So I also think it is an important step that the Republican majority is starting to engage finally in this conversation. And I think, as America has the chance to look at the different plans that are out there, they will clearly see that there is a choice. They can choose the Republican majority plan, which really affirms the right of a patient to appeal to the health maintenance organization which denied them their coverage.

So I think that is an internal appeal which falls really on deaf ears. I am afraid that the majority plan does not have any real enforcement provisions and simply moves the appeal, if you will, internally within the HMO. And as I said earlier today, the denial of coverage would be moved up the management ladder to a more fancier waste paper basket.

Now if we take a look at the Democratic plan, the plan that has been out there for a number of months, what we see is the Democratic plan does provide for real enforcement of all the provisions of the HMO that the consumer pay for will be entitled to receive. It gives the patient the right to enforce all the provisions of their manage the care plan.

That is why we need the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights legislation. The Democratic proposal reaches beyond the quick fix that is put forth by the Republican majority, and the Democratic plan will give consumers a real power in dealing with their HMO and managed care plan.

And when we think about it, in managed care and HMOs, we have the insurance executives determining what their coverage will be or what they are going to pay for, what will be covered underneath the plan, what will not be covered.

Well, we Democrats happen to think that is wrong. We believe in a doctor-patient relationship, and that is why the American Medical Association and most of the medical and consumer groups have endorsed our plan. We believe, as Democrats, that the doctor and the patient should make the decision, not what is in the fiscal interests of the managed care plan.

Some of the other very positive aspects of the Democratic plan also makes for women, the OB/GYN can be your primary care physician; not a specialist, but could be your primary care physician and would be covered underneath your HMO. In the Democratic plan, when you have a true emergency, when you have an emergency, the closest emergency room, whether they come underneath that HMO or not, must treat you.

Of course, the enforcement that I have been speaking of, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) mentioned, gives you, the patient, the right to make the enforcement process, and if that enforcement process says that you are denied coverage, you have a right to then go into court and not sue the hospital or the doctor who are trying to give you the care, but sue the insurance executive that denied you the coverage for whatever treatment or specialist you may need.

What we try to do in the Democratic plan is put back medicine where it belongs, back with the doctor/patient. The decisions on your health care should be what is medically necessary to help you overcome your illness or disease, and that is where the doctor and the patient should make the decisions.

And in the Democratic plan, all specialists that are needed, that are medically necessary, are going to be covered underneath your managed care plan. Unfortunately, in the parts that we have seen of the Republican proposal, only some specialists are covered, not all of them.

We lift the gag rule. A doctor can say, well, you may need this CAT scan, and even though your plan does not pay for it, I can refer you outside your plan for this specialty. Right now, many doctors are forbidden, underneath the contract they have signed with the managed care plan, not to even make referrals outside the plan that would cost the plan more money. Therefore, there is what has always been called a gag rule on the physicians. That would be lifted.

So you can see, the Democratic plan, in fact, I am looking at the National Journal of Congress Daily of June 25, just before we broke, and the proposal was floated, GOP plan draws diverse criticism. Even those that are supporting the plan were criticizing the Republican proposal because it provides controversial proposals that would make it easier for small businesses to band together and would escape State benefit mandates, cap damages awards.

While you are trying to give the consumer more power, the Republican plan actually took the power away from the consumer, away from the medical profession.

So the Democrats, the insurers, the consumer groups and even the American Medical Association all happen to like H.R. 3605, which is the Patient's Bill of Rights put forth by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). I would hope each and every Member would take a chance, take a look at this bill and support us with this legislation.

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) is recognized for half the time until midnight, as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to advise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak in support of legislation that I have introduced, called the national right to work bill. This is a very short bill. In fact, I am very proud of the fact that it is on one piece of paper. That is the entire bill, but it is a very important bill regarding protecting the rights of all American citizens.

This legislation deals with the right of every individual in the country to decide for him or herself whether or not they want to join a labor union when they get a job or pay dues to a labor union.

The issue is one that stems from changes in the law made more than 60 years ago. Prior to that time, every American had the right to decide for themselves whether or not to join a labor union or pay dues to a union. That right was taken away by the National Labor Relations Act in 1935.

So this is not an issue of States rights. There are States today that have State right-to-work laws that are allowed under the Taft-Hartley Act which was adopted in 1948. This is legislation that deals with overturning specific provisions of Federal law to restore to individuals all across this country the right that they had prior to that time.

☐ 2310

Mr. Speaker, this Chamber has spent the better part of this session discussing the need to reform misguided and counterproductive federal laws. We have made great strides toward reforming the education and welfare systems by taking the federal bureaucracy out and returning the focus back to individuals. We have taken a great step towards scrapping the counterproductive Tax Code and allowing the American people to keep what they have earned and spend it as they see fit.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, this Chamber has remained almost silent on one of the most abusive intrusions on individual liberties ever enacted by Congress. The passage of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935, some 63 years ago, granted union officials a unique package of coercive powers and privileges at the expense of working Americans.

Foremost among these coercive powers granted to union officials are monopoly bargaining, the power to force workers to accept representation they disagree with, and compulsory unionism, the power to force independent workers to join or pay fees to unions as a condition of employment. Compulsory unionism and monopoly bargaining are contrary to the American tradition of individual liberty and allow a tiny elite of union officials to wield dictatorial power over millions of working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the National Labor Relations Act created a massive increase

in the federal government's regulation of and interference in labor relations. It is time for reform. The antidote to compulsory unionism is right to work, the principle that Americans must have the right, but not be compelled, to join or financially support a labor union.

That is why I have sponsored H.R. 59, the National Right to Work Act. H.R. 59 does not add one word to federal law, it simply removes the forced union dues provisions from the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act guaranteeing every American's right to work and decreasing Federal intervention of labor policy.

Thomas Jefferson said it best: To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.

This legislation is designed to cure that limitation on the rights of all Americans that Congress passed 63 years ago. Indeed, compulsory unionism blots the American tradition of individual liberty by stripping working Americans of their right to join, or not join, or financially support a labor union. This legislation in no way interferes with the right of individuals to form labor unions, to engage in collective bargaining, indeed to strike under current law. It simply gives the employees the right to decide for themselves whether or not they want to join.

By forcing independent employees to join or pay fees to a union, big labor officials have embraced collectivism based on coercion and have discarded individual liberty. And how did the defenders of compulsory unionism justify their beliefs? They do not. In fact, union officials and their allies, who support forced union dues, offer no apologies at all.

Robert Reich, former Secretary of Labor for President Clinton summed up the sentiments of big labor when he said: In order to maintain themselves, unions have to strap their members to the mast. The only way unions can exercise countervailing power is to hold their members' feet to the fire.

Mr. Speaker, that statement speaks for itself. It goes against the very values of the founders of the modern labor union movement.

And I point to this quote from Samuel Gompers: Union officials long ago abandoned the principles of Samuel Gompers, the grandfather of the American trade union movement and the founder of the American Federation of Labor who once said the workers of America adhere to voluntary institutions in preference to compulsory systems which are not only impractical, but a menace to their welfare and their liberty.

Mr. Speaker, compulsory systems are a menace to the workers' welfare and to their liberty. That is what the grandfather of the American trade union movement and founder of the American Federation of Labor thought of today's system. What a contrast. While Samuel Gompers spoke of the welfare and liberty of workers, today's union officials and their supporters are concerned with maintaining their power and strapping their members' to the mast.

Mr. Speaker, the American worker has the right to know where their elected representative in Congress stands on the issue of compulsion versus freedom. The American worker has the right to know whether their elected representative in Congress supports the liberty of workers or supports the government-endorsed policy of allowing union officials to strap their members to the mast and hold their feet to the fire.

It is clear where the American people stand. A poll conducted by Mason Dixon shows that 76 percent of all Americans support the individual rights of workers to decide for themselves, 76.6 percent support right to work, 17.1 percent support forced union dues, 6.3 percent had no opinion in that poll, and I might point out that the vast majority of members of labor unions in the United States support right to work. And why would they not? It increases their ability to assure that their union is responsive to their needs because, if they belong to a union and have the right to decide for themselves whether they are going to leave the union or remain a member of the union, pay dues to the union or not, that union leadership is going to be far more responsive to their needs and their concerns because they know that if they are not responsive to the needs of their members, those members can walk out, and that is the right that every American should have.

Just yesterday 500,000 petitions were delivered to the United States capital from right to work supporters across the country urging a vote on H.R. 59 this session. I urge my colleagues and the leadership to schedule a vote to free the independent-minded voters, and I urge a vote on H.R. 59, the National Right to Work Act.

At this time I am delighted that we have been joined by the majority whip of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) to speak on this important issue.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for bringing this special order. It is high time we started talking about these issues, particularly the issue of workers having the right to, the freedom, to pick whether they belong to a union or not. Compulsory unionism is an archaic concept that no longer belongs in the economy of the United States, and it is being exemplified, quite frankly, in what is going on in the strikes in Michigan where we have people in Texas who are being laid off because two different plants in Michigan have decided to strike and the plants in Texas have no right; a right-to-work State by the way, have no right to decide their fate when their fate is being decided by the union.

I just want to take just a minute, if the gentleman will allow me, to sort of relate what we are doing and what we have been doing for the last couple of weeks in campaign finance reform and how compulsory unionism affects people's right to participate in the political process. I am a co-sponsor of this Right to Work Act and would like, I personally would like, to see a floor vote on this legislation. Nobody, nobody questions the right of labor unions to participate in our democracy. We have all been targets of their advertising campaign, but so-called campaign reform legislation that has been authored by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) while restricting the first amendment rights of all Americans does not deal with the root issue. The root issue is compulsory unionism that we are trying to get at.

The authors of Shays-Meehan legislation like to claim that they have a provision in the bill, for instance, that codifies the Beck decision to protect union workers from compulsory unionism, having their dues taken from them and used in political activities that they may not agree with. What the authors of this bill fail to tell anyone is that the way they drafted this provision does not even apply to union workers, it applies to nonunion workers.

☐ 2320

In other words, in a compulsory union State that does not have right-to-work, one's dues is taken and used not only for collective bargaining practices, but they are also used for political activities, even if one does not agree with those political activities. How they disguise things all the time around here and will try to disguise what the gentleman is trying to do in bringing H.R. 59 to the floor is disguising it in such a way that says that we are going to protect workers' rights and freedoms to decide whether they are going to be involved in political activities or not, because we are going to codify a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States; but at the same time they say, one has to resign from the union in order to stop the union from using one's dues for political activities.

My question, number one, is what if one is in a compulsory union State and one loses their job if one resigns from the union? So what the gentleman is bringing to the attention of the American people and to this House is a bill that basically gives the right of workers back to them.

So, Mr. Speaker, this provision in Shays-Meehan is a fig leaf that comes woefully short of covering the problem. The root problem is forced union dues authorized by Federal law. It is this coercive power that allows union officials to funnel union dues into their political machines without the consent of their memberships. Shays-Meehan, by

amending the Labor Relations Act, will actually act to cement compulsory unionism in place while failing to eliminate the many problems facing America's working men and women, and for these reasons alone, Shays-Meehan deserves our opposition.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is more. The curious wording of those that want to protect compulsory unionism through even the Shays-Meehan campaign reform, so-called campaign reform, would even authorize union officials to charge for political activities related to collective bargaining, which union bosses contend is just about everything they do.

Now, this provision not only is a perversion of the Beck decision, but it ignores the Beck decision's holding that workers may object to any dues payment for any union activities not directly related to collective bargaining activities. So if this language was adopted, union officials would be able to force, force workers to pay 100 percent of their dues to the unions.

So the language that the pro-union people are trying to put forward, for all practical purposes, destroys existing legal procedures that provide protection, albeit minimal protection, to workers who must pay union dues to work, must pay union dues to work. In other words, under this bill, these sponsors, whether intentional or not, would actually enlarge the scope of expenses that union officials could charge workers, and for independent-minded workers, passage of the Shays-Meehan proposal is clearly a step backward and a major victory for big labor.

Only this bill, H.R. 59, would return a basic right to millions of Americans, a right that they should never have lost in the first place. The American worker deserves more than just the right not to be forced to pay for political policies that they disagree with, they deserve the right not to be forced to pay dues or fees to a labor union just to keep or just to get a job.

We are in America. If the unions of America are viable representatives of the workers of America, then they ought to be able to compete in the marketplace just like anybody else, and they should not have to have laws on the books that forces someone that may disagree with their practices to belong to that union to keep or get their job. That is what H.R. 59 is all about. It is giving freedom back to Americans when it has been taken away from them.

I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his participation.

The gentleman is exactly correct with regard to what this is all about. Both political parties claim Thomas Jefferson and much of his philosophy as a part of their historic tradition, and certainly I from Virginia am very proud of Thomas Jefferson. He said it best: ''To compel a man,'' and of course today we mean men and women, but ''to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical,'' and that is what we are faced with in this country for the last 63 years because of legislation passed a long time ago that is outdated, certainly not in step with the vast majority of the American people who support right-to-work, and we need to pass this legislation.

I am pleased that we have been joined now by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), and we welcome him to this discussion.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia and our distinguished majority whip for taking time on the floor tonight, Mr. Speaker, to discuss this vital issue. I am proud to stand strongly and foursquare in support of one of America's most fundamental rights: The right to work.

Mr. Speaker, Arizona's favorite son recently passed, and Barry Goldwater's memory has been extolled by members of both major political parties and many others on the scene. Indeed, tonight I am reminded that Barry Goldwater, Jr., the former Congressman from California, who returned to his native State of Arizona, and now, I am pleased to say, a very good personal friend of mine, that on this date, Barry Goldwater, Jr., celebrates an important birthday. But I must say, in all sincerity, the plain-spoken, commonsensical ways of Barry Goldwater, Sr. were brought to bear in this fight, in this endeavor as Arizona clearly and unequivocally is a right-to-work State.

Said Senator Goldwater, quoting now, ''I believe people have a right to join a union, but I also believe people have a right not to join a union.'' And that simple two-sentence statement sums it up.

In this Nation we have rights to freely associate. How then could this government move to abridge those rights in the 1930s? It is sad, but truly a part of our history, that there have been times when certain factions have moved to consolidate political power in the attempt to ensure a permanent majority and abridge the rights of American citizens.

So tonight I remember the simple eloquence of Barry Goldwater, Sr., extolling the virtues of that basic fundamental American freedom, not to the detriment of unions or the collective bargaining process, which as my colleague from Virginia pointed out was summed up in the message of one of the great leaders of the American Federation of Labor, Samuel Gompers, to talk about voluntary institutions and how it was preferred that voluntary institutions would work far better than compulsory systems. Indeed, as my colleague from Virginia pointed out earlier in this time, Gompers said those compulsory systems are not only impractical, but a menace to their welfare and to their liberty.

☐ 2330

I am struck by the words of another who served at the other end of Pennsylvania avenue, and who went to foreign soil a decade ago. President Ronald Wilson Reagan stood clearly and boldly, square in the jaws of tyranny, and challenged the leader of the then Soviet Union to tear down a wall that came to symbolize oppression.

Mr. Gorbachev said, President Reagan, tear down this wall. And, Mr. Speaker, tonight, to my colleagues, to those who found it so seductive to strip Americans of a basic freedom of association, and thereby build a wall of compulsory coercive unionism, to them we say, in the best traditions of freedom, Mr. Speaker, tear down this wall, tear down this wall of compulsory unionism, tear down the wall that Thomas Jefferson would call sinful and tyrannical, because it moves to abridge the very basic rights of freedom of association. It moves through coercion and through compulsory status to extinguish the freedoms of association, and it moves against the basic fabric of American society.

Hear clearly what I say. I heard it from constituents in the Sixth District of Arizona, given the fact that we champion in this country political discourse, and give and take, and a free, open debate.

Mr. Speaker, and those who join us electronically far beyond these walls, I cannot tell Members the number of times union members in Arizona would come to me and say, I support you, but to keep my seat at the bargaining table, even though we live in a right-to-work State, to avoid retribution I must support you silently.

What does that say about those in our society who would have moved to abridge this most basic right? It certainly calls not upon the best traditions American history has to offer, and yet, tonight, this is that fundamental choice. That is why we are pleased to rise in favor of the right to work.

That is why I am pleased that Arizona, not only in the alphabet, beginning with A, leads the way, but Arizona shows the way, the youngest of the 48 contiguous States, and yet at the forefront of championing the rights of workers to freely associate with different groups.

I am pleased that every one of my colleagues on the majority side from Arizona joined me in sponsorship of the legislation offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Of course, there are other practical means beyond the most practical and basic notion of freedom that commend this act. The simple notion of prosperity is also commended. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) is well aware of the academic labors at George Mason University and the scholar there, James T. Bennett, where, in his study of a higher standard of living in right-to-work States, he illustrates how families in States like Arizona

enjoy a higher standard of living than families who hail from States with compulsory unionism.

According to the study of Mr. Bennett, the cost of living in the 21 right-to-work States is nearly 25 percent less than in the 29 compulsory unionism States. Families in right-to-work States also have lower State and local tax burdens than compulsory unionism State families. It is what the scholar calls a right-to-work boom.

The average urban family living in a right-to-work State has an after-tax cost-of-living adjusted household income of $36,540 dollars, almost $3,000 more than a family in a forced unionism State, because of the principle of the free market working, where people can freely associate and have work and not artificially inflated prices, either in the public sector, through public works, or in private works.

These are the fruits of honest labor, and this is what we come to the floor to extoll, not in the fashion of a green eyeshade, but again, evoking the best of American traditions; again, evoking the words and the memories of those who have gone on before.

Lest anyone mistake this as a harangue against any one political party or the current liberal minority, I will not only call on the memory of Arizona's favorite son and the standard-bearer of my party in 1964, but I would call upon the memory of another great member of the other body, the gentleman from North Carolina, Senator Sam Irvin.

In his book entitled ''Preserving the Constitution,'' Senator Irvin wrote, quoting now, ''Right-to-work States remove the motive of the union to subordinate the interests of the employees to its wishes, and thus leaves it free to conduct negotiations for the sole purpose of obtaining an employment contract advantageous to the employees.''

So we can see even from that observation that one from the other side of the aisle, if you will, talked about the true nature of collective bargaining, the essence of collective bargaining, not the intervention in other areas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). The time of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has expired. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK) is not on the floor. Does the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) wish to claim the remaining time until midnight?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, we would claim the rest of the time until midnight, because we do have some additional matters.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Virginia, and I thank the Speaker pro tempore, the gentleman from Maryland, who manages the proceedings of the House in a manner that behooves bipartisanship, as I call it, in the bipartisan fashion of the writings of Senator Sam Irvin and what he had to say about the true notion of negotiation; not all the other trappings and all the compulsory addenda to what is the central mission of the labor-management dynamic, but to concentrate on what is really important.

It is a sad fact, as my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, will attest, that even now there are those at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue what would look to limit the choices even of this Federal Government. When it comes to competitive bidding, there are those in this administration who have said that competitive bidding should be open only to union shops.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to stop and think about that for just a second. In addition, again, to abridging, to segregating the choices available in the work force, what would happen there to carry that scenario to fruition would mean billions upon billions of dollars of extra costs to the American taxpayer; indeed, the most conservative estimate I have seen is some $5 billion in additional spending by the taxpayers, simply to assuage the notion of those who would even move in a greater way to force compulsory unionism past the membership, already subverting the notion of free association, but to the point where this government could not contract with non-union shops.

Mr. Speaker, I will work and fight to maintain the rights of all companies to freely bid, because in that way, in that way the best interests of the taxpayers are preserved, and in that way the best interests of this country is preserved.

Yet, my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, brings it to the most simple and elemental fact here, because it deals with freedom of the individual, because it deals with the clear, simple notion that we in this Congress should undo the unfair power grab of those who succumbed to temptation in the middle part of the 1930s; that we in fact should stand, as we are poised for a new century, to reemphasize the most basic of freedoms: freedom of association, freedom in the marketplace, freedom for families, freedom from fear, and freedom to work; indeed, the right to work for all Americans for all time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I think he is particularly correct in pointing out that Arizona and Virginia have led the way with right-to-work laws, as allowed under an exception to the Federal law that was created some time after the right was taken away from all Americans to have right-to-work.

It is important to note that this is not a States' rights issue. I would point out to the gentleman, this entire bill, and we complain about bills that are thousands of pages long, this bill is on one piece of paper.

□ 2340

All it does is repeal provisions of Federal law that took away the most precious liberty that an individual can have, and that is the right to decide for themselves what they are going to do with their life, whether when they get a job, they are going to be required to pay dues or belong to something that they may or may not believe in. And we take nothing away from those who want to join labor unions, this does not affect that in any way, to organize, to collectively bargain or even strike as permitted under law.

I would like to point out that we have a number of press clippings that under the unanimous consent order previously given we would like to make a part of the RECORD. And before I do so, I would like to read from one of those from the Chattanooga Free Press of Chattanooga, Tennessee which wrote:

One of the most basic human rights that most assuredly should be protected in America is the right of men and women to work and earn a living for themselves and their families without being forced to join or pay tribute to anyone or anything. If an American can be denied the right to work, what liberty remains? Yet in all but 21 of our States that have right to work laws, American citizens can be forced to join and pay dues to a labor union against their will or be denied jobs or be fired. That obviously is utterly wrong.

Part of American freedom includes the right of workers to join unions voluntarily and to pay dues to them voluntarily. But tyranny prevails if they are forced to join a union or any other organization and pay it involuntarily or be denied the right to earn self-support.

We need a national right to work law. It is as simple as that. No one would tolerate a situation in which any American would have to join a certain church to work or join a certain lodge or fraternal group to work. Why tolerate forced union membership to work? Until a national right to work act is passed, the basic philosophy of our Declaration of Independence and Constitution of the United States is being denied American citizens. This should not be allowed to continue.

Does the gentleman have any additional remarks?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I just was struck by the eloquence of my colleague from Virginia, and I think, again, he has pointed out quite correctly, but it bears some repeating, because we all realize sadly that there are those who would attempt to deliberately misunderstand or distort the message we offer tonight. Again, the message we offer is in the finest tradition of freedom and individual self-determination.

As my colleague from Virginia points out, this is not an attempt to eliminate unions. This is not an attempt to destroy collective bargaining. This is not an attempt to end anyone's right to strike. Those rights exist in a free society and will be maintained. But what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, simply,

clearly and we believe ultimately persuasively to the American people is the fact that we want people to have the right to decide for themselves when it comes to economic association, when it comes to making determinations about their economic future and freedom, and how wrong it is to predicate the acceptance of a job on compulsory membership in a union.

Again, the quarrel is not with those who would voluntarily join such an union. That is the right of an American. But, again, we reaffirm that right in its true essence by saying, if you want to belong to a union, well and good. Join, be involved in that process. If you want to be involved politically in that union and have a portion of your earnings secured through some mechanism for union dues ultimately to go to political expression, God bless you, you should have that right. But just because you have that right does not mean you should abridge the rights of others and in some way step in and subvert their abilities, A, either to join the union or choose not to join the union or, B, once a member of the union, coercively force them to surrender a portion of their paycheck and union dues to go to political activities with which they may disagree.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that those union dues collected and used to influence policy that individuals who are members of a union may not agree with or to influence political campaigns for candidates that they may not support, that money is used all over the country. Even if you are in a right-to-work State, you are affected by forced compulsory unionism in other States. That is why we need to have a national right to work law.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Indeed, as my colleague from Virginia accurately points out, in having lived through the experience firsthand in 1996, as the number one target of boss John Sweeney and the other union bosses of the AFL-CIO, who took from their membership compulsory union dues used for the committee on political education, I can tell you, one of the real tragedies from my vantage point was not the give and take and the rough and tumble of public discourse because, as Abraham Lincoln said, the American people, once fully informed, will make the right decision. And I trust the people. No, the tragedy was this, Mr. Speaker, that that longshoreman in Maryland, or that lettuce picker in California or that assembly line worker in Michigan who knew nothing of the political dynamics of the sixth district of Arizona, who had no direct stake in the political expression of the people of the sixth district of Arizona, yet found their wages against their will imported to the State of Arizona to the tune of $2.1 million for false television ads distorting my record. And we will see that, I dare say, again as we receive reports around the country that the same activity continues.

Again, let us stress, free and open debate is fine. If people voluntarily give of their wages, that is a time-honored tradition in the Constitution. That is something we freely welcome, freedom of speech, freedom of association.

But when that crosses to compulsory, coercive, accumulations of wealth by the labor bosses against the will of the very working people they purport to help, how sad and how cynical. And again, Mr. Speaker, amidst all the talk of campaign finance reform, there is this one fact that comes from 1996. In a Rutgers University study, it is well documented that despite the reports of some $35 million used in an effort to influence congressional elections, the actual figures, according to the Rutgers University study were these. Between 300 million and a half a billion dollars was taken coercively from members of unions to go into political campaigns in an attempt to change control in this Congress.

How much better for our constitutional Republic had all those donations been freely given and freely accepted. How much better for the rights of workers would it be if they had the opportunity to express this most basic of freedoms, the right to associate and, indeed, the right to work regardless of the encumbrances of those who would compel them into associations with which they might disagree.

This is something that must change for freedom in its truest form to flourish, so that the give and take can be genuine, not coercive and for those who would stand for true reform to end the practice or the threat of this constitutional Republic, as some would say, being sold to the highest bidder. That is what is at stake every 2 years in our renewal and celebration of freedom at the ballot box expressed in this institution, the most basic, the most responsive designed by our founders to be a constitutional office absolutely beholden to the people. How much better it would be if the people were free to truly express their opinions, their free associations without the specter of intimidation or the specter of economic ruin for failing to belong to an organization.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his participation. I would point out that just yesterday petitions signed by more than half a million American citizens were delivered here at the Capitol from right to work supporters all across the country, urging a vote on this important legislation.

I urge my colleagues in the leadership to schedule a vote to free independent-minded workers who wish to choose for themselves whether or not to belong to a labor union or pay dues to a labor union. Let them decide for themselves by passing into law the National Right to Work Act. I hope we have the opportunity to vote on this legislation soon.

I thank the gentleman again for his participation and the majority whip the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DeLay).

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this important issue. I am pleased to have this opportunity to reiterate my strong support for the National Right to Work Act, HR 59. Unlike much of the legislation considered before this Congress, this bill expands freedom by repealing those sections of federal law that authorize compulsory unionism, laws that Congress had no constitutional authority to enact in the first place!

Since the problem of compulsory unionism was created by Congress, only Congress can solve it. While state Right to Work laws provide some modicum of worker freedom, they do not cover millions of workers on federal enclaves, in the transportation industries, or on Indian Reservations. Contrary to the claims of Right to Work opponents, this bill in no way infringes on state autonomy. I would remind my colleagues that, prior to the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, no state had a law requiring workers to join a union or pay union dues. Compulsory unionism was forced on the people and the states when Congress nationalized labor policy in 1935. It strains logic to suggest that repeal of any federal law is somehow a violation of states' rights.

I would also like to take this opportunity to emphasize that this bill does not in any way infringe on the rights of workers to voluntary join or support a labor union or any other labor organization. Nothing in HR 59 interferes with the ability of a worker to organize, strike, or support union political activity if those actions stem from a worker's choice. Furthermore, nothing in HR 59 interferes with the internal affairs of unions. All the National Right to Work Bill does is stop the federal government from forcing a worker to support a labor union against that worker's will. In a free society, the decision of whether or not to join a union should be made by the worker, not by the government.

No wonder the overwhelming majority of the American people support the National Right to Work Act, as shown both by polling results and by the many postcards and petitions my office has received asking for Congressional action on this bill.

I once again thank the gentleman from Virginia for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson said, ''To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions in which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.''

The House of Representatives has an opportunity to hold a historic vote on legislation to repeal those provisions of Federal law which require employees to pay union dues or fees as a condition of employment. This vote is long overdue for the working men and women of this country.

Nearly 80% of Americans share in the belief that compulsory unionism violates a fundamental principle of individual liberty, the very principle upon which this Nation was founded.

Compulsory unionism basically says that workers cannot and should not decide for themselves what is in their best interest, that they need a union boss to decide for them. I can think of nothing more offensive to our core founding principles which we celebrated on the Fourth of July, a few days ago, than that principle that the working people of this country do not have the ability to decide for themselves.

With this bill, not a single word is added to Federal law. It simply repeals those sections of the National Labor Relations Act and Railway Labor Act that authorizes the imposition of forced-dues contracts upon working Americans. It simply does away with the requirement that people have to belong to a union to hold a job.

I believe that every worker must have the right to join and financially support a labor union if that is what they want to do. Every worker should have the right, of his own free will and accord, but he should not be coerced to pay union dues just to keep his job. This bill simply protects that right, and no worker would ever be forced into union membership without his consent.

Union membership should be a choice that an individual makes based upon merits and benefits offered by the union. If a union truly benefits its members, they do not have to coerce them. If workers had confidence in the union leadership, if the union leadership was honest, upright, and forthright, then they would not need to coerce their members to join. A union freely held together by common interests and desires of those who voluntarily want to be members would be a better union than one in which members were forced to join. If the National Right to Work Act is passed, nothing in Federal law will stop workers from joining a union, participating in union activity, and paying union dues.

Union officials who operate their organizations in a truly representative, honest, democratic manner would find their ranks growing with volunteer members who are attracted by service, benefits, and mutual interests, not because they are forced against their will with no options to be a member of a union and pay union fees in order to hold a job. In addition, voluntary union members would be more enthusiastic about union membership simply because they had the freedom to join and were not forced into it.

When Federal laws authorizing compulsory unionism are overturned, only then will working men and women be free to exercise fully their right to work. When that time comes, they will have the freedom to choose whether they want to accept or reject union representation and union dues without facing coercion, violence, and workplace harassment by overbearing, and in many cases, disreputable union bosses.

A poll taken in 1995 indicates 8 out of 10 Americans oppose compulsory unionism—8 out of 10 Americans do not think you should be forced to belong to a union to hold a job.

Mr. Speaker, some members of this Chamber will say that this is a states rights issue and since law allows states to pass Right to Work Laws there is not need for this legislation.

Nothing could be further than the truth. First of all, Federal Law is the source of compulsory union. But more than that Mr. Speaker, Right to Work is about freedom.

No governmental authority should endorse the right of a private organization to force working men and women to pay dues or fees as a condition of employment.

Compulsory unionism is wrong on the federal level, compulsory unionism is wrong on the state level and compulsory unionism is wrong on the local level.

In the words of Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson ''The very purpose of the Bill of Rights is to place certain subjects beyond the reach of the majority . . . ones fundamental rights wait for no election, they depend on no vote.''

It is my sincere hope that my colleagues will join me in defending the fundamental individual liberty of the right to work and will support this bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted to:

Mr. HILL (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 4 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 7:30 p.m. on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CONYERS, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRICKLAND, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WILSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, July 16, for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. KIND.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

Mr. FROST.

Mrs. CAPPS.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. DOYLE.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. FAZIO of California.

Mr. FILNER.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WILSON) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. PORTMAN.

Mr. OXLEY.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. RIGGS.

Mr. PAUL.

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. COBLE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODLATTE) and to include extraneous material:)

Ms. STABENOW.

Mr. BALDACCI.

Mr. SMITH of Texas.

Mr. PARKER.

Mr. RIGGS.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. HILLEARY.

Mr. BONILLA.

Mr. UPTON.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1998

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2069. To permit the mineral leasing of Indian land located within the Fort Berthold Indian reservation in any case in which there is consent from a majority interest in the parcel of land under consideration for lease.

□ 2350

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 16, 1998, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9974. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Peanuts Marketed in the United States; Relaxation of Handling Regulations [Docket Nos. FV97–997–1 FIR and FV97–998–1 FIR] received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9975. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of User Fees for 1998 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [CN–98–004] received June 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9976. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final