

This audit specifically identified 293 employees with delinquent accounts. They had Federal Government credit cards within the Department of Commerce, including unpaid charges and use of credit cards for personal purchases, even with ATM's—293 employees had delinquent accounts. Now listen to this; 567 had used the card for ATM advances for personal charges for meals at fancy Washington restaurants, liquor, jewelry, flowers, books, music, on-line service fees, we do not know what that is, and automobile insurance.

Would not all of my constituents in the Seventh District of Florida like to have one of these handy cards? This is not just a few folks; this is 567.

Now, we came, we looked at the Department of Commerce, and we saw disorganization. We saw 20,000 people out of 36,000 just here in Washington, DC. We saw us losing our shirt and pants and economic opportunity in the international trade arena, and we tried to reorganize it. We proposed that and got slammed in the face. We have been ignored.

Then we have the President come here and talk about global competition, and no one is less prepared than the United States of America to compete in this global market.

So here is what is going on. These are the choices we have to make. These are the choices Americans have to make, and we have got to do something about it. We wanted to change much more. We acceded to one department, and this is what the people are getting for their money. Their money is being wasted. We are not competing.

You heard Mr. BROWNBACK. The answer that the gentleman gave is true. We can do more for business with a balanced budget. We can do more to promote business with less taxation, less litigation, less government regulation. Those are all part of our agenda here, what we have tried to do in a sensible, responsible, commonsense business fashion.

But people do not want to listen to that. They want to stand up and say the Republicans are hurting the elderly, environment, and education. It sounds good and gets on a bumper sticker, but it does not jibe with the facts.

These are the facts, that this department and other departments are out of control, that this Federal bureaucracy is out of control. When you have 350,000 Federal employees within just a few miles of my speaking distance from the floor of the House of Representatives, that is what this argument is about.

These freshmen have come here from business, from every walk of life, and they do not care whether they get re-elected. That is the difference here. They do not care whether they get re-elected. They came here to get this country's finance in order. They came here to get this Government in order. That is what they care about. They do not care about the next election, they care about the next generation.

When you see this country, the threat of our debt carrying us into a lower credit rating on the international market, when you see the President talking about responsibility with pension funds, while Secretary Rubin, the Secretary of the Treasury, is rocking the shreds that are left of our Federal employees' retirement funds. It is a pitiful state of affairs for this country, for this Congress, and for the future of any American.

So I thank the gentleman. I get a little bit wound up on this, but I care too, and I know the gentleman cares, and that is why we came here. It does not matter whether we come back, because others will come to this job. It has to be done. It must be done, and it will be done for the future of this country.

Mr. CHRYSLER. I thank the gentleman and appreciate those words. The gentleman mentioned 37,000 employees in the Commerce Department. Two-thirds of those employees were deemed nonessential during the first Government shutdown, 24,000 employees. My legislation only reduced it by one-third, or about 12,000 employees, which says we are not extreme, just conservative. The extreme position is when you want to protect the status quo, and we are here to change it.

To that point, I would sure like to yield some time to my good friend from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Michigan. As we are gathered here on the floor to have a little straight talk, I think it is very interesting again to recall the words of our Chief Executive, who stood here at the podium 2 nights ago and who said the days of big government are over.

Well, maybe there is a word we should insert there, because I think what the American people want to know is that the days of big spending government are over. For how could the President make that assertion 2 nights ago, and be here in this Chamber with his Cabinet officers, including two of the biggest spenders the executive branch has ever seen? If not the biggest spenders, certainly two of the most well traveled Cabinet secretaries this country has ever seen?

I exchanged pleasantries with Secretary O'Leary. Much as been made, and, indeed, the record of her travels has been chronicled for all in this free society to see. And apart from recognition of those problems, the White House has turned a deaf ear. Of course, this White House, goodness knows, has problems of its own.

Then Secretary Brown. It is almost as if the receptionist at the Commerce Department could make a recording that rhymes: "Mr. Brown is out of town." That in itself would not be so bad, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, but Mr. Brown is out of town, and he is on your expense account, you, the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in here, all of the American people who pay their taxes, who play by the rules, are fi-

nancing trips that need some oversight, expenditures that this Congress should take a very real look at, and, again, not questioning the sincerity of the service, but instead looking at the evidence, the compelling evidence.

A few years before we got here there was criticism of another Secretary of Commerce who served under a Republican President, and previous Congresses chose to investigate that Secretary of Commerce. And yet expenditures for the current Secretary of Commerce are some 145 percent above his Republican predecessors. Now, I realize in this town, and given the kind of quirky mathematics employed by the liberals inside the beltway, they will probably try to say that is a cut. But it is an increase, and it is to the credit of the gentleman from Michigan that he has brought it to our attention and a credit to the fact that it has not gone on his credit card, but has been brought to the attention of the American public.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Now more than ever it is time to dismantle the Department of Commerce.

#### BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 20 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House.

Mr. Speaker, former Prime Minister Rabin made it very clear that he felt that politicians, elected officials, were elected by adults to represent the children, and that is in fact what our responsibility ultimately is, to represent the children and to leave this country a better place than we found it.

When I was elected in the statehouse in 1974, really at the end of the Vietnam War, our national debt was \$430 billion. In the 22 years since the end of the Vietnam war, our national debt has grown to \$4.9 trillion. We have seen a tenfold increase since the last really extensive war. So we fought the Revolutionary War, we fought the war with the pirates, we fought the War of 1812, we fought the Civil War, we fought the Spanish-American War, we fought World War I, we fought World War II, we fought the Korean war, we fought the Vietnam war, and our national debt was about \$430 billion.

Admittedly those dollars bought more in past years, but since then our national debt has grown to \$4.9 trillion.

I was elected to the statehouse, and I looked at Congress with some awe, that it is an amazing place. It is a magnificent opportunity to serve in Congress. But I looked as a State legislator and said I have to balance our State budget in Connecticut. I cannot let it be unbalanced.

I understand when times are bad you might have a year or two when you

want to generate economic activity and get out of a recession, but you would not just have this systematic deficit spending that has added tenfold to our national debt.

When I was elected in 1987, I vowed that the most important thing would be to save our country from bankruptcy. Not to "balance the budget," but, no, to save it from bankruptcy, to not mortgage this country so that our children would not have a country.

I became part of an effort that the gentleman from Ohio [JOHN KASICH] started in 1989, at least that is the first time I remember voting for one of his major deficit reduction bills, and there were 38 of us that voted for it. Each year that number kept increasing.

We have three main objections as this Republican majority: We want to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget; we want to save our trust funds from bankruptcy, particularly Medicare from insolvency, as it is going now to bankruptcy in the year 2002, 7 years from now, now 6 years from now; and, third, we want to transform this caretaking social and corporate welfare state into a caring opportunity society.

Now, on the first area, getting our financial house in order, as a Member of Congress, I vote on one-third of the budget. I do not vote on entitlements, unless we make a proactive effort to change. What comes out of the Committee on Appropriations is one third of the budget. When I was in the statehouse, it was basically 100 percent of the budget, except for the debt issue. So we vote only one-third of the budget.

Gramm-Rudman focused on one-third of the budget. You control the budget by appropriations, but it was only one-third. Then entitlements kept growing so that they are now half of our budget.

What we are looking to do, this is the first Congress, and Wednesday are doing something that Leon Panetta, the Chief of Staff, the former head of the OMB, but then the former chairman of the Committee on the Budget said we have to do, that we will only get a handle on our budget and get our financial house in order if we look to control the growth of entitlements.

So I take tremendous pride in being part of an effort with my colleagues on this side of the aisle, who have been willing to take on every special interest to represent the children to get our financial house in order so that we do not have such large debt. And this debt is consuming 42 percent of all of our savings.

Now, what does that mean? It means that when people save money for new plant and equipment, to have it be invested in this country, 42 percent of it gets taken away to fund our national debt. So what are we doing? We are cutting some discretionary programs. We are doing that. We are downsizing Government. We are looking to have the Commerce Department not be a department anymore, to downsize and re-

duce the number of departments and become more efficient and not have 11 layers of decision makers within our departments; but to reduce that, like we have in the private sector.

But when I hear the word "cut," it applies to some things and not others. We are not cutting the earned income tax credit. We are not cutting the school lunch program. We are not cutting the student loan program. We are not cutting Medicare and Medicaid. Maybe we should in some instances be cutting some programs. We are not. We are allowing them to grow. They are going to grow and grow and grow, but we are trying to slow their growth.

The bottom line to this is what the earned income tax credit is a payment that the Federal Government makes to the working poor. We are going to continue that, but it is not going to go to married couples without children, it is not going to go to single people. And we ultimately are going to cap it so it does not go to people making incomes of \$35,000 or more. We are going to allow the earned income tax credit to grow from \$19 to \$25 billion.

□ 1500

The School Lunch Program is to grow from \$5.2 to \$6.8 billion. The Student Loan Program is to grow from \$24 to \$36 billion; that one really gets me. We are getting student loans. They are growing by 50 percent. Only in this place and in this city, when you cut the growth and allow it to continue to grow by 50 percent, do people say you are spending less.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. Yes, I will yield briefly.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I am so glad to see my friend from Connecticut here, because once again he returns to the key point in this debate. We are trying to realize budgetary savings, not by eviscerating programs but by reducing the rate of growth.

I cannot help but note with great interest when our friend who visited two nights ago, the gentleman who lives in the big White House at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, talks about budgetary savings, he is talking about the same type of exercise, yet he remains unchallenged on that by our friends on this side. Yet that curious mathematical exercise, where increases are called cuts, runs rampant in this institution; and I salute my good friend from Connecticut for once again bringing it to our attention.

I would like to inquire of my friends from Connecticut, because this is something that intrigued me: In the latest budget our President has offered us, he himself talked about the days of big Government being over; but as I understand it, his plan calls for some \$200 billion in higher taxes and some \$350 billion in additional spending over and above the real savings that you have labored so hard for to try and right-size this Government. That, to me, is especially confounding, and I am

wondering why the reports of, dare I say it, budgetary neglect or overspending are not really chronicled in the White House budget offer. It is very curious what transpires inside this beltway with the representations of certain budgetary exercises.

Mr. SHAYS. The gentleman has asked a very important question, and I would like to get into that issue; but what I first want to do is be very clear about what we are doing, because I am not all that clear about what the President is doing.

I am clear about what he is saying in terms of his message, and I want to compliment the President on a few issues. And the gentleman is welcome to stay, but I want to go through a few key points; and I might have time at the end that we would have this type of analysis of the President's presentation.

We are not cutting the earned income tax credit; it is growing. The Student Loan Program is growing. The student lunches are growing. Student loans are growing by 50 percent. Every student is going to get the same amount of loans under our plan as they would get under the President's plan.

There is a difference. We are saying, with the students in that period of when they graduate to when they get a job, and we allow a 6-month, what they call grace period, interest free, we are going to have that interest paid by that student, but we are going to allow that interest to be amortized during the entire repayment of the loan. It amounts to \$9 more a month. It is a movie theater and popcorn. It is a pizza. It is something that we are asking students to do. They will still have all the loans, but it is \$9 more a month, and that is because we do not want the taxpayer to pay that.

We are saving, admittedly, \$4 billion in the next 7 years, the taxpayers are. Medicaid is growing from \$89 to \$127 billion. Medicare is growing from \$178 to \$289 billion.

Medicare is the one that really gets me. Medicare is growing at 7.2 percent more a year, and we did it by not increasing copayments and not increasing the deduction or increasing the cost of the premium to the beneficiary. We leave it at 31.5 percent. The taxpayers will pay 68.5 percent. We left it at 31.5 percent. Under existing law, it would have dropped to 25 percent.

Why would we ask the taxpayers to pay even more? We want to be at 31.5 percent. As health care costs go up, 31.5 percent is going to be slightly higher, but the taxpayers are going to pay slightly higher at 68.5 percent, because they pay the balance of it.

The bottom line is, we are looking to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget, and we are doing it by cutting some programs in discretionary spending and slowing the growth of entitlements, which are 50 percent of the budget. They are on automatic pilot, and we are looking to change that, and we are doing it for our children.

Now, when we get to Medicare, in particular, we know it is starting to go insolvent. What does that mean? This year, more money is going out of the Medicare Part A fund that pays for our hospitals than is coming in; and in the seventh year, all of it is out of the fund; there is no money left. Then the only way we pay for Medicare Part A is, the money goes into the fund and it immediately disappears and it will not be enough to pay for all the costs of Medicare Part A.

So we are looking to restore \$132 billion of funds to put into that system, to slow the takeout and to provide the funds to be in that system until the year 2010. And when I think about this, I am thinking about Medicare, it is growing at 7.2 percent a year. Per beneficiary, it is \$4,800 to \$7,100. And I am going to say it again: Only in this place, when you spend so much more, do people call it a cut. It is a 49-percent increase to beneficiaries.

Let me go through one last part. When we get to this third part, we want to get our financial house in order. We want to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare, from bankruptcy. Transforming this caretaking, social and corporate welfare state into an opportunity society is a very big part of what we are about. Instead of giving people the food, we want them to learn how to grow the food. Instead of giving them the food, we are giving them the seed to grow the food. We are looking to make people responsible.

This gets me to the President's presentation. The President gave a speech that Ronald Reagan, for the most part, would have been proud to give, and I would be. He talked about personal responsibility. He talked about downsizing Government, making it smaller. He talked about what we have been fighting for during this last year. And I want to be respectful of the President, because he was respectful of us and he is our President.

To his credit, he said that this Republican Congress is trying to do some heavy lifting and get our financial house in order. He acknowledged that, and in the end, he acknowledged what we have done with congressional accountability and the gift ban and lobby disclosure. He said it happened under this Congress, and I consider that a positive and honest statement.

I also believe in a lot of what he said about cherishing our children and our family, and dealing with crime and dealing with education issues, and the need, in fact he scolded Congress on the environment, and I happen to agree with his scolding of Congress on that one issue. The pendulum is too far this way, and unfortunately, I think too many of us on our side of the aisle want to go too far the other way. We may have an honest disagreement on that, but that is democracy.

But the bottom line is, I wrestle with this, 12-year-olds having babies. I wrestle with 14-year-olds selling drugs. I wrestle with 15-year-olds killing each

other and 18-year-olds who cannot read their diplomas. I wrestle with 24-year-olds who do not have a job, not because jobs do not exist, but because those McDonald's jobs are dead-end jobs.

My dad, bless his heart, would have said to me, Son, how many hours are you working there? I would have said, 10. He would have said, Son, it just increased to 12 or 15. No job is a dead end, because it teaches you to come to work on time and to get up in the morning and to be of service. And it teaches you that you get something in return.

And so I just make this point, that if we succeed in balancing the budget, if we succeed in saving our trust funds, but we do not transform this social and corporate welfare state into an opportunity society, we have ultimately failed. And I say that as a moderate.

I say, as someone who recognizes that some of what Government has done, and some of what I have voted to have Government do, has failed.

Could I ask the Speaker how much time we have left. I want to make sure I am thoughtful of my colleague who has joined me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman has 5 minutes left.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, sometimes a liberal is the person who sees someone drowning out 50 feet from the pier and runs to the end of the pier and grabs 100 feet of rope and throws this excess rope. The rope is dangling around the person, and finally it is taut and ready to be pulled in, and that liberal takes the rope, drops it, and says, I have done my good deed and on to the next.

I have criticism of conservatives if they take this position: They see someone drowning 50 feet out and they take 25 feet of rope and say, Here, I will throw 25 feet of rope. You swim halfway, and I will meet you and pull you in.

They may need 50 feet of rope, but they may need something more, and I believe this side of the aisle has not taken that view. It has taken the view that we need not only give people the seed, but show them how to grow the food. But we do not necessarily give them the food indefinitely.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I think my friend offers an interesting analogy, and what I have often said, despite some of the labels and names that have been bandied about this Chamber, what difference does it make if an idea is called conservative or liberal or whatever, if it makes sense? The notion being this: that if we are able truly to empower the individual, if we are able to make sure that society has a safety net instead of a hammock, then that should be our goal.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Connecticut for his diligence in looking at budgetary issues and acknowledging, while sometimes we may not

see completely eye to eye on every item that comes down the pike, certainly there is a broad consensus within this new majority to address the problems.

But even as we had our friend from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue join us the other night and say that the days of big government were over, I was intrigued by the statement he said, "But we cannot fend for ourselves," or words to that effect. And I believe that we have to be very careful of that type of blanket statement, for what it does is contradict the previous statement.

For it is not the role of government to step into every home, to step into every situation; to say, Washington calling, and we are here to provide you certain safeguards, or we are here to step in and intervene in every avenue of your life. Of course not.

The notion is this: that for society's poorest, that for society's sickest, that for society's weakest, government can exist to help make sure that rights are enforced, that individual liberties are not taken away; but we must remain ever vigilant that the same government who works to empower us with those rights does not in the process take away a person's well-being, both mentally and financially.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, as the gentleman points out, there is a tremendous balance in that whole effort. The bottom line is, the President talked about personal responsibility, and that is where it is at.

I would like to close by making this point. I know there are a number of Members of Congress who are not running again. Some of them happen to be moderate Members. And the news media said they are not running again because this is no longer a fun place or that this is no longer a nice place. And I just want to take a little bit of a different view of that issue.

Mr. Speaker, my view is, very frankly, this is not a fun place anymore. Why would it be a fun place? Because we are doing heavy lifting. There is nothing fun about having to confront the elderly and the young and every other special interest group and say, We are going to have to do some things differently to save this country from bankruptcy. It is not a fun place.

But what bothers me is that some of the people who are leaving were here as this country went down into a deep hole of debt, and now that we are in this deep hole of debt and we have to get out of this deep hole of debt, at least stop the deficits, they are quitting. So I contend that they may be quitting, not because this is not a fun place anymore because people are not nice, but because we have to do heavy lifting.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, we are doing heavy lifting. This is an epic battle. We are not going to necessarily agree with our colleagues on the other side. We should continue this battle and fight it out.

## PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MEETS THE TEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we have heard since the election of November last, and all of last year, that the goal of the Republicans in Congress was a 7-year, CBO-scored, balanced budget. And the challenge over the last several months apparently was to get the President of the United States to agree to put on the table a 7-year, CBO-scored, balanced budget.

The President of the United States has done that. He has met that test. CBO has scored that budget. There is some \$700 billion in savings in that proposal sufficient to balance the budget in these 7 years; and yet we now find that rather than take those savings and balance the budget, the Republican majority would rather end the negotiations. So those negotiations have been ended when there is \$700 billion in cash sitting on the table that all they have to do is walk in and pick it up and walk out, and the American taxpayers get all the benefits that we have all talked about from balancing the budget.

□ 1515

Rather than do that, apparently now there is an idea afoot that what we will have is a downpayment, a downpayment on the deficit. I have been here 20 years, and I have only seen one downpayment on the deficit that lowered the deficit. That is what President Clinton did 2 years ago when the deficit was over \$250 billion, and today it is \$167 billion. All the other downpayments on the deficit never quite got around to lowering the deficit.

So right as we are on the eve of a balanced budget, we find ourselves in the unusual position of the people who claim to have been the strongest proponents of that balanced budget, and I do not think there is any question that they have done everything to move this Congress toward a balanced budget, they now walk away from the negotiations because it is not everything that they could have had.

Rarely in negotiations, whether it is in business or sports, in your family or in the Congress, do you get your sway on everything. And so we are talking about \$700 billion in savings sitting on the table, waiting for somebody to pick it up. It is \$297 billion in discretionary cuts, \$124 billion changes in Medicare, \$73 billion in interest savings, \$67 billion in other mandatory spending changes, \$59 billion changes in Medicaid, corporate subsidies and compliance, \$56 billion and \$41 billion in welfare changes. This is a lot of money, my colleagues. This is the largest deficit reduction that we have seen. But now we are going to turn it down because it is not perfect? Because it is

not exactly apparently what the majority wanted?

We can still make these changes in Medicare. We can have a separate vote on this floor. We can have a separate vote on this floor on medical savings accounts, make them part of it, either in or out. But we do not have to hold up the changes necessary to get the largest entitlement program in the country under some control.

We can make changes and we can still discuss whether Medicaid is going to have nursing home standards or it is not going to have nursing home standards, whether it is going to be an en bloc entitlement or a personal entitlement. We can have those debates afterwards. We can spend this whole year debating that subject. But we can get the budgetary savings, we can get the deficit reduction now while it is real. That is when it is important.

We know that essentially, that essentially we would dramatically change, under the coalition welfare bill that was passed, that was voted on in this Congress, I believe every member of the Democratic Party voted for, dramatically restructures welfare as we know it in this country, dramatically restructures your ability to stay on welfare forever without meeting your responsibilities to try to find a job and to go to work, substantially changes your obligations if you are going to receive taxpayer dollars. The requirements of going to work, the requirements of time limits on welfare, all of that can be achieved and \$41 billion in savings at the same time. But we are going to turn it down because it is not exactly what the Republicans wanted in their bill.

This is incredible. This is incredible that we would be here on this eve, and now we are going to back up and we are going to create some kind of stopgap budget reduction legislation with a tax cut, and we are going to sort of give some kind of partial savings.

I just find that when we see that the President of the United States has come this far and is this willing to make these kinds of concessions and these kinds of changes, changes that are needed in each and every one of these programs, that somehow the Republican majority in this Congress will not give the American people those savings, those savings that will bring the budget to balance, those savings, as one of the previous speakers in the well said, will provide for reductions in interest rates on home mortgages, on credit cards, on student loans, and all of the things that America borrows for, that will provide real money in the pockets of working families in this country, is now going to be turned down by the Republican majority.

## MAJOR RULING IN ENFORCEMENT OF GATT AGAINST UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that the gentleman that just spoke on the Republicans not wanting to get to a balanced budget and not negotiating, the very gentleman that spoke voted against the first balanced budget act this country has seen in 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise to me that the first ruling of the World Trade Organization in enforcement of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was against the United States. Many people had predicted that that would happen if we in fact gave up our sovereignty to the World Trade Organization as far as our international trade is concerned.

The World Trade Organization argued that the Clean Air Act, one of the most important environmental laws that we have, unfairly discriminated against foreign oil refiners whose fuel cannot meet our clean air standards. It was predicted that this was going to happen, but everyone ignored this prediction saying it would not happen. It has happened now. Everyone said it could not, but it has.

Rather than target the harsh and blatantly protectionist regulatory regimes of our major competitors, the World Trade Organization has now predictably chosen to target U.S. environmental laws. This ruling gives major competitors against the United States a huge bonus while overturning U.S. laws written to protect the health of our citizens in one fell swoop.

And as unbelievable as all this sounds, our executive branch of Government, the President, has not decided whether to appeal this ruling. It is outrageous. This decision should be appealed immediately and, further, we should withdraw from the World Trade Organization, and we should use our contributions to reduce our deficit.

We should give significant and clear consideration to a repudiation of the last GATT treaty. Congress and the American public have clearly and consistently supported clean air standards and set an example for the world of the importance of the clean air environment. Are we now going to let the World Trade Organization thwart the will of the American people and overturn American laws? Are we going to let foreign arbiters of the World Trade Organization now dictate to this Congress, to the U.S. Congress what laws we can and cannot pass? I for one will not stand by while foreign judges of the World Trade Organization rule on the validity of the American environmental and labor laws. I will not surrender our sovereignty to the World Trade Organization, nor should we.

American business and manufacturers have invested billions of dollars in complying with the Clean Air Act. It is not correct, it is not right, it is not fair for foreign competitors that have not been faced with the kind of investment