if the moratorium were removed; and (3) Iceland's harvests are not likely to be brought under IWC management and control at sustainable levels through multilateral efforts at the IWC.

In his letter of July 19, 2011, Secretary Locke expressed his concern for these actions, and I share these concerns. To ensure that this issue continues to receive the highest level of attention, I direct: (1) relevant U.S. delegations attending meetings with Icelandic officials and senior Administration officials visiting Iceland to raise U.S. concerns regarding commercial whaling by Icelandic companies and seek ways to halt such action; (2) Cabinet secretaries to evaluate the appropriateness of visits to Iceland depending on continuation of the current suspension of fin whaling; (3) the Department of State to examine Arctic cooperation projects, and where appropriate, link U.S. cooperation to the Icelandic government changing its whaling policy and abiding by the IWC moratorium on commercial whaling; (4) the Departments of Commerce and State to consult with other international actors on efforts to end Icelandic commercial whaling and have Iceland abide by the IWC moratorium on commercial whaling; (5) the Department of State to inform the Government of Iceland that the United States will continue to monitor the activities of Icelandic companies that engage in commercial whaling; and (6) relevant U.S. agencies to continue to examine other options for responding to continued whaling by Iceland.

I concur with the Secretary of Commerce's recommendation to pursue the use of non-trade measures and that the actions outlined above are the appropriate course of action to address this issue. Accordingly, I am not directing the Secretary of the Treasury to impose trade measures on Icelandic products for the whaling activities that led to the certification by the Secretary of Commerce. However, to ensure that this issue continues to receive the highest level of attention, I am directing the Departments of State and Com-

merce to continue to keep the situation under review and continue to urge Iceland to cease its commercial whaling activities. Further, within 6 months, or immediately upon the resumption of fin whaling by Icelandic nationals, I have directed relevant departments and agencies to report to me through the Departments of State and Commerce on their actions. I believe these actions hold the most promise of effecting a reduction in Iceland's commercial whaling activities.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 15, 2011.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WEBSTER (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending a memorial service for David Bitner.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 19, 2011, at noon.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 112th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

MARK E. AMODEI, Nevada Second.

ROBERT L. TURNER, New York Ninth.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

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

Gary L. Ackerman, Sandy Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alex-

ander, Jason Altmire, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Robert E. Andrews, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Tammy Baldwin, Lou Barletta, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Karen Bass, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Rick Berg, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Mo Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Ann Marie Buerkle, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G. K. Butterfield, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Francisco "Quico" Canseco, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Caputo, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, John R. Carter, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Ben Chandler, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Hansen Clarke, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. "Gerry" Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Chip Cravaack, Eric A. "Rick" Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Mark S. Critz, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Geoff Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Rosa L. DeLauro, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Joe Donnelly, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Bob Filner, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Jeff Flake, Charles J. "Chuck" Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Elton Gallegly, John Garamendi, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Gabrielle Giffords, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Charles A. Gonzalez, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, Janice Hahn, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Jane Harman*, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Nan A. S. Hayworth, Joseph J. Heck, Martin Heinrich, Dean Heller*, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Maurice D. Hinchey, Rubén Hinojosa, Mazie Hirono, Kathleen C. Hochul, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Tim Huelskamp, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson Lee, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Dale E. Kildee, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Larry Kissell, John Kline, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, Jeffrey M. Landry,

James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Christopher J. Lee*, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Cynthia M. Lummis, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Connie Mack, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Carolyn McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNeerney, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Mick Mulvaney, Christopher S. Murphy, Tim Murphy, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Kristi L. Noem, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, John W. Olver, William L. Owens, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Gary C. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Benjamin Quayle, Mike Quigley, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, Denny Rehberg, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Silvestre Reyes, Reid J. Ribble, Laura Richardson, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, David Rivera, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Peter J. Roskam, Dennis Ross, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Jon Runyan, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Linda T. Sanchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Robert T. Schilling, Jean Schmidt, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, Tim Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Steve Southerland, Jackie Speier, Cliff Stearns, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Scott Tipton, Paul Tonko, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Robert L. Turner, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Joe Walsh, Timothy J. Walsh, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Daniel Webster, Anthony D. Weiner*, Peter Welch, Allen B. West, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Frederica Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu*, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3104. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act in the Rural Utilities' Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband (Broadband) Programs account, 12-1232; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3105. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Army Case Number 10-05; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3106. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report entitled "Report to the Congress on Secured Creditor Haircuts"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3107. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3108. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the National Emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3109. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Country Reports on Terrorism 2010"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3110. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3111. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act Inventory Summary as of June 30, 2010 and June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3112. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Medicare Ombudsman report to Congress for the year 2009; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

3113. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Evaluation of the National Competitive Bidding Program For Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics, and Supplies"; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 399. A resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-207). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2401. A bill to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2646. A bill to authorize certain Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility projects and leases, to extend certain expiring provisions of law, and to modify certain authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2935. A bill to authorize the full funding of part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act by making certain spending cuts to the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOREN (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BACA, Mr. BARROW, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 2936. A bill to amend the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 with respect to the Small Business Administration's Express Loan Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 2937. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for enhanced safety and environmental protection in pipeline transportation, to provide for enhanced reliability in the transportation of the Nation's energy products by pipeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. QUAYLE, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 2938. A bill to prohibit certain gaming activities on certain Indian lands in Arizona; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2939. A bill to provide for the disposal of drugs pursuant to national pharmaceutical stewardship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H.R. 2940. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to eliminate the prohibition against general solicitation as a requirement for a certain exemption under

Regulation D; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. QUAYLE (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. YODER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. DOLD):

H.R. 2941. A bill to make the internal control reporting and assessment requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 optional for certain smaller companies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. TERRY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. LUECKEMEYER, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 2942. A bill to direct the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers to revise the Missouri River Mainstem Reservoir System Master Water Control Manual to ensure greater storage capacity to prevent serious downstream flooding; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 2943. A bill to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through December 31, 2011; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 2944. A bill to provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH of Illinois:

H.R. 2945. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the indexing of certain assets for purposes of determining gain or loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2946. A bill to require that vessels used to engage in drilling for oil or gas in ocean waters that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States must be documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CRAVAACK:

H.R. 2947. A bill to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land conveyed by the United States in 1950 for the establishment of an airport in Cook County, Minnesota; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2948. A bill to provide assistance for the modernization, renovation, and repair of elementary and secondary school buildings in public school districts, as well as community colleges, across America in order to support the achievement of improved educational outcomes in those schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana (for himself, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BACA, Mr. BARROW, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr.

MICHAUD, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 2949. A bill to amend the Small Business Act with respect to goals for procurement contracts awarded to small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana (for himself, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BACA, Mr. BARROW, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 2950. A bill to amend the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 with respect to small business access to capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. PENCE, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. FLEMING):

H.R. 2951. A bill to intensify stem cell research showing evidence of substantial clinical benefit to patients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 2952. A bill to provide for expedited removal of certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 2953. A bill to require States to take certain additional steps to assist children in foster care in making the transition to independent living, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BROOKS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CHU, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLON, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of

Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 2954. A bill to improve the health of minority individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Budget, Veterans' Affairs, Armed Services, Agriculture, the Judiciary, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2955. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to clarify the requirement of the Department of Defense to procure footwear from American sources; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 2956. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for additional criteria for the United States Postal Service to consider with respect to closing or consolidating a post office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2957. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain elderly persons from demonstrating an understanding of the English language and the history, principles, and form of government of the United States as a requirement for naturalization, and to permit certain other elderly persons to take the history and government examination in a language of their choice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2958. A bill to provide a short-term disability insurance program for Federal employees for disabilities that are not work-related, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COLE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mrs. NOEM):

H.R. 2959. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deductibility of charitable contributions to agricultural research organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 2960. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes and diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POMPEO (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. YODER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. COLE, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia):

H.R. 2961. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to have Early Innovator grant funds returned by States apply towards deficit reduction; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NUNES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 2962. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the depreciation recovery period for energy-efficient cool roof systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2963. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide grants to eligible nonprofit organizations to provide specialized housing and social services to elderly individuals who are the primary caregiver of a child that is related to such individual; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YODER (for himself, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. FLORES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. LABRADOR):

H.R. 2964. A bill to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 to provide for regulatory impact analyses for certain rules, consideration of the least burdensome regulatory alternative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Rules, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United Nations or NATO should investigate the treatment of black Africans in Libya; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRJALVA (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H. Res. 400. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Hispanic-serving Institutions Week should be established, and commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H. Res. 401. A resolution observing the 20th anniversary of Ukrainian independence and expressing strong and continued support to the Ukrainian people for their efforts toward ensuring democratic principles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YODER (for himself, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. LABRADOR):

H. Res. 402. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Office of Management and Budget should direct all Federal agencies to postpone for one year the implementation of major rules; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2935.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 2936.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 2937.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 2938.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2939.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H.R. 2940.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. QUAYLE:

H.R. 2941.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2942.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 gives Congress the authority to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 2943.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2944.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALSH of Illinois:

H.R. 2945.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises..." Article I Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2946.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CRAVAACK:

H.R. 2947.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2948.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana:

H.R. 2949.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 3 "To regulate commerce among foreign nations and the several states."

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana:

H.R. 2950.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 3 "To regulate commerce among foreign nations and the several states."

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 2951.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 2952.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Article 1, Section 8 grants Congress the authority to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States and Clause 4 of Article 1, Section 8 states that Congress shall "establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization."

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2953.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 2954.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2955.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2956.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution regarding the power to "establish Post offices and Post Roads."

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2957.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, sec. 8, cl. 4 ("To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization"), and cl. 18

("To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.").

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2958.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2959.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 2960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. (Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers)

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 2961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 7, and Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. (Article I, Section 8, Clause 18)

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 2964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. DENT and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 25: Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 157: Mr. CASSIDY and Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 210: Mr. DOYLE and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 237: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 302: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 329: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 360: Mr. SCHILLING.
 H.R. 374: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 436: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 452: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 583: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 610: Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 667: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 676: Ms. SEWELL.
 H.R. 693: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 718: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BACA, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.
 H.R. 719: Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 721: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. DUFFY.
 H.R. 733: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 750: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H.R. 757: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 758: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 797: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 800: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 812: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 817: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 854: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 860: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GUTTEREZ, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 873: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 886: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 894: Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 935: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 973: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
 H.R. 1031: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1037: Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 1040: Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 1063: Mr. BACA, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. HEINRICH.
 H.R. 1103: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1116: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1155: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1167: Mr. GOWDY.
 H.R. 1171: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1206: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1219: Mr. PETERS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. LUJÁN.
 H.R. 1240: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 1244: Mr. OWENS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 1262: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1297: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1351: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 1418: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 1426: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 1434: Mr. BROOKS.
 H.R. 1451: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 1465: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 1506: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 1509: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BERG, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 1533: Ms. HOCHUL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 1537: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1546: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1633: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H.R. 1639: Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 1648: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 1653: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H.R. 1666: Mr. KILDEE and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1723: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1738: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1754: Mr. TONKO and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1755: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
 H.R. 1756: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 1780: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 1781: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 1803: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
 H.R. 1815: Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 1834: Mr. PITTS and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1867: Mr. ROSS of Florida.
 H.R. 1895: Mr. CASSIDY.
 H.R. 1897: Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H.R. 1905: Mr. DUFFY, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. WEST.
 H.R. 1946: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 2005: Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 2040: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 2059: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 2063: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 2086: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 2088: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 2106: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 2108: Mr. FLORES.
 H.R. 2123: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 2229: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 2245: Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 2250: Mr. FLAKE.
 H.R. 2256: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 2273: Mr. CAMP, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DENT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mrs. EMERSON.
 H.R. 2299: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
 H.R. 2341: Mr. HEINRICH and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 2353: Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 2362: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 2387: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. HULTGREN.
 H.R. 2401: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BONNER, and Mrs. EMERSON.
 H.R. 2404: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 2433: Mr. GUINTA and Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 2446: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 2447: Ms. FOX, Mr. WEBSTER, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H.R. 2459: Mr. HARPER and Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 2479: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 2481: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 2492: Mr. KILDEE and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 2500: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 2505: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 2513: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 2514: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. GUINTA.
 H.R. 2530: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 2563: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. GRIMM.
 H.R. 2600: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 2659: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 2675: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 2681: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mrs. EMERSON.
 H.R. 2698: Mr. DICKS and Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 2705: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 2752: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2774: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. FLEMING.
 H.R. 2796: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 2798: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 2799: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLAY, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 2800: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 2823: Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 2829: Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. FOX, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 2833: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 2835: Mr. RICHMOND and Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 2840: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 2847: Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 2852: Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 2856: Mr. REED.
 H.R. 2883: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. STARK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BERG, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 2885: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 2897: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H.R. 2898: Mr. RIGELL and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 2914: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 2919: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 2925: Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.J. Res. 69: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.J. Res. 73: Mr. QUAYLE.
 H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. TONKO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. BACA.
 H. Con. Res. 77: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
 H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. MORAN.
 H. Res. 137: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H. Res. 231: Mr. HONDA and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H. Res. 253: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. CALVERT.
 H. Res. 271: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H. Res. 298: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H. Res. 364: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. MARINO.
 H. Res. 394: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GAR-

RETT, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.J. Res. 79 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.J. Res 79, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2012, do not contain any congressional ear-

marks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1380: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mr. CRITZ on House Resolution 310: Allyson Y. Schwartz.

Petition 2 by Mr. GOHMERT on the bill H.R. 1297: John Campbell, Phil Gingrey, Joe Wilson, Howard Coble.