

going to have some protections in place and find out that they cannot even go home because something happened at work.

I would ask this Congress, this body, to please take note of these issues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE IMPORTANCE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FROM A HIGH TECH PERSPECTIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I come to the well of the House today to speak in favor of and to recognize the importance of collective bargaining. I would like to do it from the perspective of my particular district. I represent a high tech district in the State of Washington just north of Seattle that includes Redmond where Microsoft is located as well as many software firms. It includes a biotech corridor where some of the new medicines are being developed with our new genetic technology, Immunex and others. From that perspective, a lot of folks have thought in the new economy where we have high tech jobs and software and biotech that the importance of collective bargaining or organized labor would fade away. I just want to say today that from the perspective of the high tech economy represented by my district, the importance of collective bargaining to people remains just as large and fundamental as it always has been in this country.

I want to tell just a couple of stories as to why that is true. First the story of Northwest Hospital in my district where a large group of employees desired to be represented by the SCIU, the service employees union, from a variety of professions at the hospital. Something interesting happened when those workers decided they wanted to be represented by SCIU. What was interesting that happened is that the hospital management, unlike a lot of places, decided not to try to intimidate workers, not to try to browbeat workers, not to interfere in the decision by the workers who are really the people who ought to have the decision whether to be represented or not represented. As a result of that, the workers freely voted and indeed in this case voted to be represented by that bargaining unit. To date there has been peace and harmony and increased productivity at that hospital I think because of that peaceful relationship. It was one example about how where management took a progressive attitude to allow workers to freely voice whether or not to be represented, things worked well.

Now I want to talk about the current situation at the University of Washington where the teachers assistants have expressed a desire to be represented by a bargaining unit of the UAW. Despite, I think, their clear manifestation of a desire, the administration of the UW has felt constrained, they believe they do not have the legal authority under the Washington State legislative structure to enter into a bargaining unit at the University of Washington. Many people, myself included, believe that is a misinterpretation of Washington law.

Nonetheless, that has created a lot of tension and the lack of the ability to move forward between the management, essentially the administration of the University of Washington and the teachers assistants. It is a situation where collective bargaining has not been able to move forward at least due to the perceived belief of the University of Washington management that we have not been able to move forward in a collective bargaining agreement, much I think to the detriment of the institution as a whole.

I think it has been instructive as to why collective bargaining needs to be recognized. We have been hopeful that the administration would take another look at the interpretation of Washington law. Failing that, we have also been hopeful that the Washington legislature would do some house cleaning and simply grant very specifically to the University of Washington administration the ability to collectively bargain. I am told that our friends in the other party have blocked efforts of that in the Washington legislature. I think that is very, very shortsighted. To simply give the University of Washington management the same authority that other management anywhere in America has to enter into collective bargaining units.

I want to say today from a high tech corridor, there is good news in a bargaining situation in a hospital. There is bad news in another high tech corridor, the University of Washington. We are hopeful that that gets resolved so that the parties can move forward in this very important right of collective bargaining to organize. That is the story from the high tech world.

INTRODUCTION OF BIPARTISAN SOFTWOOD LUMBER FAIR COMPETITION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I would certainly echo the comments of those that preceded me in the well about the contributions of organized labor to all working people in the United States and join them in supporting their efforts. But I come to talk about a specific sector of the economy and specific workers, that is, people who work in the lumber and wood products industry.

Back in the 1980s, the United States Department of Commerce found that Canadian lumber is heavily subsidized.

□ 1700

The Reagan, Bush I and the Clinton administrations have all found the Canadian lumber is subsidized. Numerous Canadian sources, including the BC Forest Resources Commission, Canadian Private Wood Owners Association, Maritime Lumber Bureau have also found those subsidies. That is not in question.

The subsidies come in three primary forms. The provincial government owns 95 percent of the timberland in Canada and administratively sets the price of timber one-quarter to one-third of its market value.

Agreements allow Canadian mills long-term access to timberland in exchange for cutting to subsidize the timber. No matter what the market conditions are, they are required to harvest and process the lumber, and they lose their licenses if they do not do that.

Finally, they are really back 50 years ago or more in terms of their environmental practices. They regularly violate principles set by the Canadian national government in terms of streamside buffers; drag logs through the streams and destroy precious salmon habitat. The results of that are being reflected in crashing salmon runs off of Canada and Alaska.

In response, in 1996, the United States and Canada negotiated a softwood lumber agreement. Unfortunately, that has expired and negotiations to extend or revise the agreement have not occurred despite the fact that many of us have contacted the current administration and asked them to make this a high priority.

We have seen statistics that say a mere 5 percent increase in lumber imports, subsidized lumber imports, from Canada could cost 8,000 jobs in the Pacific Northwest. So we feel this is of the utmost priority.

I am introducing legislation tomorrow with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), bipartisan legislation, the Softwood Lumber Fair Competition Act, and I really appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) has joined me as the chief Republican sponsor. It also will have support and introduction of a number of other Democrats and Republicans from various parts of the United States.

If Canada will not do the right thing and come back to the negotiating table and the Bush administration will not take the initiative, then Congress must force the issues through enactment of such measures as the Softwood Lumber Fair Competition Act.

Our legislation is based on the import relief provisions of the Steel Revitalization Act, which has 212 bipartisan cosponsors. The legislation requires that the President take necessary steps by imposing quotas, tariff surcharges, negotiate voluntary export restraint

agreements or other measures when softwood lumber imports from Canada exceed the average volume imported monthly during the 24-month period preceding December 1995.

This will help ensure that the U.S. industry and workers are not harmed by unfair dumping of subsidized Canadian lumber.

The job losses and mill closures will accelerate if the United States does not stand up for our working families and demand that Canada trade fairly.

With the sluggish U.S. economy, we simply cannot afford to sacrifice more U.S. jobs and U.S. industries to unfair trade by the Canadians.

The President has repeatedly assured Congress that his administration will vigorously enforce U.S. trade laws. I was pleased with his recent decision to pursue a Section 201 case on steel dumping. Now it is time for the President to do more on softwood lumber issues. It has been nearly 3 months since the agreement expired, and 3 months since a number of us contacted the administration to tell them how urgent it was that they pursue these negotiations. He needs to bring the Canadians back to the negotiating table and work out an agreement which both sides can live with similar to the 1996 agreement.

The choice is clear. Canada needs to come back to the negotiating table with a good faith effort or Congress must take action.

ORGANIZED LABOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HART). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in praising the men and women of organized labor. Organized labor has been a key proponent in the battle for fair wages and better working conditions and safer working conditions throughout the history of our Nation. Just like my colleague from California, let me say a little background because I know people all over the country do not know that most of us represent individual districts.

I started out in high school, as we call it, a fly boy at a newspaper, and worked in my apprenticeship, graduating from college; at the same time also getting my journeyman as a union printer, and finding out in 1971 I made more as a union printer than I did as a college graduate with an undergraduate degree in business. So I stayed in the printing business and worked there and ended up helping manage a small business.

In that time, I got involved in politics, elected to the legislature, went back to law school at night but still worked in the printing business for 23 years and still kept my card in the union. With the merging now of the Typographical Union with the Communications Workers Union, I can proudly

say that I am not working at the trade but a member of the Communications Workers Union.

I tell people do not ask me to fix their phone. I cannot even run a press any more. I have been ruined by serving in Congress.

I believe that the right to bargain collectively is a basic civil right and that unions are an avenue of that fair treatment and economic stability for working people.

The right for people to bargain collectively and independently is not only important in our country but around the world because of the litmus test on the freedom that a society has.

We have seen the impact that employee groups can have in establishing more Democratic governments in institutions worldwide, with one example of the success being the Solidarity Union in Poland. In other countries that are still autocratic regimes, such as China and Vietnam, the rights of workers to organize into unions or employee groups and push for improved pay and working conditions will be the key to showing that that country is ready for real governmental and economic reforms and establishing a free society and the rule of law.

So freedom to organize is a basic civil right that free societies enjoy.

Back here in America, last year 475,000 people joined unions in 2000. Despite the fact that oftentimes this is a basic right of workers, they face intimidation from employers who break the law and try to prevent workers from organizing.

Let me read just a few statistics about what workers have to go through to exercise their rights. Twenty-five percent of employers fire workers that try to organize unions. Over 90 percent of the employers, upon hearing that their workers want to organize, force employees to attend closed-door meetings and listen to the anti-union propaganda. Whether it is true or not, no one really knows since they are closed door.

Thirty-three percent of employers illegally fire workers who tried to form unions and 50 percent of employers, half of the employers, threatened to shut down if their employees organize.

If workers in America are subject to this kind of discrimination, then we can only imagine what workers in the rest of the world have to go through when they want to join together to bargain collectively.

Before I get too far along, I have a particular piece of legislation that came out of an experience in Houston that I want to speak to. This is the second session I have introduced what is now H.R. 652, the Labor Relations First Contract Negotiation Act. This bill was introduced to enhance the rights of employees to organize and bargain collectively for improved living standards. It will require mediation and ultimately arbitration if an employer and newly-elected representative had not reached a collective bargaining agreement within 60 days.

Time after time, valid elections are held where workers choose to be represented by a union, but months and sometimes years later will go by and these workers still have no contract even though they voted for union representation.

This bill is important because what we see with the NLRB is that the delay is often justice denied, and what we would like to see is that bill come to a vote so we can debate real labor law reform on both sides of the issue. I believe passage of that bill will help with short-circuiting the delay that we have with the NLRB and actually have workers go back to work and prevent workers and employers being locked in sometimes a stalemate.

America has a great history of recognizing workers and their right to organize, but we still have a long way to go.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) for his effort today and will work with him to continue to fight for the rights of workers not only here in America but throughout the world. I know the bumper sticker I see in Houston often says, "If you like weekends, it is brought to you by unions." I think that says more than any of us can say, Madam Speaker.

SALUTE TO ORGANIZED LABOR IN OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), in the salute to organized labor in our country.

The enduring value of organized labor's contribution is best measured by what labor has done for those who are not members of labor unions. Labor unions have done much for their members: Higher wages, broader and more valuable benefits, safer and more fair working conditions. It is the collective lifting of all workers and all industries and all persons across the country that has been the lasting legacy of organized labor.

With that in mind, I think it is important that we examine what labor has achieved, how our lives would be different if labor had not been organized; what we must do in this Congress to continue the strong tradition of collectively bargaining in America, and then to consider the issues that affect each of us that labor is taking a lead in fighting and working for.

Members of the generation that has been described as America's greatest generation were born in a very different world than the one in which we live today. A person 75 years of age today was born in 1926. In 1926, when they stopped working they stopped having an income unless they were someone very affluent and very privileged. Most people worked until the