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 card 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

day that they died. Then labor helped to take the lead in enacting the Social Security legislation in the mid-1930s.

If one was born in 1926, they lived in a world where the day they stopped working, they stopped getting any kind of health care coverage or access to medical services if they had it at all before then.

The mid-1960s again was in the vanguard as Congress passed and President Johnson signed the Medicare legislation, which has assured generations of Americans, labor union families and nonlabor union families, the security of first class health care from the day they retire until the day that they die.

If one was born in 1926, they lived in a world where it was legal to require someone to work more than 40 hours a week without paying them overtime. It was legal to press into service children. It was legal to send them to work for long hours in dark places that were unfit for human work or human habitation. Labor was in the vanguard of changing that as well.

The strides that labor has made are based upon the ability to bargain collectively, and it is this right of collective bargaining that needs protection and support in the Congress of the United States. There are two actions that I think are important for us to consider. One we should take and one we should not take.

We should, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), has suggested and others have suggested, enact legislation that says to an employer that when the employer in bad faith refuses to bargain collectively with a duly recognized collective bargaining union, that that employer should be held responsible for the consequential damages and attorney's fees which flow from such a failure to bargain in good faith.

The way it works today is that when a union fights and wins a representation election and an employer chooses to keep on fighting rather than to start bargaining, that lost wages and lost value of benefits and expenses incurred as a result of continuing to litigate and to fight are not recoverable by the workers who won that representation election.

It is a unique anomaly in American law. In virtually every other area of contract law in America, if one has a contract and it is breached by the other side, they are made whole for the consequences of that breach. That is not true in collective bargaining legislation and it ought to be. That is the aim of legislation that I have introduced in the House of Representatives in this Congress.

□ 1715

What we should not do is pass so-called paycheck protection legislation that is designed to require of unions what we do not require of any other institution in American life, and that is that if the union wishes to become involved in political activity, to express itself through education or voter registration, they have to get unanimous consent. I believe that is the wrong way to go. We should not do so. I think we should do the other legislation.

COMPACT IMPACT AID TO GUAM NOT SUFFICIENT

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, today I want to draw the attention of Members to the financial and economic conditions in Guam by discussing two policy and legislative items with dramatic consequences for Guam.

First of all, I want to talk about the Interior appropriations bill which was marked up today by the full Committee on Appropriations. Guam was given $5.38 million for Compact Impact Aid. Compact Impact assistance is money that is given to the Government of Guam as a form of reimbursement for educational and social services given to migrants from the Freely Associated States, primarily the FSM, the Federated States of Micronesia, some impact from the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Republic of Palau.

These three states, that are independent nations, are in free association with the United States; and these compacts of free association have allowed these three nations to be the only independent nations on the face of the Earth to have unmonitored and unregulated migration into the United States.

Because of the geographic and developmental conditions in the Micronesian region, Guam is impacted more than any other state or territory by the unmonitored migration by the Freely Associated States in Micronesia, which continues to have dramatic impact for a number of services provided by the Government of Guam.

Since the Compacts of Free Association were first established in 1986, Guam only started to receive Compact Impact aid in fiscal year 1996, and during that time period until 1999 Guam annually received $4.58 million from the Department of Interior's Office of Insular Affairs budget. However, the Government of Guam continues to maintain that it expends anywhere between $15 million to $25 million annually to provide educational and social services for migrants.

Although there continues to be differences between how the Government of Guam and how the Department of the Interior calculate these actual impact costs, the Department of Interior in a letter accompanying a report by the new Secretary of the Interior, Gale Norton, acknowledges the Department of the Interior's own best estimates of $12.8 million annually for Compact Impact costs for Guam. This is acknowledged in a letter by the new Secretary of the Interior.

It has been noted by the Governor of Guam, Carl T. Gutierrez, that Guam has spent over $150 million for these migrants who have come to Guam since 1986, while Federal reimbursement has totalled roughly $40 million for the same period.

Funding authority for Compact Impact assistance stems from Public Law 99–239. This is the law which governs the relationship between the United States and these three independent countries. Basically, the law states that there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after 1985 such sums as may be necessary to cover the costs, if any, incurred by the State of Hawaii, the Territories of Guam, American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands, resulting from any increased demands placed on educational and social services by immigrants from the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia.

The impact has been direct, the impact has been dramatic, right on Guam. The need for Compact Impact Aid has been documented. It is doable to fix this problem.

This situation for the Government of Guam is further aggravated by the recent passage of the President's tax cut plan. Guam and the Virgin Islands are two territories that operate under a mirror Tax Code. That is, any changes that are made in the Federal Tax Code are immediately reflected in the local tax codes, which also collect income tax. So this means that, particularly in the case of Guam, we are probably likely to experience cuts over the next year of anywhere between $20 million and $30 million in local revenues as a result of these tax cuts that have been introduced by President Bush and have now passed into law.

These tax cuts were conceived here for the Federal Government because of a surplus. In Guam, the Government of Guam is operating on a deficit, we are experiencing some 15 percent unemployment, and we are in the middle of an economic downturn as a result of the Japanese economic downturn and recent reductions in military spending.

So, basically, we need the Compact Impact Aid. It can be done, it is doable, it is the right thing to do, and I urge Members to consider this as the Interior appropriations works its way through.