

it, it is a path that is delivering on its promises.

I don't believe I have any further speakers, so at this time I just want to reiterate that we've been here for almost 5 months. Nothing that has come to this floor has created jobs. Communities like mine and communities that most of my colleagues represent in this body still have high unemployment. There are no jobs. We need to continue to provide unemployment insurance. We need to work to begin to create the jobs that the people of America need.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss Democratic initiatives for creating jobs and rebuilding the economy.

While Republicans were busy voting to end Medicare in order to give more tax breaks to big oil, they forgot one important task—job creation.

With the fragile economy just beginning to recover, Americans cannot afford the Republicans' reckless "So Be It" attitude toward job creation.

Their failure to propose a single jobs bill after more than four months in the majority is alarming and is indicative of a general lack of concern for the needs of our constituents.

Under the Obama administration, almost 2 million jobs have been created over the last 15 months.

The 244,000 total jobs added last month is the largest in nearly a year, with broad-based gains in retail trade, manufacturing, health care, leisure and hospitality, and professional and business services.

While this is an impressive feat, we need to dig deeper in order to replace the 8 million jobs that we lost during the Bush Administration.

The African American community continues to bear the brunt of the unemployment crisis; close to 16 percent of African Americans are out of work and still looking for jobs.

In some cities, African American unemployment rates have hit Depression levels. This is unacceptable.

The American people have spoken and Democrats are listening; job creation is the key to economic recovery and growth.

Democrats' "Make It in America" agenda is a powerful initiative based on the conviction that when more products are made in America, more families will be able to make it in America.

This comprehensive domestic manufacturing strategy is about investing in innovation and clean energy, helping our small businesses and workers compete, rebuilding America, and keeping jobs here at home.

For example, the Make It in America Block Grant Act establishes a grant program at the Commerce Department to provide small to medium-sized businesses, in communities hardest hit by unemployment, with the resources and strategies they need to transition to the manufacturing of clean energy, high technology, and advanced products.

Equally promising is the Job Opportunities Between Our Shores Act, which establishes a Workforce Investment Act pilot program to provide education and training programs in advanced manufacturing.

These bills, along with other Democratic initiatives, prove that Democrats are listening to the American people as they continue to ask, "Where are the jobs?"

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

THE GREAT STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, BOEING, AND THE NLRB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, last week, of course, we were in our respective districts, which means I was home in my beloved State of South Carolina. And while the bulk of that time was spent in the upstate, in Greenville, Spartanburg, and Union Counties, South Carolina is such a small State with a deep and rich tie throughout the various regions of the State that, even in a course of 1 week, Mr. Speaker, I was able to go to all six congressional districts in South Carolina at one point or another.

South Carolina is full of natural beauty, from the mountains of the upstate to the beaches of our coastal region. South Carolina is home to hard-working, loyal, kindhearted and resilient people. We have wonderful schools, a world-class port, vibrant research universities, and highly regarded hospitals and medical centers. We have a depth and breadth of assets throughout the State of South Carolina, as well as the small businesses that are the backbone of this country and this economy.

Mr. Speaker, South Carolina is among the first States to help other States when calamity strikes. We have a rich history of fighting and sacrificing, indeed, dying for this country. We are proud and brave, and we are not easily intimidated, which brings me to the National Labor Relations Board and its recent interactions with the State of South Carolina.

At a time when union membership is at a historic low, unions seek to influence this administration in a historically high fashion. At a time when this Nation needs to come together and face the great challenges of our time, there are those in this administration who seek to benefit from the politics of class, generational and, now, regional conflict: from a Secretary of Health and Human Services who claims that our colleague's, PAUL RYAN's, efforts to reform Medicare would cause seniors to die sooner when it is a demonstrably false statement, indeed, an abomination to say something so overtly political about a courageous colleague who has the foresight to try to save Medicare, from that to the NLRB and its general counsel and their efforts to intimidate the State of South Carolina, not once, but twice, with threatened lawsuits and now a complaint when a company decides to put an additional line of work in the great State of South Carolina.

Boeing decided to build some of its new 787 Dreamliners in South Carolina.

And nearly a year, Mr. Speaker, after the decision was made and construction had begun and, in some instances, been completed, after South Carolina workers received the good news that jobs were finally headed our way, the National Labor Relations Board decided to file a complaint. And it's important to keep in mind what is not at issue. There is no merit to the contention that Boeing did not negotiate in good faith with the union over the placement of a second line of work in South Carolina. No one seriously contends that. And, incredibly, there is no evidence that existing jobs will move from Washington State to South Carolina.

Instead, the NLRB seeks to tell companies where it can and cannot build additional lines of work. Let that sink in for a moment. The National Labor Relations Board seeks to tell a company where it can and cannot build additional lines of work. So be forewarned: If you build a plant or a facility in a union State, there is the prospect that you will never be able to leave again if the NLRB has its way. And the law was clear, indeed, it is crystal clear: Employers are permitted to make predictions on future economic circumstances so long as the circumstances are demonstrably predictable.

So is it predictable that there would be labor shortages and stoppages in Washington State? Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been four strikes since 1989 in the Washington State facility for Boeing, all of which support the movement of the entire 787 production line to South Carolina. But that's not what Boeing is doing. And I would commend, Mr. Speaker, the reading of the comments by a Boeing customer who said that the continued threatened work stoppages are causing it to reconsider whether or not it wants to do business with Boeing, and yet Boeing is not supposed to consider that when they decide where to build additional lines of work.

Indeed, make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, there will be two planes made in Washington State for every one plane made in South Carolina. But that is not enough for this administration. They want to control where businesses can locate, what they can make, and how much of it they can make.

I want you to consider, Mr. Speaker, the comments of the NLRB spokesperson, and I quote: We are not telling Boeing they cannot make planes in South Carolina. We are talking about one specific line of work, three planes a month. If they keep three planes a month in Washington, there is no problem.

Really? The National Labor Relations Board is going to tell Boeing how many planes it can make and in what State and what constitutes a problem and what doesn't constitute a problem? To my colleagues from the South Carolina delegation who have labeled this an unprecedented act, they are entirely correct.

So what it appears now, Mr. Speaker, is that this administration and the National Labor Relations Board will elevate the unions to the same status as the employer; that all future decisions have to be made in concert; and if the unions object to a line of work that is separate and distinct, they can move to a right-to-work State like South Carolina, it cannot be done.

Mr. Speaker, I have been joined by my distinguished colleague from the Fifth Congressional District, Mr. MULVANEY, and I would seek to yield such time as my colleague may consume.

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank my colleague, Mr. GOWDY. His words are well considered and well made and I think bear out the decision of the people of his district to send him to Washington. This is perhaps the first real challenge we have faced together as a team here in Washington, and I'm proud to be a member of this team as we take on perhaps the critical issue of our day and our State when it comes to economic development and job growth.

I want to do something that we are not very good at in South Carolina when it comes to these types of issues. I want to speak bluntly. Ordinarily, we don't talk about uncomfortable things in our State very bluntly. We are more southerly and gentlemanly about it than I'm going to be for the next few minutes. But I feel compelled to do that by the circumstances that face us. I want to talk very briefly about what this says about the current administration's attitude towards business. And then I want to talk very briefly about why people, not only in South Carolina, but people all over this country, should be concerned with this lawsuit against Boeing by the NLRB.

Regarding the administration's attitude towards business, I talked several times when I was running for this office with folks in my district about another issue at that time. It was cap-and-trade. And I remember coming across an employer in my district who I never thought would be in favor of that particular piece of legislation but who had signed on and actually contributed financially toward advancing that particular initiative. I remember talking to them and asking them why this was, why were they doing something that was so clearly against their self-interest. And they told me that it had been made very plain to them that if they did not get on board that they would have a visit from the EPA, and wasn't it much better for them to participate in the cap-and-trade legislation than it was to get run over and visited by the EPA, to have someone come down and bring down the full regulatory authority of the government on you without any recourse whatsoever. Wouldn't you rather be sitting at the table to design part of your own demise rather than having it dealt fully in your face by the regulatory arm of the administration?

□ 2010

It frightened me to death. It frightened me to death that that is what we had come to in this Nation. I call, and I still do, I call it to this day, and I know this frustrates people and bothers people when I call it this, it is government by Mafia. It really is. It is like walking into an office going: Wow, it would be a real shame if this place burned down tomorrow. Why don't you give us a little money to help us in our cause, and we will make sure nothing happens to you. It frightens me and it disgusts me that this is the way the government treats its own people.

I can't help but think of that example as I sit here and look at what the NRLB is doing these days. To come to the Boeing company and admit, and you can go and read what the NRLB says, admit that they have done nothing wrong, admit that Boeing has done nothing wrong in any of its statements, but still taking the position that they have the basis for bringing a lawsuit against this company in order to do nothing else but to shake it down.

My colleague, Mr. Speaker, mentioned the other shoe to drop when the NLRB came forward through its spokesman and said: Listen, you know, this whole thing could just go away if Boeing would agree to build three more airplanes every single month in Washington State.

That is what this is about. It is about using leverage. It is about using muscle. It is about pushing around a private business simply because you can, and it is absolutely and positively wrong for our government to be doing this to its own citizens. That is exactly what is happening. They are walking into Boeing and saying: Boy, it would be a real shame if we shut you down in South Carolina; wouldn't it? You can make that not happen. You have it in your ability to make sure that this terrible thing doesn't happen to you. All you have to do is agree to produce an additional three planes in Washington State. What a travesty. What a complete insult to what this Nation stands for.

That brings me to my second point, which is why should ordinary people care about this. Is this just an issue that the State of South Carolina cares about? Is it just an issue that the Boeing Corporation should care about? Is it just an issue that businesses should care about? Absolutely not. Absolutely not. This is an issue that every single working person in this country should be scared to death of because the day that the government can tell business where it can operate, which is what the NLRB is trying to do in this lawsuit, the day that the government can tell businesses where they can operate is the day before it can tell you where you can go to work.

And if Boeing is not free to leave Seattle, Washington, and move to North Charleston in South Carolina, then the next day, you might not be free to do the same thing. It violates everything

that we stand for. It violates everything that makes this country exceptional. It brings up frightening thoughts of what has happened in other countries in the past. It is wrong, Mr. Speaker. It must stop now. We will do everything that we can in this delegation to prevent it from happening. And, more importantly, we will be ever diligent to make sure that after this one is put to bed, and after this NLRB lawsuit is exposed for the fraud that it is, we will be ever diligent to make sure that it never happens again in this country.

Mr. GOWDY. While my colleague was talking so eloquently in defense of freedom, not in defense of South Carolina, but in defense of freedom and the freedom to pursue the free market, something as fundamental as that, we have been joined by our colleague from South Carolina, Congressman JEFF DUNCAN, and I would yield him such time as he may consume on this issue and any other issue on his heart.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. First, I thank my colleagues for taking this time to talk about an issue that—I cannot believe we are even having this discussion. We have seen a lot since we have been here in Washington on January 5, but I never thought that I would see the day when the NLRB and our government would sue a company over creating jobs in South Carolina. I may have experienced that in another country, say the Soviet Union back in the eighties, but to think that we have got a government here in America that is suing a company for making a business decision, a decision that would affect their bottom line, to go where their labor costs are cheaper, to come to a great State like South Carolina and locate in a wonderful city like North Charleston where they were already operating an operation that made the fuselages. This was a decision not to locate a whole other operation, but to bring the rest of the components to South Carolina, to assemble the complete aircraft there. And since they made that decision to come to South Carolina, they have added an additional 2,000 jobs in the State of Washington. And so for the NLRB to say that Boeing made a decision to punish a union in Washington is ludicrous. It is ludicrous.

Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli said that NLRB's action against Boeing is a threat to every right-to-work State. And I agree with him because if this suit is successful against Boeing, we are not going to have the conversation in this country about whether a business is going to locate in a right-to-work State or a union State. The conversation is going to turn, Mr. GOWDY, to a conversation about whether to locate in America or to locate that operation overseas. That ought to scare every one of us, not just those in the right-to-work State, but every American who understands capitalism, who understands that government doesn't create jobs, businesses do.

Looking at the NLRB's decision and examining the recent electoral map, it

is not difficult to see a policy that clearly rewards blue States while severely punishing red ones. South Carolina is a red State, and we are proud of that fact. We shouldn't be punished for Boeing locating in South Carolina. And this is the second attempt by NLRB to punish South Carolina.

Right before this, they decided to sue South Carolina, South Dakota, Arizona, and Utah over the right to a secret ballot. Back in November, Mr. Speaker, 80 percent of South Carolinians voted in a referendum that we liked the right to a secret ballot when it comes to union elections, that we don't want card check, a method where union bosses can come to employees and say: You know, we really want to unionize here, and we would love to have your name, and through fear and intimidation get them to agree to go along and unionize after a majority of those people in that business have said, under intimidation usually, that they would go along with the union. We like the right to a secret ballot, that free Americans can go into the voting booth, whether it is at a union or anywhere else, and cast a ballot in secret without fear of intimidation, go in there and cast a vote on how they feel on whether they want to collectively bargain, whether they want to unionize, or whether they like the right to come to work and negotiate with their employer for their best interest and for the best interest of the company, for the best interest of the company.

And so NLRB said nope, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Arizona; we determine how you are going to unionize. We determine what methods you are going to use. And if we say that you have to use card check as a method of unionization, that is what you have to use. And just because you in South Carolina, just because 80 percent of your voters like the right to a secret ballot, that doesn't matter. That is off the table because NLRB is saying they have the last word, they are the only voice. And you know what? That is wrong, because it is a States' rights issue. The Constitution I carry says Congress—and I am going to get a little passionate on this issue because I feel NLRB has overstepped its bounds on this—it says that no power not specifically outlined in that document as belonging to the Federal Government, nor prohibited by that document to the States, is reserved for the States or the people. It doesn't say that the NLRB has the right to determine how we can unionize in South Carolina or any other right-to-work State.

I think States do have rights. And I think we have to stand up, and I applaud my colleagues tonight for standing on this floor and championing States' rights, championing the Constitution of the United States, championing the 10th Amendment, and pointing out the rightful place of the States in this country that freely joined the Republic.

So after the NLRB decided to sue these four States, they came in and decided to sue a private business, to sue a business that made a business decision to affect the bottom line, shareholder value, looking after profit, which others want to demonize in this country but which made this country great, capitalists going out and investing their hard-earned dollars, convincing others to invest their money in their stock, to grow a business, create a product that folks around the world would want to buy. And folks like buying Boeing products.

I applaud Boeing for wanting to come to South Carolina, to invest their billions of dollars in our State, their idea of staying there for 100 years, their love for South Carolina workers, the climate and the pro-business climate we have in our State, the pro-business climate they have in North Charleston, the effort that South Carolina had to step up to the plate to help Boeing in the deal to come to South Carolina.

□ 2020

I look forward to flying on the Boeing manufactured aircraft the Dreamliner. What a great name. We're talking about the shattering of American dreams by the NLRB suing Boeing, which is chasing the American Dream. Yet they're chasing it to form an airliner called the Dreamliner. Is that not irony? I can't believe we're having this discussion, but I'll tell you what. We're doing the right thing, and this Congress needs to get behind defunding the NLRB's ability to sue South Carolina, to sue Boeing. We need to get behind that.

Mr. GOWDY, thank you for having this.

Mr. GOWDY. My colleague from South Carolina raises the second issue, doesn't he? It wasn't just the complaint against Boeing. It was also the threatened litigation over South Carolina having the unmitigated temerity to want to memorialize the right to a secret ballot in the constitution of our State. Our voters voted to do that, to memorialize something as sacred in this country as the right to a secret ballot, and the reward for memorializing that in our constitution was threatened litigation by the NLRB. When our attorney general, Alan Wilson, fought back, the response was, Well, let's see if we can settle it. I think that's instructive because no sooner had the threatened litigation against Boeing been announced that there was another effort to want to settle it as if these are two private companies which are negotiating over an easement.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. They said they'd talk with Attorney General Wilson and the other attorneys general, but they said, We're going to do it in secret. We're going to do it in secret. They demanded secret meetings, made threats, and they attacked the right to the secret ballot. That doesn't exactly look like a good track record.

Have you heard about that?

Mr. GOWDY. Not only, Congressman, had I heard about that, but I read a quote attributed to the NLRB just this week where they were advising Boeing and its counsel not to litigate this in the media. Imagine the arrogance of telling a company not to litigate something in the media. These are not two private parties. This is a government agency taking legal action against a private company, and then they advise not to discuss this in the media.

Then the second thing—and I'd love to ask Congressman MULVANEY his thoughts on this—is that there was a quote attributed to a Senator who was advising the NLRB, Do not share your legal strategy publicly. Do not tell the other side what your legal strategy is.

This is not a criminal case. This is not a civil case between two private companies. This is a government agency that is seeking to influence the business decisions of a private company, and they're getting legal advice from a Senator not to share their strategy with the other side.

Mr. MULVANEY. My question to you, Mr. GOWDY, and to you, Mr. Speaker, would be this:

Why would there even be a strategy? What is this talk of strategy that the NLRB is charged with enforcing the law? There should be no strategy involved with that. Either it violates the law or it does not. The NLRB, itself, has already said on more than one occasion that the statements that Boeing made do not rise to the level that's required for this litigation to proceed. They've already admitted that this is an expansion of a new business, that this is a new business line. It is not the moving of a business from one place to the other, and the NLRB has already admitted that that is protected activity under the National Labor Relations Act. So you wonder: What is the strategy?

It raises a really good point: Why are we here? Why is the NLRB doing this?

Mr. GOWDY, perhaps this is a rhetorical question; but what does it say, for example, about the lawsuit that Mr. DUNCAN mentioned before regarding the right to a secret ballot? What does it say about an administration in this day and age that specifically attacks not only one State but several States for granting additional freedoms to its citizens? Think about that. That's what we've done. That's what Arizona has done. That's what several other States have done. We have simply memorialized in our constitution the right that we have to a secret ballot. This is the granting of a right.

Ordinarily, this would be cause for great celebration; but for some reason, with this administration, it is not cause for celebration; it is cause for the bringing of lawsuits and litigation, and I cannot help but wonder what that says about where we stand as a Nation.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. You have to wonder why the NLRB is doing this. What is their ultimate gain? I

think it's to force a private industry to make a decision that the government tells it to. That's like a government takeover, a government's telling a private business what to do or not to do.

The American people are tired of the spending and the borrowing and the bailouts and the takeovers. We saw it with General Motors. We've seen it with other businesses. We've seen the government takeover of health care. Now we're seeing the government sue a private business for making a business decision to locate in South Carolina.

Because we come from the great Palmetto State, we know why they wanted to locate in South Carolina. We know about the work ethic. We know about the wonderful business climate, and we know about the wonderful climate, period. I know why they chose Charleston. What a great location. It's not just because the airbase is there; that it's close to the port is probably one of the biggest reasons. It's the wonderful port that we've got in Charleston. The reason South Carolina is great is because of the Port of Charleston.

While I'm on that, let me just applaud my colleagues across the building there for their help in securing the money that was necessary for deepening and widening the Port of Charleston. It was the right decision for the Corps of Engineers to make. It's the right decision for the business climate in South Carolina, and it's the right decision for our State. It's going to be a perfect business example for South Carolina and for the east coast.

Mr. GOWDY. To echo what both of my colleagues have already said, I would say this:

Not only is there a tremendous natural climate and business climate in the State of South Carolina, but you will not find a group of people more appreciative for the right to work than our fellow citizens in South Carolina, who desperately need the work. "Thank you" to Boeing and to every other company that has been willing to take a chance on the people of South Carolina. We are not easily intimidated.

One of my colleagues asked, What is the NLRB doing? Why now? I think we touched on it earlier. Union membership is at an historic low. At the same time, they seek to have an historically high level of influence with this administration.

Mr. MULVANEY, there is no legal analysis by which the NLRB can hope to prevail in this case. This is a political calculus, so I would like in the few minutes we have remaining to discuss with both of my colleagues the remedy that the NLRB seeks; and it's instructive, I think, to set the chronology one more time.

Boeing has been manufacturing airplanes in Washington State for at least two decades, and since 1989, there have been four work stoppages. I read a partial quote by a customer of Boeing's, saying, If the unions and the employers and management do not get together

and stop the strikes, we are going to look somewhere else for our airplanes.

So you're in a leadership position at a company, and you're being advised that the work stoppages—and there have been four of them—are going to impact your ability to get future business. You negotiate in good faith, and there has been not one scintilla of evidence to suggest that Boeing did not negotiate in good faith in Washington State. As our colleague Mr. MULVANEY pointed out, there is no allegation of bad faith. There is no allegation that Boeing did anything wrong other than seek to move to a right-to-work State. When they had planted a flag in a union State, they wanted to move a separate, distinct line of work to a right-to-work State in South Carolina.

There are 2,000 more jobs in Washington State than there were, and the comments of the spokesperson for the NLRB are so terribly instructive: If you'll just build more planes in Washington State, we'll shut up about what you did in South Carolina.

Can you imagine that? As a 16-year prosecutor, can you imagine my saying, "Well, I'll excuse what you did here, if it were wrong, if you'll just do this instead"? If what Boeing had done were really wrong, the NLRB would not be seeking to settle this and negotiate out more work for the State of Washington, which is exactly what they're trying to do.

□ 2030

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. The gentleman from Georgia just a few minutes ago in the last hour was over there talking about us not manufacturing anything in this country anymore, talking about bringing manufacturing back. I don't know if y'all heard that.

I sat there and listened, and I thought about the irony there, that here we are, we have the NLRB that's suing a business who is operating in this country, who has numerous manufacturing facilities, not just in Washington and South Carolina, who's creating a wonderful product that's sought all around the world. They're manufacturing it here in this country. They're creating jobs in South Carolina. We are manufacturing here. And so to that gentleman, Mr. SCOTT from Georgia, the message is clear: They are, and they'll continue to do so as long as we have a pro-business economy, as long as we have a pro-business climate.

Like I said earlier, if NLRB wins this suit, we're going to see decisions made about not whether to locate in a right-to-work State like South Carolina or Utah or Arizona or South Dakota or even Virginia or many, many others in this country, we're not going to see that argument about whether to locate in a right-to-work State or a union State, we're going to see truly what he was talking about, the decision being made about whether to locate in the United States of America and put

Americans to work or locate in another country. That's the question that's going to be asked.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to realize in this discussion that this is not just an attack on one company, nor is just an attack more broadly at some of the principles that we hold to be so dear. This is a specific attack on the people of South Carolina. It is. It's a specific attack on the people that we represent.

We live in a State that has chosen to be a right-to-work State. By the way, it's important to know, that doesn't mean that unions are against the law in South Carolina. It doesn't mean that they are banned. It doesn't mean it's any more difficult to form. It simply means you don't have to work in a union in order to work in South Carolina. We have chosen to do that. We have come together as a State and said, This is the kind of State that we want to be. We want to be a State that balances the needs of business and the needs of workers. We want to be fair to both sides. We don't want to make you do something that you don't want to do just to get a job. That's what we stand for, and this administration in this lawsuit is attacking that.

We also chose as a State to give Boeing incentives to come to South Carolina. It was a difficult decision for us to make. I was in the State legislature when we did that. But we said to ourselves as a State, this is such an opportunity, and it is one of those true rare times when it's an investment. This was such a rare opportunity for us as a State, not only for this generation but for several generations. The Boeing company has been making airplanes since there have been airplanes, and they're going to be making them for another hundred years after this and we wanted them in our State, so we gave them the incentives. This administration is attacking that. Nowhere does the NLRB say what might happen, if they were to succeed, to the money that the State of South Carolina has given to Boeing. It's a slap in the face to the people of South Carolina.

Finally, you can't have a discussion up here, or you shouldn't have a discussion up here without talking about jobs. Our people want to work. Our people need to work. It's one of the most hardworking, well-educated, honest and ethical group of working people that you're going to find in this country. The Boeing Corporation was going to give them the chance to do that, in areas that provide tremendous opportunities for us to grow as a State, to grow our wage base, to grow our skill base.

Think about what this meant to the technical college system in our State. Think about what this means to the other opportunities in the aerospace industry alone, never mind the other industries that feed it. We want to work, and this administration is going out of its way to prevent that from happening. Unforgivable. Unforgivable.

Unemployment in my district is over 15 percent, and I have to fight with my own administration as to whether or not these people can go to work? This is absolutely wrong. It is unforgivable that this is what it's come to in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity. I commend the rest of my delegation. It is a true honor to be amongst these gentlemen tonight as we sit here and try and come to our State's defense against what is clearly an unjustified attack.

Mr. GOWDY. We saw firsthand when the automotive manufacturing company, BMW, decided to come to the upstate of South Carolina. I tell my colleagues, it transformed the upstate of South Carolina. Every now and again, you have an opportunity to have a company like a BMW or a Boeing or a Michelin or a Milliken or a GE that cannot just transform a community but, even more importantly, transform individual family lives by giving them the greatest of all family values—a job.

Mr. MULVANEY is exactly right. We come from a State that has a rich and, in some instances, provocative history, but one thing that we all agree on, and it is every Member of this delegation, we represent people who want to work, and when you consider the consequences of this complaint, what are the remedies? Are they really going to ask Boeing to dismantle the plant that is under construction in North Charleston? Are they really going to tell Boeing, you cannot manufacture this line in this State? Or are they going to do what we really suspect that this is all about, which is negotiating strength so they can force Boeing to do more work in Washington State? "We'll let you slide in South Carolina, but you've got to make it up to us in Washington State."

That is not the business of this administration, and I applaud my colleagues, those that are here and those that were not able to join us tonight, because we are in one accord when it comes to standing up for the people and the workers and the State of South Carolina.

I would yield to my colleague, Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I just have to ask myself, listening to my colleagues here, thinking about this issue, since when did America stop becoming and being the land of the free? The land of the free that we sing about all the time? Do we just want to say that we're a free Nation, or do we want to be a free Nation?

Our freedom is under attack, guys. Our freedom is under attack across this Nation, through suits like the NLRB suing the States, NLRB suing a private business for making a business decision. But in America? I can't believe we're witnessing this. It's not just NLRB, it's the EPA. When they deny an air quality permit for a drilling platform in the Alaskan Sea, where the closest impacted town is over 70 miles

away, with only 250 indigenous people there.

I've been out to a deepwater drilling platform. I've been to a production platform. The only air impact that I've seen was the flare gas, where they flare off and burn off the gas that comes through the natural drilling activities. Usually it's natural gas. Some proponents of that side of the debate think that natural gas is and say—and I believe that, too—it's probably cleaner burning. But we've got the EPA denying an air quality permit, not a drilling permit this time, so we're not able to meet America's energy needs by domestic production.

We've got NLRB suing the State of South Carolina, the State of Utah, the State of Arizona, and the State of South Dakota. Then we've got them suing a fine American company named Boeing. We've got the EPA going after drilling, denying to issue air quality permits. We've got them changing the air quality standards that will affect economic development in my district and around the State of South Carolina.

This is a power grab. This is a power grab by this administration to keep us from being free people, to keep us from being able to make business decisions and creating jobs, putting America back to work.

□ 2040

America needs to wake up and see that your freedoms are being eroded day by day.

It's hard to believe that January 5 we were elected into Congress and had high optimism for changing the way Washington does business, and then we see this continuation of these policies, which I labeled on the campaign "POR policies." I called it Pelosi, Obama and Reid policies that were bankrupting this country, and they're continuing today. They're continuing today because they are affecting private businesses that are out creating jobs in States like South Carolina.

So I applaud my colleagues and, like you said, those that aren't here, those that may be taking the floor on the other side of the Chamber in the United States Senate, those that had obligations, other places tonight that feel the way we do, that South Carolina is a great State to do business.

Boeing made the decision to come there. They made the decision about their bottom line, about profitability, shareholder value, about creating something great, creating American jobs, manufacturing in this country that the gentleman from Georgia talked about. Well, they're doing it. And they're going to do it in South Carolina because I believe they're going to win this lawsuit. I believe they are going to win because it's the right thing, it's the American way, it's unconstitutional, un-American for the NLRB to be suing Boeing.

I believe with my heart that they are going to win. They're going to put

those thousands of workers to work in South Carolina, they're going to invest their money, and they're going to be there 100 years from now.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a family health issue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. ELLISON (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of tornado damage in district.

Mr. HINOJOSA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Ms. MCCOLLUM (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

Mr. MARKEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel delays.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and May 24.

Ms. SUTTON (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel delays.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 349. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4865 Tallmadge Road in Rootstown, Ohio, as the "Marine Sgt. Jeremy E. Murray Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 655. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 95 Dogwood Street in Cary, Mississippi, as the "Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr. Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 793. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12781 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard in Inverness, California, as the "Specialist Jake Robert Velloza Post Office".

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the