

party rather than the Democratic Party. Their actions speak louder than their words.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support as a family member from a strong union background. My father was a shop steward for the Teamsters and my mother was a proud worker for the United Rubber Workers, who worked tirelessly for 20 and 25 years. Without the health protection we received and the retirement benefits, I know myself and my seven siblings wouldn't be where we are today.

It is important for people to have the ability, especially in this day than a time, when new women, new immigrants, are coming about, and want to be part of the American fabric. One of the ways they can do that is by joining the union, being part of that, to have those protections in place.

When union people get paid good wages, that money stays in the community, it helps to provide a vibrant economy, it helps to also even send their children, like me, who is a child of immigrants and of a union household, to be able to come to college and to eventually even run for office. Wow. Outstanding.

The unions always get a bad name by certain people in this area, but I will tell you one thing: I am very proud to stand with many of our union members to see how they have revitalized many of our communities, especially in Los Angeles.

I ask for you to support H.R. 800.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this modified closed rule today. Although several worthy amendments were offered in the Rules Committee last evening, and I am grateful I will have the privilege to offer one here on this floor later on today, but only three were made in order, and three of those that were not made in order deserve special mention, I believe, here in this rules debate that we are having.

The first would be Representative MUSGRAVE's amendment to repeal those provisions that permit employers to require employees to join or pay dues or fees to a union as a condition of employment, that being the right to work amendment. I have long supported that language, going clear back into the seventies as an employer and a small business owner.

Secondly, Representative EMERSON and I both submitted separate amendments that would exempt businesses employing 50 individuals or less from the legislation.

Third, Representative CHABOT attempted to exempt small businesses by using the Small Business Administration definition.

I have spent my life in small business. I started one in 1975. I met payroll for over 28 years. That is over 1,400 consecutive weeks. I faced the regulations day by day by day, and one of the reasons I stepped into public life was to try to reduce the regulations that are so oppressive to small business.

One of the things that you will realize when you are a small business owner and entrepreneur is that you have to be an expert in all things. You can't have a whole floor of lawyers that are there to sort out all the regulations, and you surely cannot have union members that are in there that are there to organize your employees in a fashion that is unfair.

If you are a small business, and say you have 12 or 15 employees, and I actually saw this happen on a job where there were 18 heavy equipment operators back in the early '70s asked to vote on whether we would go union or not, and I know exactly how every single member of that crew voted today. I can name them. I can tell you how they voted. You know that in that kind of an environment.

We are here without a secret ballot. That is what is taken away from this. I hopefully will be able to offer a motion to recommit based upon that. But that is the Charlie Norwood language that needs to be considered here. There has got to be a secret ballot to protect small employers' employees, especially because the intimidation effect is far greater in a small company than it is in a large company. If I can remember over a period of 34 years how they voted on that vote back on that job in the interstate in Iowa City, then you will know every week how your colleagues are going to vote.

We need to respect the initiative of Charlie Norwood, our good friend. We need to protect small business. We need to exempt small businesses from this. We are not going to get that real debate on exempting small businesses here, Madam Speaker, and that is unfortunate.

I appreciate the fact that this process has been opened up some, but I do think if there is an idea that is good enough that you can present it and say this should be etched in stone for all of America, which this overall bill does, this card check bill, then we ought to at least have the courage of our convictions and debate those convictions here on the floor of the House of Representatives here in the United States Congress. A rule that doesn't allow that then is a rule that tells me the courage of your convictions really aren't there.

Ms. SUTTON. I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

Like many of my colleagues who we have heard from today, my family was built on good working class union jobs. My grandfather and great-grandfather worked at Fafnir Ball Bearing in New Britain, Connecticut, and I am, in some

sense, the product of that American dream, a dream in which my grandfather's daughter could be the first woman in her family to go to college, a dream in which his grandson could be standing here on the floor of the House of Representatives, fighting for what is right and what is fair in the workplace.

But, Madam Speaker, this disappearing middle-class has no lobby here in Washington, DC. They are not organized as a special interest. And maybe because of this, their interests haven't been very well represented on this floor in the past several years. But things are changing.

Workers who belong to unions on average earn 30 percent more than non-union workers. They are 63 percent more likely to have health care. They are four times more likely to have pension benefits. But unfortunately, over the years, the rights of these workers to join unions and to bargain collectively with their employers have eroded because of anti-union campaigns, employee intimidation and ineffective penalties for employers who violate worker rights.

Today, we are making standing up for what is right in the workplace a little easier, Madam Speaker. This isn't about making doing business more difficult; this is about strengthening the society in which families like mine were allowed to succeed.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from San Dimas, California (Mr. DREIER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, who argued very strenuously yesterday on behalf of the free enterprise system for America.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Dallas for his very able handling of this rule, and I congratulate my friend from Ohio as well.

Madam Speaker, I have to rise in strong opposition to this rule. We were yesterday on the House floor listening to the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Financial Services argue passionately in support of the need for an open amendment process and how great it is. And yet today we are given a rule that denies 12 of the 15 amendments that were submitted to us.

It is interesting, the bill yesterday that was controversial enough that we had an open rule for it passed by a vote of, I think 423 to zip, 423-0. There was no controversy whatsoever. We had three amendments that we voted on here. But it was an open rule.

Now we have a bill that is slightly controversial. In fact, it is extremely controversial. And yet we have closed down the amendment process, preventing Democrats and Republicans from having an opportunity to participate in this process, as they should.

We, Madam Speaker, when we proceeded with the Rules Committee