

RECOGNIZING LEXMARK INTERNATIONAL'S EXCELLENCE IN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

HON. ERNIE FLETCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1999

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Lexmark International, an excellent corporate constituent headquartered in my District, that embodies the entrepreneurial spirit as well as the environmental consciousness required by a global corporation.

Lexmark received the Kentucky Governor's Environmental Excellence Award on November 9, presented by Lt. Gov. Steve Henry and James E. Bickford, Secretary of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet, at the Governor's Conference on the Environment.

Lexmark International was selected to receive this year's Environmental Excellence Award for Industrial Environmental Leadership because of the many steps it has taken to prevent pollution and encourage recycling. Since 1991, Lexmark has increased the amount of materials it recycles by about 70 percent. Last year, this Lexington-based company recycled more than 4.3 million pounds of paper and one million pounds of scrap metal.

Lexmark encourages its customers to recycle by offering them an incentive to return their empty laser printer cartridges through its Prebate program. Since the incentive began, Lexmark says that returns of empty toner cartridges have tripled, saving them from ending up in landfills.

As we recognize America Recycles Day this week, I urge my colleagues and our constituents to help encourage environmental protection both at home and at work. I offer my congratulations to Lexmark International for setting such a positive example for others to replicate.

COURAGE

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1999

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this statement regarding my constituent, Gordon D. Ladd, which shows the courage and perseverance he displayed in organizing the first union in northern Vermont in the 1940s, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I believe the views of this person will benefit my colleagues.

GORDON D. LADD—FIRST PRESIDENT OF IAM LODGE IN DERBY LINE VERMONT ORGANIZING A UNION IN VERMONT IN THE 1940'S

In 1943 I requested an interview with the superintendent of management at Butterfield Corporation in Derby Line Vermont to request a wage increase and my request was denied emphatically. I informed him that I would return.

I met a friend of mine who used to be a coach, a hockey coach, and he had relatives in the plant. This guy I met, Bert, you could call him, he was a machinist for the railroad in Island Pond, and he belonged to the machinist's union. So he asked if we had a union up there and what the wages were. We

were good friends, he was coach for a long time, but anyway, I told him that wages were very low at my workplace, and he said "Well, do you think they would be interested in the union?" I said "Well, yeah I'll talk to a few." So, I did.

When I went up to see the boss that first time he asked me what I was making. I told him "65 cents an hour". I had started at 45 cents and worked three years—I got a 10 cent raise each year. And it was 65 cents, and he, ah, he's a rough little character, he slammed his fists down on his desk and he says "by god," he says, "that's the highest we will ever pay at this plant". So then I got up and said "We'll see about that, and I'll be back."

So now I went to the shop, talked to several guys, they were all interested, all enthused about it, and said they would support a union. So then I get back to Burt at Island Pond, and told him to send us up a representative. It was then less than a week and the Machinist representative had arrived from Albany, New York. And he talked to me, he came to the house a few times, and then we called a meeting, and, more and more, one meeting after another, at first it was a small amount, a few men, but then they got bigger and bigger crowds.

Management of course fought us tooth and nail. Well, one thing I can remember in particular. The general foreman, he was under the superintendent, he was putting something on the union representative's car, on the front end of it, come to find out, spikes on a rope. And he was seen doing that, and we called him on it, but he denied it of course. You see they hit just right and they could blow the tires.

They did little annoying things. They'd send us one of these, what we'd call suckers down, always coming down and talking to me, trying to find out things, you know. I just told them I knew nothing. Another one of these superintendents came down one day and says "We know you're the head of the union," and I said "I've got a perfectly good right to according to the laws". And he didn't have too much more to say.

We also learned that the company had hired an electrician for the purpose of organizing against the union, see he was a company plant. So he got up and threw a scare, said that if we had a union we would lose our bonus, a 10% bonus every six months. So that killed the first drive right there, see. And they tried every little trick, they sent the people down that I knew, they'd come down and fish around, try to get information from me. Then they called me, offered me 10 cents an hour more, if I'd stop the union organizing. "We'll give you 10 cents an hour raise, but I want you to keep it quiet, I don't want you to tell anybody." Then they'd say, "If you tell me the guys that are dissatisfied in the shop, give me their names, we'd give them 15 cents an hour more." And I said "Just a minute, if everybody gets 15 cents and hour we'll go along with it, but other than that," I said, "no way". You can pick out a few, that would just start trouble.

So then we call the meeting, the machinist's union, and we get a hall and call the meeting, and that was the one where we lost the election the first time.

I don't remember the exact vote total but it was close. But then comes the good part. We later learned that the company sent down foremen and group leaders and had them vote too. But the fact is they shouldn't have been able to vote because they were management. They even sent down 3 or 4 women down from the office to vote, and the vote was for production workers and these were office workers. They shouldn't have been able to vote either but management wanted more to go in the ballot box.

So we petitioned for another election. And once again during the vote the company

starting sending down foremen and group leaders to vote. But this time our union representative said no way. The Labor Board Representative was there and we challenged the right of these supervisory men to vote. The Board Representative put those votes, I think there were 26 of them, in a special envelope. This time we won the election by a pretty good margin. That was in 1944.

Another little thing here. I was in a barber shop and the big shot manager from the venier mill came in. My barber was my landlord, we were renting the house, and he asked me something about the union. And this management guy from the mill, he says "That union" and he used a few cuss-words "won't last six months!" Well it's a 55 year later and the union's still there. But the funny part is, in about a year and a half, they plopped the union in at the venier mill.

Well, the main thing at my plant was wages, because plants in the state, we checked around a little bit and some of the plants were paying, at that time, double what we were getting. We checked around, because some of the guys, neighbors in Newport were working down in the Springfield machine shops, at places like Jones-Lampson. When we heard what they were getting, we thought "Well, we should be getting about the same."

I was elected as the first president of the union lodge in 1944 and served for seven years. We did pretty good with improving wages and getting benefits—we got health insurance, a pension plan. I've collected from the pension plan for 19 years now, and we got pretty good medical. We didn't have either before the union. It definitely pays to be union.

A BAD WEEK FOR ISOLATIONISTS

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1999

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, for those who might have missed it, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a piece by David Ignatius from Wednesday's Washington Post.

As a strong supporter of free trade, I share Mr. Ignatius's optimism at the agreement reached earlier this week for China to join the World Trade Organization. As foreign trade becomes increasingly important in the developing global economy, we must work to ensure open access to the emerging Chinese markets, especially in the areas of financial services and telecommunications. This agreement will give that access to American companies. I salute Trade Representative Barshefsky on her hard work at achieving this agreement under difficult circumstances.

I also agree with Mr. Ignatius's view that the agreement does not go far enough. As a member of the congressional delegation to the WTO Ministerial in Seattle later this month, I will work to restore some of the more favorable aspects of the agreement rejected by the President in April.

I commend Mr. Ignatius's article to my colleagues' attention.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 17, 1999]

A BAD WEEK FOR ISOLATIONISTS

If you believe that international engagement is America's best hope for the future, then this is a week to savor. For beyond the

headlines, you can see the possibility for a restoration of the confident, outward-looking U.S. consensus that our history teaches is a requirement for global peace and prosperity.

The cornerstone of this renewed embrace of America's global role is the deal reached early Monday in Beijing for China to join the World Trade Organization. President Clinton let this agreement slip away last April, because of fears about the anti-international know-nothingism that seemed to have infected Congress. That was one of the biggest mistakes of his presidency, and he has commendably been trying ever since to walk it back.

The deal Clinton got Monday isn't quite as good as the one he backed away from before, but it's good enough. What's better is the new confidence among free traders that they can win the political argument, on Capitol Hill and around the country.

Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers puts the case for the WTO deal simply and starkly: Twice in this century, changes in the economic balance of power have led to wars—first with the rise of Germany before World War I and later with the rise of Japan. Now the world economic order is changing once again, with the emergence of Beijing as an economic superpower. It is overwhelmingly in America's interest to draw this modernizing China into the global economic system.

Americans who are confident about the world-changing power of our capitalism and democracy will welcome the agreement. China will now have to live by the free-market rules of the WTO. It will have to accept international investments in its major industries, including banking and telecommunications; it will have to abide by international arbitration of its trade disputes; it will have to accept the Internet and its instantaneous access to information. If you can devise a better strategy for subverting Communist rule in China, I'd like to hear it.

What makes the anti-WTO camp so nervous? It must be the fact that we're living in a time of economic upheaval. As the global economy becomes more competitive, the rewards for success become greater, and so do the penalties for failure. Optimists embrace this future, while pessimists seek protection from it.

Fear of the future: That's the shared characteristic of the new anti-internationalists—from Pat Buchanan on the right to AFL-CIO president John Sweeney on the left. They seem to believe that every new job in China will mean one less in America. Thank goodness economics doesn't work that way. The evidence is overwhelming that global prosperity creates new markets, new demand—and more prosperity for all of us.

That doesn't mean that there won't be losers—there will be and the U.S. textile industry and some blue-collar traders will undoubtedly be among them. But in macro terms, this is a pie that gets bigger, a game where two sides can win.

The administration's most articulate champion for this kind of internationalism is Summers. And it must be said that the new Treasury Secretary is cleaning up some of the unfinished business left by his predecessor, Robert Rubin.

Summers helped rescue the WTO agreement with a trip last month to Beijing, where he met with Zhu Rongji, the Chinese prime minister. Summers told him that "we wanted a deal, but it would have to be on commercial terms. . . . We would both have to make concessions on percentage points." Thanks to hard bargaining by U.S. trade negotiator Charlene Barshefsky, that's essentially what happened.

This week brought other signs of renewed political support for a pragmatic internationalism. The administration cut a deal with House Republicans that will allow the United States to pay nearly \$1 billion in back dues to the United Nations, in exchange for a ban on funding any international organization that promotes abortion.

Summers has worked hard to include debt relief for the world's poorest nations as part of the U.N. funding deal, and his mostly succeeded. Wealthy lenders will take a hit under this agreement, while poverty-stricken nations will get a break. That sounds like the right kind of bargain.

Another step in the internationalist revival could come next month when Summers pitches European nations to accept some new rules for the International Monetary Fund. He'll urge that the IMF support either tough fixed exchange-rate plans or genuinely free floating rates—but not the muddled in-between schemes that have gotten so many countries in trouble. He'll also urge a new IMF assessment system to detect when countries' short-term liabilities are rising toward the danger point. And in light of the recent Russian fiasco, he may argue that countries should accept outside audits as a condition of receiving IMF funds.

Some Americans still believe that "IMF," "free trade" and "WTO" are dirty words—symbols of an elitist conspiracy that will harm ordinary Americans. This view is dangerously wrong, and it was good to see it losing ground this week.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MR. LAURIE CARLSON

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1999

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and commend the life of Mr. Laurie Carlson and to extend my personal sympathies to his family and friends in his passing. Mr. Laurie Carlson worked to enhance the lives of many citizens of Wisconsin over the years. He was the founder of the Wisconsin Progressive Party in 1934 and was elected to the Wisconsin State Assembly in 1936, where he served for three terms. He then continued his life of dedication to public service as the Clerk of Courts for Dane County for another four terms.

Mr. Carlson's simple message and instructions on, "How to get the Voters Involved" is one that I deeply respect and identify with. In this message he spoke of town meetings and always maintaining a strong personal connection to constituents. Upon reflection on his time in public service Mr. Carlson was quoted as saying, "Shoe leather is cheap. We would go out and meet people. We would get ideas from them." He also believed that a strong focus on the issues, as well as on true bipartisanship would help Wisconsin and the Nation move forward.

Mr. Carlson's political achievements were numerous and great, but there was also much more to this wonderful man. He was a devoted husband and proud father of four children. His commitment to his wife Helen and his children—Mary, Jay, Laurene, and Geraldine, was first and foremost in his life. Mr. Carlson was also a dedicated friend and community member. He tirelessly worked to share his knowledge and leadership in order to as-

sist others to become successful. He empowered many people to prosper in business and countless other ventures while always maintaining his commitment to those less fortunate in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to honor this fine gentleman for his life commitment to public service.

RECOGNITION OF THE UKRAINIAN FAMINE OF 1932

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1999

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian famine of 1932–33 stands as one of the most tragic events of this century. Millions of Ukrainian men, women and children starved to death in one of the cruelest acts of inhumanity ever recorded.

The rich and productive soil of Ukraine once fed the world. Ukraine was known then as the breadbasket of Europe. It was inconceivable that in 1932 peasants would be forced to scavenge in harvested fields for food and that their diets would be reduced to nothing but potatoes, beets and pumpkins. Instead of planting seeds for the next crop, peasant were reduced to feeding those seeds to their children. As a result, little grain was harvested for the next crop, and the situation grew worse.

Peasants began leaving Ukraine, trying to search for food in Russia and other neighboring territories, but they were turned back.

Soon, millions began to starve to death.

As many as ten million people may have died in this famine. That's fully one-quarter of the people in rural Ukraine. The Kremlin was starving the people of Ukraine to death because Josef Stalin and the Soviet dictators wanted to avoid mass resistance to collectivization. So they killed the peasants—slowly, deliberately and diabolically through mass starvation.

The West did little at the time to put an end to the man-made famine. They continued to buy grain at cheap prices from Russia, taking more food away from the Ukrainian people.

We should never forget this tragedy. Today we honor the memory of the millions of victims. And we support the efforts of the people of Ukraine, who were subjected to the famine and to decades of oppressive Soviet rule, as they continue on their path to democracy, respect for human rights, and economic progress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution and stand together with the people of Ukraine.

H.R. 3446, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD REFORM ACT OF 1999

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1999

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today H.R. 3446, the Surface Transportation Board Reform Act of 1999.

The Surface Transportation Board has been a troubled agency since its creation at the end of 1995.