

abuse that keep the cycle of poverty unbroken. To build a lasting monument to James Chaney, Michael Schwerner and Andrew Goodman, we must face these issues with a clear, unblinking eye and say "no more."

And finally, we Mississippians must announce to the world what we've learned in 40 years. We know today that our enemies are not each other. Our real enemies are ignorance, illiteracy, poverty, racism, disease, unemployment, crime, the high dropout rate, teen pregnancy and lack of support for the public schools.

We can defeat all those enemies not as divided people—black or white or Indian—but as a united force banded together by our common humanity, by our own desire to lift each other up.

Forty years from now, I want our children and grandchildren to look back on us and what we did and say that we had the courage, the wisdom and the strength to rise up, to take the responsibility to right historical wrongs—that we pledged to build a future together, we moved on. Yes, we moved on as one people.

Dick Molpus, a former secretary of state and gubernatorial candidate, owns the Molpus Woodlands Group, a timberland investment company in Jackson.

IN HONOR AND REMEMBRANCE OF
FORMER CLEVELAND MAYOR
RALPH S. LOCHER

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 2004

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, we rise today in honor and remembrance of former Cleveland Mayor Ralph S. Locher—Devoted family man, accomplished attorney, Ohio Supreme Court justice, community leader, and admired friend and mentor. Mr. Locher's term as Mayor of the City of Cleveland during a turbulent period of Cleveland's history, solidified his reputation as a man of honesty, integrity and heart.

Mayor Locher was born in Romania to American parents. His family left Europe to return to America, settling in western Ohio. Mayor Locher graduated from Bluffton College in 1936 and graduated from Western University School of Law three years later. He practiced law in Cleveland with Davis & Young until 1945, when he left for Columbus to accept the position of secretary of the Industrial Commission of Ohio.

His political career began in 1953, when Mayor Locher was appointed by Cleveland Mayor Anthony Celebrezze as the city law director. Mayor Locher did not seek elected office—it sought him. In 1962, Mayor Celebrezze resigned his post to accept an appointment by President John F. Kennedy, which immediately plunged Mr. Locher into the role as Mayor of Cleveland. Mayor Locher significantly trounced his opponent at the special election, and ran unopposed for a full term the next year.

Following his departure from office, Mayor Locher went on to be elected as probate judge in 1972. In 1976, Mayor Locher was elected as an Ohio Supreme Court justice, where he served until retiring from the bench in 1988. Mayor Locher served the bench with honor, integrity and concern, and garnered the admiration and respect of everyone associated with the court.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join us in honor, gratitude and remembrance of Mayor Ralph S. Locher—An outstanding citizen, devoted husband, father, grandfather and great-grandfather, and an exceptional man and caring leader whose life positively impacted the lives of countless. We extend our deepest condolences to Mayor Locher's beloved wife, Eleanor, his daughter, Virginia Wells, and his grandson, and great-granddaughter. His passing marks a deep loss for so many of us who called him friend. Mayor Locher's flawless legacy of exceptional leadership, judicial integrity and sincere concern for others will be remembered always by the people of Cleveland—and far beyond. Moreover, his kindness, grace, and quiet dignity will always serve as example of a successful leader and more importantly—an exceptional human being.

APPLAUDING BETTY DUKES FOR
HER COURAGE IN STANDING UP
FOR WOMEN WORKERS AT WAL-
MART

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 2004

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last month, Vice President DICK CHENEY visited the corporate headquarters of Wal-Mart and praised the company for the example it is setting for American business. Here is the example that Wal-Mart has set for American business:

If you violate workers' organizing rights, you can get away with it, receiving just a slap on the wrist from weak and ineffective federal labor laws.

If you shift the cost of health care onto workers who cannot afford it, you can increase your profits and have taxpayer-funded programs like SCHIP pick up the tab.

If you distrust your own workforce enough to disregard their safety, you can lock them inside your store overnight without a key.

If you want to increase the wealth of one of the wealthiest families in the world, you can maintain the lowest wages in the industry, laying off your most senior and loyal employees and replacing them with lower-paid entry-level workers.

If you want to eliminate competition in your industry by lowering your wages and prices, you can force U.S. suppliers to outsource their manufacturing jobs, so that you can reap the benefit of cheap labor from countries with even worse workers' rights records than our own.

All of these reprehensible labor practices are detailed in the February 2004 report which I commissioned, "Everyday Low Wages: The Hidden Price We All Pay for Wal-Mart." I urge Vice President CHENEY to read it.

Today I submit to you, contrary to the Vice President's remarks, that the employees of Wal-Mart are beginning to set an example for American workers—by fighting back on behalf of themselves and others who are unfairly treated by their employer. This week, as the attached L.A. Times article explains, a judge in California certified the largest employment-discrimination class action in history. A class of 1.5 million women who have worked at Wal-Mart are suing the retail giant for sex dis-

crimination. According to papers submitted in court, female employees are paid less than their male counterparts, promoted less frequently than their male counterparts, and retaliated against when they complain. In today's workplace—all too often rife with employer threats and intimidation—it takes a great deal of courage from workers to stand up for their rights. So I rise to salute one of those workers, a brave woman from my home district,

Betty Dukes of Pittsburg, California, one of the lead plaintiffs in this historic lawsuit. She has worked at Wal-Mart for ten years and simply wants a fair opportunity to succeed. She is now standing up for over a million other women who have punched the cash registers, stocked the shelves, and greeted customers for years without that opportunity. Her courage is to be commended. And I hail her as an American hero.

[From the LA Times, June 24, 2004]

WAL-MART PLAINTIFF STILL LOVES THE
STORE: WORKER WHO IS SPEARHEADING A
LANDMARK GENDER BIAS SUIT SAYS SHE
JUST WANTS A CHANCE TO ADVANCE

(By Donna Horowitz, Eric Slater and Lee Romney)

Pittsburg, CA.—Less than 24 hours after a federal judge ruled that 1.5 million women who have worked for Wal-Mart could pursue a class-action gender discrimination suit, the lead plaintiff in the case was back on the job here Wednesday nattily dressed, quick with a smile and talking about how much she likes the company she's suing.

All Betty Dukes wanted, the 10-year veteran of the company said, was "the opportunity to advance myself with Wal-Mart."

On Tuesday, U.S. District Judge Martin J. Jenkins in San Francisco ruled that the suit originally filed by Dukes and five other women could be expanded to virtually every woman who has worked at the world's largest company since late 1998. The suit alleges that Wal-Mart pays women less than men for performing the same job, passes over women to promote less-qualified men and retaliates against women who complain.

The judge's ruling set the stage for what could be the giant retailer's greatest test ever. The sheer number of plaintiffs means that a loss or even a settlement could cost the company billions of dollars.

As Dukes was receiving minor-celebrity treatment from customers and co-workers—"Did you see my story in the paper today?" she asked customers, holding up a copy of a local newspaper—officials from the Arkansas retail colossus emphasized that Tuesday's ruling did not address the merits of the case and said it would do nothing to influence the company's plans to expand in California and elsewhere.

"It really doesn't change anything," said Robert McAdam, the firm's vice president for state and local government relations. "Nothing is different as it relates to our development plans or our prospects for growth in the state."

The company has weathered a series of high-profile tests, most recently in Inglewood, where Wal-Mart went so far as to ask voters to allow a Supercenter in their community only to be rejected. At the same time, other communities in the state have actively courted the retailer.

As Dukes smiled and welcomed customers to the store in this town of 48,000 about 40 miles northeast of San Francisco, many of the mixed emotions that Wal-Mart tends to evoke were in evidence around her.

Lozell Belarde, 39, seemed to embody the dichotomy of some customers.

"I really don't even like the store," said the property manager after a short shopping

spree. "I don't like the company. They don't treat their employees right. They don't even treat the customer right."

"But," she added, "the price is reasonable."

Holly Hamilton pushed her shopping cart through the parking lot looking not unlike an ad for Wal-Mart. In her cart was almost everything the 27-year-old nurse would need for an upcoming camping trip: a fishing pole, beach towels, food and bottled water, all gathered at a single store for hard-to-beat prices.

Like many customers outside the Pittsburgh store Wednesday, Hamilton did not know about Tuesday's ruling, but when told, she expressed some concern and said she might consider shopping elsewhere if a court determined the company discriminated against women.

During an afternoon break, Dukes, dressed in a black and tan outfit with a billowing red scarf, turned an upside down shopping cart into an impromptu chair.

"Wish you the best of luck, sweetie," a male customer called to Dukes in the store parking lot.

Dukes was hired at Wal-Mart a decade ago, with grand plans for a quick move up the ladder into management. Instead, she says, she was passed over for promotions repeatedly, as men with less experience landed the job.

But she makes \$12.53 an hour—an increase of more than 25% in the three years since the lawsuit was filed, thanks to generous raises. A volunteer minister, Dukes likes most of her co-workers and bosses, who "respect my right to pursue this matter." She likes most of the customers, most parts of the job. She works at Wal-Mart and shops at Wal-Mart, and loves the prices.

"All we're asking for is our day in court, and to let the evidence speak for itself."

The ruling, in which Jenkins said the "evidence raises an inference that Wal-Mart engages in discriminatory practices in compensation and promotion that affect all plaintiffs in a common manner," however, is by no means the company's first considerable trial. And even as the number of Wal-Mart critics appears to be growing, so does the number of its defenders—and so does the company's reach.

One of the company's previous blows came in April, when Inglewood voters soundly defeated a sweeping initiative that would have allowed the company to build a Supercenter the size of 17 football fields without going through the traditional layers of city bureaucracy.

The company spent more than \$1 million in its failed effort to pass the initiative, buying television commercials and handing out doughnuts, all for an election that drew just 12,000 voters. Opponents spent a fraction of that amount and won the contest, about 7,000 casting ballots against the proposal and 4,500 in favor.

The contest's David vs. Goliath overtones rippled across the country. On paper, however, the defeat cost the company but a single Supercenter.

And the company, which opened its first Supercenter in the state this spring in La Quinta, southeast of Palm Springs, has plans for 40 more across California, including stores in Stockton and Hemet expected to open this year.

The Supercenters are the company's most controversial because of their size, averaging 200,000 square feet, and the fact that they stock groceries.

Wal-Mart pays its employees, male and female, less than many other similar retail outlets as well as grocery stores. The so-called Wal-Mart effect—the company's ability to undercut competitors with its lower

wages and prices—helped trigger the longest grocery store strike in Southern California last year as some grocers sought wage and benefit concessions they said were needed to compete with the Supercenters.

Although the company lost its Inglewood battle, and as many California cities, including Los Angeles, have passed ordinances that effectively ban such massive "box stores," the company has found open arms in many other parts of the state. Some describe the Inglewood opposition, the lawsuit and other attacks on the company as knee-jerk bashing of a successful corporation.

In Gilroy, where the City Council voted 5 to 2 in March to approve a Supercenter, Wal-Mart proponents wrote off the news of the lawsuit ruling as legal hullabaloo.

"Certification of a class-action suit is easy to do," said Bill Lindsteadt, executive director of the Gilroy Economic Development Corp., which embraces the new center. "It's frivolous. It's another ploy by the unions to force Wal-Mart to become union."

While heated fights over proposed Supercenters are playing out across the state, some observers say the company is facing increasing difficulties as it moves from rural and suburban markets into urban areas—and that Tuesday's ruling may increase opposition.

As Wal-Mart moves "from the suburban fringe and really starts to look more in urban areas . . . they're encountering a different level of concern and opposition than they were when they were building out amid the strip malls," said Amaha Kassa, co-director of the East Bay Alliance for a Sustainable Economy. "These kinds of issues of pay equity and disparate treatment are very much going to be issues of concern for urban voters."

RECOGNIZING SANDCASTLE DAYS IN IMPERIAL BEACH, CALIFORNIA

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 2004

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a country of patriots. A nation entering a hot summer, full of turmoil and uncertainty.

The coming three months will be marked by many significant world events; the transfer of sovereignty in Iraq, the Olympic games in Greece, an escalating November election at home.

The world will spin a little faster this summer and to compensate we must all pull together as a nation.

It is time for us to reconnect, to remind ourselves what it is that makes us uniquely American.

We are all neighbors, and that which divides us will never outshine that which unites us.

We are all neighbors, and for that reason I share with the community what is happening in my yard this summer.

In one month time the 28,000 residents of Imperial Beach, California will be holding their city's 48th birthday commemoration.

Proudly anchored as the country's most southwesterly city, this diverse seaside town is preparing to celebrate the same way it has for the past quarter-century. Come early July, the city of Imperial Beach will be holding its 24th annual U.S. Open Sandcastle Competition.

For three days, creativity and civic pride will be honored. In addition to the sand-sculpting

contest, festivities will include a community ball, street parade, and nighttime fireworks display over the Pacific.

The weekend long celebration will draw over 250,000 spectators. People will swarm the sand to see creations that will not last the next tide. In the spirit of ingenuity, modern marvels of dirt will be erected and destroyed in an afternoon's time.

For three days the sun will shine and the children will smile. The world will slow in this corner of the country and we will celebrate the anniversary of a city, the essence of a nation.

We are a "can do" people, but that does not mean we should have to do it alone.

My district is only 1 of 435, and so I ask my fellow Representatives in the House, what is your District doing this summer? Let us share in this most public of forums, that which unites us as a country.

We are each other's neighbors and we should not let an opportunity to come together pass us by. The world will seem a smaller and safer place if we know what is happening in our own backyards.

So as summer quickly comes to our countryside, let us give voice to our originality, and champion all that makes our society truly extraordinary.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEDICATION OF THE TARAS SHEVCHENKO MONUMENT

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 2004

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 2004, the Ukrainian American community will be celebrating the 40th jubilee commemoration of the unveiling of the monument to Taras Shevchenko, known as the bard of Ukraine for his exquisite lyric poetry and numerous novels, as well as his many works of art.

Taras Shevchenko was born in the Kyiv region in 1814 to a childhood of servitude and a life of hardship. He first worked as a houseboy until his owner realized his artistic talent, after which he was apprenticed to a painter. His freedom was purchased in 1838 by another painter who appreciated Mr. Shevchenko's work.

An ardent champion of freedom and Ukrainian independence, Taras Shevchenko saw George Washington as a symbol and liberator of the American people from the colonial rule of a foreign power. Mr. Shevchenko's works played a key role in the awakening and drive for national liberation of the Ukrainian people. In his poems, he attacked tyrants, oppressors and all enemies of human freedom and decency.

Mr. Shevchenko's love of freedom and criticism of the czars resulted in his arrest in 1847. He was first sentenced to forced military duty, and later imprisonment, where he remained in Russian custody until his release in 1857, two years after the death of Czar Nicholas. He was arrested again in 1859 and remained under police surveillance until his death in 1861.

Years of harsh punishment did nothing to curtail his fight against the imperialist and colonial occupation of his native land. Mr. Shevchenko secretly produced numerous