

PN143 ARMY nomination of Ines H. Berger, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

IN THE COAST GUARD

PN94 COAST GUARD nominations (260) beginning GEORGE F. ADAMS, and ending ANDREW H. ZUCKERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN112 MARINE CORPS nominations (3) beginning JERMAINE M. CADOGAN, and ending AUSTIN E. WREN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN113 MARINE CORPS nominations (7) beginning ANTHONY K. ALEJANDRE, and ending JONATHAN R. RISSER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN114 MARINE CORPS nominations (4) beginning PAUL M. HERLLE, and ending ROBERT W. PUCKETT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN116 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning JAY B. DURHAM, and ending ANDREW K. LAW, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN117 MARINE CORPS nominations (6) beginning DANIEL H. CUSINATO, and ending WILLIAM C. VOLZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN118 MARINE CORPS nomination of Ryan M. Cleveland, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN119 MARINE CORPS nominations (5) beginning NICHOLAS K. ELLIS, and ending KOLLEEN L. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN120 MARINE CORPS nomination of Jonathan L. Riggs, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN121 MARINE CORPS nominations (657) beginning BRETT D. ABBAMONTE, and ending JASON E. ZELLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN123 MARINE CORPS nomination of David C. Walsh, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN124 MARINE CORPS nomination of Scott W. Zimmerman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

PN109 NAVY nominations (37) beginning ALYSSA B. Y. ARMSTRONG, and ending KARI E. YAKUBISIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN144 NAVY nomination of Rachel A. Passmore, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN145 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JUSTIN R. MILLER, and ending JAMES R. SAULLO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN146 NAVY nomination of Candida A. Ferguson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN149 NAVY nomination of Richard R. Barber, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN178 NAVY nomination of Benigno T. Razon, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2015.

PN179 NAVY nomination of Donna L. Smoak, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2015.

PN180 NAVY nomination of Fabio O. Austria, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2015.

PN182 NAVY nomination of Shawn D. Wilkerson, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2015.

PN183 NAVY nomination of Budd E. Bergloff, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2015.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 4; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S.J. Res. 8, with 2 hours of debate remaining, equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Tomorrow Senators should expect two rollcall votes at approximately 11:30 a.m. on passage of the resolution of disapproval on ambush elections, followed by cloture on the Keystone veto message.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following up to an hour of debate controlled by Senator MURRAY or her designee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the National Labor Relations Board and the reforms that have been proposed in the new rule. I rise

first of all to provide by way of a predicate or background what happened in 1935 when the National Labor Relations Act was passed. There is a lot to talk about in that act, but just like when a major piece of legislation passes, we have findings that undergird the statute itself.

I will not go through all of those today, but I think some of the language in there is especially appropriate for what we are talking about. The findings and summary spoke to the benefits of collective bargaining—the benefits of organizing and collectively bargaining, and asserted at one point very early in the statute, in the findings, the first couple of paragraphs of the findings that experience—I am paraphrasing this but I will get to specific words in a moment.

But experience has shown that collective bargaining and organizing—and these are the exact words—“safeguards commerce from injury, impairment or interruption.” It goes on to talk about why it was better—why they believed it was better to pass a statute to resolve labor-management disputes instead of the old way, which was constant conflict, conflict fighting, in some cases even violence.

So we did the right thing in 1935 as a country. We have had some history since then to draw from. The National Labor Relations Board, of course, is the entity that gives meaning to what we intend when we pass laws such as the National Labor Relations Act.

Now we are having a dispute here in this body and in the other body as well about what these rules ought to be. What are the rules that govern the National Labor Relations Board, but in particular, what are the rules that govern elections?

With all of the challenges we are facing in the country right now—the middle class has nowhere near recovered from the last—the great recession. Wages have been declining over a generation, or at least not increasing at the level that costs have been increasing.

So with all of that pressure on families, you could think this could be an area of common ground, but it is not. With all of those challenges facing middle-class families, it is disappointing that Republicans in the Senate have chosen to focus on rolling back the National Labor Relations Board modest and commonsense reforms, to help workers get a seat at the table, so they can increase their wages and their economic security.

Democrats are fighting to increase wages and we are also fighting for economic security, at the same time Republicans seem to be constantly fighting to increase corporate profits while making workers pay the price. All of us, whether we are Democrats or Republicans, should be coming together to expand workers' voices at the table and not attacking workers' right to collectively bargain.

We are talking about something fundamental here, the opportunity to have

an election in a workplace, and the benefits that flow from that. That is really about empowering workers. I believe that is one of the reasons why we passed the National Labor Relations Act, not just to have a board that can settle disputes, but to actually empower workers in ways they have not been empowered up to that point in our history.

Empowering workers is an important part of building a stronger economy that works not just for those individual workers in that worksite, but in an economy that works for all families, not just the wealthiest few. When the workers have a seat at the bargaining table, our economy prospers and the middle class thrives. I have always believed that if we did not have unions and collective bargaining and organizing since World War II and even since the 1930s, we would have a much less robust middle class. Some people believe there would not be a middle case. But I am at least willing to assert that the right to organize and collectively bargain is not just good for that worker and his or her family, but it is also good for the economy as well.

Those workers are the ones who drive the economy, not just the work they do, but the expenditures they make on behalf of their family. So even though workers are more productive in the United States than ever before, workers are still struggling with those stagnant wages. Today the middle class accounts for the smallest share of the Nation's income since World War II. Hard to believe that the middle class has been so devastated.

We know from our history that when workers have a voice in the workplace through collective bargaining, wages increase, workplace safety improves, and workers have increased retirement and health security. All of those benefits have helped grow America's middle class. Labor unions helped workers share in that economic prosperity that they have helped to create through their own hard work.

One of the great moments I have had as a Senator from Pennsylvania is when you go to a manufacturing plant and they take you on a tour. I am sure the Presiding Officer has done this a number of times. They take you on the tour not just to show how they are producing something, how they manufacture something, they are making something, but they are also very proud of the way they interact with and relate to and work with their employees. They go out of their way to point to a bulletin board or point to a data point in their record to say we have very few injuries, or zero injuries in a certain point of time. They take great pride in that because they know that if they have fewer injuries, they are going to be more productive. If they have fewer injuries, they are going to have employees who can produce on their behalf.

One of the reasons they have fewer injuries over time in our economy and

in those businesses is because workers have rights. Workers have rights they did not have in the early part of the 1900s. So we know from our history that this works, this process of making sure workers have a seat at the table.

Now let's go to the National Labor Relations Board, their election reforms. These particular reforms make modest but, I would argue, very important updates to both modernize and streamline the election process, to prevent delays and reduce litigation. The current system is vulnerable to litigation that will drag out for a long period of time, drag out the election process and put workers' rights on hold.

Those reforms will reduce unnecessary litigation that is not relevant to the outcome of the election. In the past, employers and unions had to send information about the election process to the Post Office, which would cost time and money. The new rule brings this election process into the 21st century—which is 15 years old now—by letting employers and unions file forms electronically.

I think that is the least that can happen. You would think in this era we are living in, when everything that is done—most everything is done electronically, in banking and in other industries, that at a minimum we should have information transmitted about an election—something valuable in a workplace. We hold elections with great regard and we believe in the sanctity of elections. So the least we could do is make sure those workers have the benefits of something that would transmit the information electronically. Sending that information in that fashion makes all of the sense in the world.

The rule also allows the use of modern forms of communications through cell phones and emails. That is not asking too much, to be able to transmit information to prepare workers for an election by the use of email or cell phones.

The reforms are commonsense steps to make sure the NLRB, the Board, is using its taxpayer dollars efficiently and effectively.

These changes, as I referred to earlier, are not just good for workers, they also help businesses by streamlining the whole process, the elections process in this case. Right now the election process varies from region to region. Streamlining the process will provide certainty for both employers and workers themselves. The new rule allows businesses and unions to file forms electronically, as I mentioned, instead of using postage. This will save every-one time and money. So modernizing—this is what we are talking about here—modernizing election rules allows businesses and unions to use these basic forms of communications in a way that promotes common sense.

The rule will at long last level the playing field for small businesses. Right now the biggest corporations can exploit the system with long and costly

litigation to deny workers, if they choose to do that, a fair up-or-down vote on joining a union. By making the election process more consistent and transparent, the Board's reforms level the playing field for the smaller businesses that already play fair.

The NLRB, the Board itself, the representation rule, are in need of kind of basic updates. There have not been substantial updates to this NLRB election process since the 1970s. Today that leads to inefficiencies and delays. Right now big corporations take advantage of those inefficiencies to postpone and even deny workers the right to vote on union representation.

Often, in the face of employer tactics, workers give up hope. In fact, one in three will never even get to have an election. That is not something the National Labor Relations Act intended. I do not think that is what anyone intended when it comes to these elections or the possibility of an election. So these amendments, these updates, these modernization reforms help restore balance and fairness to the election process. I am perplexed why this is the subject of so much controversy, because these are basic reforms to help people exercise their right to vote in the workplace, which is consistent with our values, consistent with our history, and also consistent with our efforts not just to move that worker and his or her family forward, and their business forward, but also to move the American economy and the middle class forward.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

MS. WARREN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today with strong support of the National Labor Relations Board's new effort to make workplace union elections more efficient and more effective. I come to the floor today in opposition to Republican efforts to preserve a broken system. Today, instead of raising minimum wages for millions of struggling families, or letting people refinance their student loans, or making sure women get equal pay for equal work, instead of implementing policies that strengthen the middle class, Republicans are pressing a bill to stop a government agency from modernizing its procedures because it might help—yes, help—American workers.

Coming out of the Great Depression, America's labor unions helped build America's strong middle class. For half a century, as union membership went up, America's median family income went up. You know, that was true for families whether they were part of a union or not. As our country got richer, our families got richer. As our families got richer, our country got richer.

Since 1935, Congress has required the National Labor Relations Board to oversee the workplace elections in which workers decide whether to be represented by a union. According to NLRB data, more than 90 percent of

time this works out just fine. For most of the cases that make it to an election, employees and employers agree about the process and an election is held without a dispute. Done.

But in the remaining handful of cases, the rules on how to resolve these concerns have turned into a mess. Over time, a hodgepodge of different rules for resolving these dispute has emerged in each of the country's 26 NLRB regions. To fix this, the NLRB recently finalized one national set of rules that sets out clear procedures for resolving these issues. In other words, the NLRB is trying to make dispute resolution clearer, more efficient, and more consistent from region to region.

Trying to make government work better should not be controversial. But it is controversial. Why? Because some employers simply oppose union votes altogether. They do not want the NLRB to work. They do not want union elections to happen at all. So they are lobbying against those new rules, and congressional Republicans are standing up for them, advancing a proposal to stop the NLRB from implementing its final rules and doing the job Congress gave it 80 years ago.

Republicans claim they were concerned about workers being able to ambush their employers with workplace elections. That is just plain nonsense. Employers are always notified at the beginning of the election process, and according to Caren Sencer, a top labor attorney who testified a few weeks ago in the HELP Committee hearing, there is nothing—nothing—in the new rule that would stop an employer from having its relevant concerns heard and addressed prior to an election.

Let's be honest. The only ambush here is the Republican ambush on workers' basic rights. According to a 2001 study from the Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education, long election delays correspond with higher rates of labor law violations. A delay gives any union employer more time to retaliate against a union organizer, and to intimidate workers and delay work.

According to NLRB data, nearly one-third of the time when employees file a petition to request an election, they never actually get one. Employers who want to keep their workers out of a union prefer a broken, inefficient system that gives them room to manipulate the process and to block workers from organizing. But that is not the law. The NLRB doesn't answer to them. Federal law directs the NLRB to make sure election disputes can be resolved fairly between employers and employees, and that is exactly what the NLRB is doing.

Throughout our history, powerful interests have tried to capture Washington and rig the system in their favor, but we didn't roll over. At every turn, in every time of challenge, organized labor has been there fighting on behalf of the American people. Labor was on the frontlines to take children

out of factories and to put them in schools. Labor was there to give meaning to the words "consumer protection" by making our food and our medicine safe. Labor was there to fight for minimum wages in States across this country. In every fight to build opportunity in this country, in every fight to level the playing field, in every fight for working families, labor has been on the frontlines.

Powerful interests have attacked many of the basic foundations of this country—the foundations that once built a strong middle class—and too many times those powerful interests have prevailed. So it comes down to a question I have asked before: Whom does this Congress work for? Republicans say government should keep on working for powerful CEOs who don't like unions and who have figured out how to exploit a tangled system. Republicans complain about government inefficiencies, but then they introduce a bill that is specifically designed so a broken, inefficient system will stay broken and inefficient, even when we know how to fix it.

Well, we weren't sent here just to represent CEOs who don't like unions. We were sent here to support working people who just want a fighting chance to level the playing field. I urge my colleagues to vote against this Republican resolution and let the NLRB do its job.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor to express my disappointment that the majority leader is asking to rule XIV the bipartisan Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act.

I must ask the majority leader, what happened? Where is the bipartisanship part? Where is the bipartisanship that we have expressed and that I expressed this morning on the floor and last night at AIPAC? I ask again, what happened to putting aside political posturing and partisanship? What happened to the majority leader's pledge in January to "decentralize power in the Senate" and "open up the legislative process"?

"We need to return to regular order," he said. I agree with him. Let's do it. Let's return to regular order.

Frankly, this is not what was intended, and it is certainly against my better judgment, against procedure, against any understanding we might have had to take the politics out of our effort to establish congressional oversight of any nuclear agreement with Iran. I am more than disappointed; I am pretty outraged.

I said last night and again this morning that I join Chairman CORKER and Senators GRAHAM, KAINE, DONNELLY, HEITKAMP, KING, NELSON, AYOTTE, RUBIO, MCCAIN, and RISCH in introducing bipartisan oversight legislation to ensure that Congress has a chance to review the deal before it goes into effect and to oversee its compliance after it goes into effect. And now, putting any bipartisanship aside, we are back to politics as usual. The only way to make this work is to work together.

The provisions of the bill itself are good ones. It would require the President to submit an agreement to Congress within 5 days of reaching it. It would give Congress 60 days to consider the agreement before sanctions relief could be provided. It would outline consequences should Congress decide to disapprove the agreement. And in terms of oversight, it would require information on potential breaches to be promptly reported to Congress, along with a comprehensive report every 180 days of any Iranian action inconsistent with the agreement. It would require a report every 90 days from the President on Iran's compliance, informing us of any actions that might advance Iran's nuclear weapons program, that it has not supported or financed or carried out any acts of terrorism, and that any sanctions relief is both appropriate and proportionate to Iran's efforts under the agreement. Of course, it would have here in the Senate a 60-vote threshold, so that means it would have to be a bipartisan determination.

We in good faith agreed to introduce this legislation and take it through the committee process and to the floor so that Congress—which was responsible for bringing Iran to the table in the first place to negotiate—would have a role in reviewing the agreement before it goes into effect, whether to provide sanctions relief, and overseeing implementation and Iranian compliance after it goes into effect because, as I said last night, a deal cannot be built on trust alone. Now, I was talking about Iran; I did not know that I was talking about our deal to pass a bipartisan review act.

So let me conclude. I can't imagine why the majority leader would seek to short-circuit the process, unless the goals are political rather than substantive. And I regret to say these actions make clear an intention that isn't substantive, that it is political. On a day that has been defined by serious discourse about Iran's illicit nuclear weapons program, at a moment when legislators contemplate the most serious national security issue of our time, I am disappointed that the leader has chosen to proceed outside of regular order. By bringing the Corker-Menendez legislation directly to the floor for debate, the majority leader is singlehandedly undermining our bipartisan efforts.

Nobody in Congress has worked harder on this issue, and I certainly don't take a backseat to anyone in pursuing

Iran's nuclear weapons program and standing up for Israel, but I sincerely hope that we can restore regular order and that this bill can be fully considered by all the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in due time.

Finally, there is no emergency. This deal—if there is one—won't be concluded until the summer, so there is plenty of time to wait until March 24, find out whether we have a deal, and then act to be able to be in a posture to opine on that deal and to deal with it accordingly. There is no reason to accelerate this process in this way, to go outside of regular order, bypass the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and come directly to the floor.

I know I cannot object to the rule XIV process under the rules, but I say to my colleagues, if this is the process, then I will have no choice but to use my voice and my vote against any motion to proceed. I hope that is not the case. I have worked too hard to get to this moment. But if that is the way we are going to proceed, then I will certainly have to vote against proceeding at that time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise to oppose S.J. Res. 8, a misguided resolution that targets workers' right to organize and hurts working families in Hawaii and around the country.

Union election rules haven't been updated since the 1970s. The National Labor Relations Board—or NLRB—is trying to bring union election rules into the 21st century, but today's Senate resolution will block the NLRB's commonsense updates.

The right to organize is a crucial part of our democracy. Unions have helped build the middle class in Hawaii and nationwide. It is disappointing that instead of working to create jobs or help the middle class get ahead, today we are debating whether to make it harder to join a union.

Workers wishing to join a union already face many barriers. For example, companies have significant opportunities to make their case to employees about why they should oppose a union. Meanwhile, unions are not allowed to visit the worksite to make their case for joining a union, and they do not have access to modern contact information such as emails and cell phone numbers—unbelievable as that may sound—to contact workers.

In addition, companies can delay union elections with what amounts to frivolous litigation and appeal after appeal. Nationwide, in contested cases workers already have to wait an average of 4 months to vote whether to join a union.

While most employers in Hawaii want to support their workers, there have been those rare cases of companies exploiting the current system to prevent workers from having a voice in the workplace.

Let me share a situation that happened in Hawaii where workers had not been given a raise in 6 years. They asked a local union for help in organizing their union. In the runup to the union elections, the workers were forced to attend one-on-one or group meetings on work time where their management could convince workers to vote against the union. This company hired a private security firm and posted security guards outside the voting area during the vote. Workers felt intimidated.

The company appealed election results and NLRB rulings over and over again, adding delay after delay and revote after revote. In July 2005, 40 months after a petition was first filed to hold an election, the NLRB finally certified a union for the workers. Still, the company continued to offer appeal after appeal of the election results and even fired 31 union supporters in 2007. Finally, at the end of 2012, 10 years later, the certified union reached its first union contract.

Remember, I noted that where most workplaces are organized, things are done in 4 months. That is not always the case. The NLRB's updated union election rules would help reduce this kind of intimidation and delay, which happens all too often, and would allow organizers to contact workers by email and cell phone. It is pretty astounding that we had to have a rule change in order to make this kind of commonsense change available to organizers—which, by the way, this resolution which I ask my colleagues to vote against disallows.

The rule will make it easier for small businesses to follow labor election laws. Currently, big corporations can use expensive lawyers to litigate and prevent union elections, while small businesses don't have those kinds of resources.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting these modest, commonsense updates to NLRB rules and voting no on the resolution. Let's stand with working men and women in this country and support the middle class.

I want to end with a quote from one of our labor organizers and leaders in Hawaii, Hawaii Laborers' business manager Peter Ganaban. In a recent piece in Pacific Business News, Mr. Ganaban explained that "Hawaii's union climate is an extension of our local culture of helping each other and caring for our communities."

Allowing workers a fair choice and a fair chance to join a union is the least we can do for our workers in the middle class.

I yield my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORLD WILDLIFE DAY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 95, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 95) designating March 3, 2015, as "World Wildlife Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 95) was agreed to. The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—Continued

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am here for the main purpose of vigorously opposing S.J. Res. 8, and to support the National Labor Relations Board's recent rule to modernize the process that workers use if they decide they want to form a union and bargain collectively.

The new NLRB rule makes modest but highly important changes to improve the overall consistency and efficiency of the election process, allowing workers to vote for or against the creation of a union in a fair and timely way. This rule is long overdue, and in Connecticut I have seen—and in my personal experience with the NLRB—how important it is.

As I go around Connecticut, I consistently hear of problems when workers seek to gain representation to form a union. It is cumbersome, costly, time consuming, and is prone to needless delays. It involves needless litigation, and it creates uncertainty for all involved. This rule change—this new rule—is not only good for working men and women, it is also good for businesses by reducing—and in some cases eliminating—the cost, time, and uncertainty that are aggravating and expensive. It is a small step toward a level playing field and a guarantee that companies respect workers' rights to organize and gain the benefits of union membership.

Very simply, here is what the rule does: It removes obstacles to forming unions and requires businesses to postpone litigation over member eligibility issues until after workers join a union.