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