

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STRICKLAND addressed the house. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### WTO/ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, next month, the world's power brokers are going to meet in Seattle so they can kick off a new round of trade talks for the World Trade Organization. Although one will not learn much about the WTO summit from television news casters or read about it on the front pages of newspapers, there are few events this year that will be more important to workers in Ohio and around the world.

While the WTO corporate supporters and allies in Washington see the Seattle negotiations as a fresh opportunity to completely deregulate the international economy, the truth is that their agenda has systematically gutted our worker, consumer, and environmental protections that we have fought for in this body, and deliberately usurped the rights of individual nations to make their own laws, especially when those laws protect the environment and especially when those laws protect workers.

Mr. Speaker, a report "Whose Trade Organization," written by Public Citizen's Global Trade Watch dramatically demonstrates why the WTO requires fundamental change before the bureaucrats in Seattle take us down another road of trade negotiations.

When Congress approved the World Trade Organization and other agreements, like NAFTA, we essentially ceded our authority to independently advance health and safety standards that protect America's families. Let me say that again. Thanks to the WTO and to NAFTA and other trade agreements, we are losing our ability to protect the health and the well-being of the men and women that voted us into office.

That is because we have to ensure that we are not violating some bureaucrat's view of what constitutes a trade barrier or what constitutes a legitimate health concern.

None of the lawyers, Mr. Speaker, from the U.S. Trade Representative's office or the Commerce Department or their supporters on Wall Street has been elected to office. Yet these are the very people that will represent us in Seattle, the people that will weaken our ability to erect meaningful worker and environmental standards.

Their fascination with a healthy bottom line is how we wind up with trade agreements that give more rights to corporations and their stockholders than they do to individual citizens and

to our elected governments. That is how we wind up giving unelected bureaucrats the authority to determine whether or not our consumers have to eat foods that have been treated with carcinogenic pesticides or whether or not we have to drink water that tastes vaguely like paint thinner.

That is what is happening right now in California. The governor has banned the gasoline additive MTBE because it is leaking into the drinking water. The Canadian corporation that makes it is using NAFTA to sue the United States for nearly \$1 billion because they think this constitutes a trade barrier. Think about that. A foreign corporation is asking our taxpayers to give it \$1 billion because the people in California do not like the taste of paint thinner in their drinking water and think it is good public health to ban this gasoline additive.

This case is just one of the dozens that are included in this book I mentioned which meticulously documents how every single health safety or environmental law reviewed by the WTO has been declared an illegal trade barrier that must be eliminated under the threat of sanctions.

In addition to these cases, Public Citizen documents that much of the WTO's damage is done merely by threatening the use of its powerful dispute system, a fact evidenced by the increasing number of countries that are preemptively eliminating their environmental or health laws just to avoid the steep political and fiscal costs involved in defending a law from a WTO challenge.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to preserve American jobs, if we want to continue protecting our environment, we need to make sure that negotiators in Seattle, U.S. taxpayer financed negotiators in Seattle, respect the principles that let us stand here during this debate tonight.

Rather than letting unelected officials from the Trade Rep's office or their friends on Wall Street tell us what is good for America, we need to make sure they hear what our constituents want.

Every weekend that I go home to Ohio, they tell me they do not want to eat contaminated strawberries; they tell me they do not want to drink unsafe water. They do not want to lose their jobs because the WTO does not care whether some foreign workers, no older, sometimes, than the age of 13 or 14, or that work 18 hours a day for what amounts to less than a dollar an hour, that WTO does not care whether workers like that are taking American jobs and being exploited in developing countries.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we in Congress, that the American people, realize what is at stake when the world's largest assembly of millionaires meets in Seattle this year. We have to keep fighting to make labor standards, environmental standards, and human rights as important to our trade bu-

reaucrats as intellectual property rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS AND THE EEOC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend this House on a vote of 218 to 211. We put ourselves in a position of saving Social Security. We have said to all agencies that we can and do expect them to find ways to make savings so that we can sacrifice today to save Social Security for tomorrow for this generation and for future generations.

I commend my colleagues to stay tuned as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) will deliver a special order. We will go more into detail on the very significant plans we have voted on today and I believe we can achieve.

I would also like to remark on a comment made by the Vice President last night in the debate with Senator Bradley.

□ 1800

The debate was centered on bureaucracy, and the Vice President basically said that we should not allow a faceless, nameless bureaucrat to stand in the way of health care of Americans, basically saying we do not need a bureaucracy in order to deliver health care.

Well, I say to the President and the Vice President today that maybe we should use that same strategy when we talk about education. Because I think we have created a lot of bureaucracies, and the gentleman from Texas is going to talk about some of the ways we believe we can save the American taxpayers some money.

But I want to discuss another situation today, an outrageous situation. In fact, my district office sent up the clippings from the newspaper. And Diane, who works for me in Port St. Lucie, puts "today's outrage" on things she thinks bears specific note on where we might have gone astray.

This week the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission announced they are planning to extend anti-discrimination rights to working illegal immigrants. This policy would include remedies such as potential back pay, punitive damages, and even reinstatement to their jobs? I am sorry, I must not understand the term illegal immigrant. Perhaps the EEOC can start providing free towing for car thieves or free checking for bank robbers.

It just baffles my mind. I clearly do not want things to happen to any worker, no matter how they are in this country, but if the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is really concerned with equal employment opportunity, as their title would indicate, they should be ensuring that legal residents and citizens have fair and equal access to earn a living. This does not include protecting illegal immigrants who are working illegally for an employer who hired them illegally.

This is all illegal. We are talking about the rule of law. We must make a concerted effort to track down employers who are hiring illegal immigrants and charge them not with worker discrimination, but with hiring illegal workers. Working illegal immigrants take jobs away from Americans. They hurt the U.S. work force and they damage the economy.

This is just another misguided attempt by this administration to—well, I will be quite honest, I have no idea what they are trying to do. I hope my colleagues will join me in sending a message to the administration that coddling illegal aliens is not what our policies are all about.

I cannot underscore this enough. None of us should sit willingly by while workers' rights are being abused, but we also have to recognize first and foremost that there are laws on the books that have to do with hiring illegal aliens, hiring illegal workers, and we should enforce this policy. But this policy, announced by the EEOC today, just once again extends the reach of government into an area where they should be concentrating and working clearly to track down illegals and return them to their native countries.

Mr. Speaker, I will be submitting a bill, in fact, it is here at the desk, and I will be submitting it to the committee for consideration, because I believe we should tell strongly the EEOC, yes, protect workers rights; yes, stand for equal employment for all Americans; yes, make certain that employers are treating workers fairly, but, in a case like this, where they are not permitted to work based on their status, we should not provide protection under the law for those who choose to work or those who choose to hire illegal immigrants.

#### THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak to the topic, but I do want to tell the gentleman from Florida that as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the Committee on the Judiciary, I will look intently at his issue, and I appreciate his bringing this to the attention of the House.

I would hope that the different extremes of thought, the fact that people

should not be discriminated against but the fact that we should have a workplace that respects American workers and recognizes that we do discourage illegal immigration and encourage employers to hire both legal immigrants and those who are American citizens, that we can find a way to respond to the gentleman's concerns, and I thank him for bringing this to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, many of the American public who have watched us over this past time frame of dealing with the appropriations process may have wondered what all of the bickering was about. In fact, they may have wondered why the bickering, with the most prosperous peacetime over a period of time that we have seen in a number of years. Consistent prosperity. It seems ludicrous to many who would study the issues of economics that we find ourselves at a point where we are denying services to the American public under the precept of an across-the-board cut at a time when there is great prosperity.

So the problem, I think, is that we are either misrepresenting to the American public, playing our own private games, or failing to recognize our responsibility to work in a bipartisan manner to address the needs of this country.

It is important to note that just a couple of months ago the Republican majority was offering a \$792 billion tax cut. What was that based upon, particularly when we now are debating the idea of an across-the-board cut? And as I continue in my discussion, I think my colleagues will see the people who are negatively impacted by such a cut.

Well, the \$792 billion tax cut was based upon presumptions and good news and the hope that something would happen, and that was that if the peacetime economy was to continue, there was some thought that the prosperity of this country would allow monies to be recouped on the \$792 billion tax cut. This is the same tax cut that most Americans said they did not want; the same tax cut that probably would give little benefit to working and middle class Americans; the same tax cut that would not have benefitted the EITC, the earned income tax credit, recipients, those working poor who would benefit from their lump sum tax benefit, who in the last days were in the middle of a chopping block while we were talking about a \$792 billion tax cut.

So my call on my fellow colleagues is that as we have now voted on the last appropriations bill, of which it is quite obvious that the President will veto, when we have the opportunity to come back again, or if we go into major negotiations, might we put in front of all of the distinct and disparate political philosophies the fact that the American people have asked us to frugally, yet responsibly, and with compassion, deal with all of their needs.

I would hope when we come back to the table again that we would not deny

950,000 children the right to participate in after-school programs. Today, I had the privilege of conducting a hearing entitled "An Ounce of Previous Recollection Is Worth a Pound of Cure". It was a reaffirmation or a hearing regarding the testimony of advocates and participants in programs that children use after school. It was the children themselves, it was the participants in Boy Scouts and Campfire Girls, it was the YMCA, which indicated they are in 22,000 communities around this Nation.

If my colleagues could have heard those young people, 14 years old and 16 years old, tell their own personal stories. A 14-year-old Girl Scout, who is already a mother, says she belonged to a gang and that if she had not been steered away, through this program which receives complementary Federal funds to expand its program into lower income neighborhoods, she would not have been sitting in that hearing room today. She got off drugs, or the enticement of drugs, she got away from gangs and began to understand how to behave as a girl, and she said she is now a better parent.

These programs, Mr. Speaker, are just one example of why the appropriations process is wrong, why this bill was wrong, and why we should go back to the drawing board and do the right thing for the American people.

#### CONTROVERSY OVER USE OF PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDERS AND PROCLAMATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a steady increase in controversy over executive orders and presidential proclamations has arisen since Franklin Roosevelt's administration. Nevertheless, I am truly concerned about the comments of the President's Chief of Staff, John Podesta, as quoted in the current issue of U.S. News and World Report.

To quote Podesta: "Frustrated with the balky Republican Congress, President Clinton plans a series of executive orders and changes to the Federal Rules that he can sign into law without first getting the okay from GOP naysayers. There's a pretty wide sweep of things we're looking to do, and we're going to be very aggressive in pursuing it."

These statements are deeply disturbing and should be to all Americans. An unelected political bureaucrat is boasting to the American people about his plan to sidestep the Constitution. Sadly, Congress should not be surprised that this President's frustrated staff is looking to bypass Congress and implement their agenda. We have seen this before.

When the President issued his Executive Order on striker replacements, he attempted to do what had been denied him by the regular legislative process. In addition, when the President issued