

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 any 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	Lofgren, 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
 McGovern Price (NC)
 McNerney Quigley
 Meeks Rahall
 Michaud Rangel
 Miller (NC) Reyes
 Miller, George Richardson
 Moore Richmond
 Moran Rothman (NJ)
 Murphy (CT) Roybal-Allard
 Napolitano Ryan (OH)
 Neal Sánchez, Linda
 Olver T.
 Owens Sanchez, Loretta
 Pallone Sarbanes
 Pascrell Schakowsky
 Pastor (AZ) Schiff
 Payne Schwartz
 Pelosi Scott (VA)
 Perlmutter Scott, David
 Peters Serrano
 Peterson Sewell
 Pingree (ME) Sherman

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 Stated against:
Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on rolcall 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 MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a letter received from Mr. Scott Gilles, Deputy Secretary of Elections, on behalf of Nevada Secretary of State, the Honorable Ross Miller, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held September 13, 2011, the Honorable Mark E. Amodei was elected Representative to Congress for the Second Congressional District, State of Nevada.

With best wishes, I am
 Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
 Clerk.

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,
 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 Ruppertsberger

□ 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