

are devastated as a result of these cheap goods coming into the United States.

A perfect example is Margie Brown. You heard me talk about Whiteville, NC, which was one of the areas in eastern North Carolina hardest hit by this flow of cheap goods into the United States. Margie Brown is 47 years old. She had a good job working at Jasper Textiles in Whiteville, NC. She made just under \$200 a week. She depended on it. Her family depended on the income from that job. It is what she was trained to do; it is what she knew how to do; and she felt good about what she did.

As a result of that plant being closed down, the reality exists all over North Carolina. In many cases there is no work for these folks; they have no comparable employment. There is nothing they can do with the education and the job training they have.

So she had nowhere to go. Today, instead of having a job she is proud of, being able to support her family, feeling good about going to work every day and doing the things that made her productive as an American citizen, she is on unemployment and she gets \$51 a week.

My point is that these are real people. These are real families, and the impact on them is devastating. We can't turn our heads on this. This is not hypothetical. This is not some theoretical thing we are talking about. It is all well and good for us to talk abstractly on the floor of the Senate about trade being good, about, in this case, this having some diffuse benefit to our country as a whole, but there are real people whose lives are being devastated by these trade agreements, real people who have nowhere to go to work tomorrow, who have no way of taking care of their families and who have lost all semblance of self-esteem.

These people, who oftentimes worked in textile mills for 20, 30, or 40 years—I do have to say at this point my dad worked in a cotton mill basically his whole life. During the summers, in high school and college, and then in law school, I saw firsthand the people who spent their whole lives in these textile mills and these cotton mills. They do not know anything else.

We can talk about the technological world we now live in and how these people have to make a transition because the world is changing. The reality is, many of them are 50 or 60 years old and have spent their whole life working in the mill. They have nowhere to go. They have no idea what to do about their families. They are put on the street after working every day for the last 30 or 40 years. What do they say to their kids? What do they say to their spouses about what they are going to do?

My point is that these trade agreements have a real impact on real people's lives, and we all have to recognize it. In fact, this particular agreement is going to do nothing but accelerate the

problem. The Margie Browns I just described will be all over North Carolina and the southern United States.

The reason is very simple: The average apparel wage in the United States is \$8 an hour.

Of some of the countries that are covered by this agreement: In Mexico the average wage is 85 cents an hour; the Dominican Republic, 69 cents an hour; El Salvador, 59 cents an hour; Guatemala, 65 cents an hour; and, Honduras, 43 cents an hour.

You don't have to be a mathematical wizard to figure out that there is no way for American workers under these circumstances to compete, and there is no way they are going to keep their jobs.

What will happen is China is going to ship goods through Africa. In all likelihood, there will be massive transshipping with no way to stop it, no way to detect it, and no way to enforce the antitransshipment provisions of this bill. As a result, people all over North Carolina and the United States are going to lose their jobs.

We are playing with fire. I said this when we debated the bill last fall. I say it again. The only thing that has changed is the fire has gotten hotter. It has gotten more dangerous.

There are more American workers whose jobs are going to be lost, and this conference report it does not meet the fundamental principles of equity, the principles that ought to apply to every trade agreement, the principles that are needed to protect our businesses and our textile workers in the United States.

They are perfectly willing to compete. They just want the chance to compete on a level playing field. The other countries aren't lowering their barriers. We are. We know there are going to be goods transshipped through Africa from China and other places. And there is no way to prepare for that. The net result is this is not an abstract thing. Real people, real families, lives and jobs are about to be changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, thank you very much. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMS. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

PARK SERVICE SNOWMOBILE BAN

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes today to talk about the Department of Interior's recent decision to ban snowmobiling in most units of the National Park System.

While the Interior Department's recent decision will not ban snowmobiling in Minnesota's Voyageurs National Park, it will impact snowmobiling in at least two units of the Park System in my home state—Grand Portage National Monument and

the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway. In addition, this decision will greatly impact Minnesotans who enjoy snowmobiling, not only in Minnesota, but in many of our National Parks, particularly in the western part of our country.

When I think of snowmobiling in Minnesota, I think of families and friends. I think of people who come together on their free time to enjoy the wonders of Minnesota in a way no other form of transportation allows them. I also think of the fact that in many instances snowmobiles in Minnesota are used for much more than just recreation. For some, they're a mode of transportation when snow blankets our state. For others, snowmobiles provide a mode of search and rescue activity. Whatever the reason, snowmobiles are an extremely important aspect of commerce, travel, recreation, and safety in my home state.

Minnesota, right now, is home to over 280,000 registered snowmobiles and 20,000 miles of snowmobile trails. According to the Minnesota United Snowmobilers Association, an association with over 51,000 individual members, Minnesota's 311 snowmobile riding clubs raised \$264,000 for charity in 1998 alone. Snowmobiling creates over 6,600 jobs and \$645 million of economic activity in Minnesota. Minnesota is home to two major snowmobile manufacturers—Arctic Cat and Polaris. And yes, I enjoy my own snowmobiles.

People who enjoy snowmobiling come from all walks of life. They're farmers, lawyers, nurses, construction workers, loggers, and miners. They're men, women, and young adults. They're people who enjoy the outdoors, time with their families, and the recreational opportunities our diverse climate offers. These are people who not only enjoy the natural resources through which they ride, but understand the important balance between enjoying and conserving our natural resources.

Just three years ago, I took part in a snowmobile ride through a number of cities and trails in northern Minnesota. While our ride didn't take us through a unit of the National Park Service, it did take us through parks, forests, and trails that sustain a diverse amount of plant and animal species. I talked with my fellow riders and I learned a great deal about the work their snowmobile clubs undertake to conserve natural resources, respect the integrity of the land upon which they ride, and educate their members about the need to ride responsibly.

The time I spent with these individuals and the time I've spent on my own snowmobiles have given me a great respect for both the quality and enjoyment of the recreational experience and the need to ride responsibly and safely. They've also given me reason to strongly disagree with the approach the Park Service has chosen in banning snowmobiles from our National Parks.

I was stunned to read of the severity of the Park Service's ban and the rhetoric used by Assistant Secretary Donald J. Barry in announcing the ban. In the announcement, Assistant Secretary Barry said, "The time has come for the National Park Service to pull in its welcome mat for recreational snowmobiling." He went on to say that snowmobiles were, "machines that are no longer welcome in our national parks." These are not the words of someone who is approaching a sensitive issue in a thoughtful way. These are the words of a bureaucrat whose agenda has been handwritten for him by those opposed to snowmobiling.

The last time I checked, Congress is supposed to be setting the agenda of the federal agencies. The last time I checked, Congress should be determining who is and is not welcome on our federal lands. And the last time I checked, the American people own our public lands—not the Clinton Administration and certainly not Donald J. Barry.

In light of such brazenness, it's amazing to me that this Administration, and some of my colleagues in Congress, question our objections to efforts that would allow the federal government to purchase even larger tracts of private land. If we were dealing with federal land managers who considered the intent of Congress, who worked with local officials, or who listened to the concerns of those most impacted by federal land-use decisions, we might be more inclined to consider their efforts. But when this Administration, time and again, thumbs its nose at Congress and acts repeatedly against the will of local officials and American citizens, it is little wonder that some in Congress might not want to turn over more private land to this Administration.

I can't begin to count the rules, regulations, and executive orders this Administration has undertaken without even the most minimal consideration for Congress or local officials. It has happened in state after state, to Democrats and Republicans, and with little or no regard for the rule or the intent of law. I want to quote Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt from an article in the *National Journal*, dated May 22, 1999. In the article, Secretary Babbitt was quoted as saying:

When I got to town, what I didn't know was that we didn't need more legislation. But we looked around and saw we had authority to regulate grazing policies. It took 18 months to draft new grazing regulations. On mining, we have also found that we already had authority over, well, probably two-thirds of the issues in contention. We've switched the rules of the game. We're not trying to do anything legislatively.

In other words, an end run of Congress, which is an end run of the American people.

That is a remarkable statement by an extremely candid man, and his intent to work around Congress is clearly reflected in this most recent decision. Clearly, Secretary Babbitt and his staff felt the rules that they've created

allow them to "pull the welcome mat for recreational users" to our national parks.

As further evidence of this Administration's abuse of Congress—and therefore of the American people—Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Carol Browner was quoted in the same article as saying:

We completely understand all of the executive tools that are available to us—And boy do we use them.

So it is handy for them to avoid the legislative route, to avoid coming through Congress; they do it through executive orders and mandates.

While Ms. Browner's words strongly imply an intent to work around Congress, at least she did not join Secretary Babbitt in coming right out and admitting it.

I for one am getting a little sick and tired of watching this Administration force park users out of their parks, steal land from our states and counties, impose costly new regulations on farmers and businesses without scientific justification, and force Congress to become a spectator on many of the most controversial and important issues before the American people.

It's getting to the point where I'm not sure what to tell my constituents. I've been on the phone with snowmobilers in Minnesota and they ask what can be done. I start to explain that because of the filibuster in the Senate and the President's ability to veto, it will be difficult for Congress to take any action. I've found myself saying that a lot lately. Whether it's regulations on Total Maximum Daily Loads, efforts to put 50 million acres of forests in wilderness, or new rules to regulate a worker's house should they choose to work at home, this Administration just doesn't respect the legislative process or the role of Congress. Nor does this Administration respect the jobs, traditions, cultures, of lifestyles of millions of Americans. If you're an American who has yet to be negatively impacted by the actions of this Administration, just wait your turn because you were evidently at the end of the list. Sooner or later, if they get their way in the next few months, they're going to kill your job, render your private property unusable, and ban you from accessing public lands that have been accessible for generations.

Regrettably, many of us in Congress are now left with the proposition of telling our constituents that we must wait for a new Administration. I have to tell them that this Administration is on its way out the door and they're employing a scorched earth exit strategy. And I have to warn them that the situation could get worse if a certain Vice President finds himself residing at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue next year.

I have to admit, there's nothing pleasurable about telling your constituents to wait until next year. I think it's important to remember that, as Senators, we are the representatives

of every one of our constituents. When I have to tell a constituent that Congress has lost its power to act on this matter, I'm actually telling that constituent that he or she has lost their power on this matter. When I have to tell a snowmobiler that the Administration doesn't care what Congress has to say about snowmobiling in national parks, I am really telling him or her that the Administration doesn't care what the American people have to say about snowmobiling in national parks. Congress did not get a chance to debate it or to represent the people back home. I doubt any of us could've said that any better than Donald J. Barry said it himself.

When forging public policy, those of us in Congress often have to consider the opinions of the state and local officials who are most impacted. If I'm going to support an action on public land, I usually contact the state and local officials who represent the area to see what they have to say. I know that if I don't get their perspective, I might miss a detail that could improve my efforts. I also know that the local officials can tell me if my efforts are necessary or if they're misplaced. They can alert me to areas where I need to forge a broader consensus and of ways in which my efforts might actually hurt the people I represent. I think that is a prudent way to forge public policy and a fair way to deal with state and local officials.

I know, however, that no one from the Park Service ever contacted me to see how I felt about banning snowmobiling in Park Service units in Minnesota. I was never consulted on snowmobile usage in Minnesota or on any complaints that I might have received from my constituents. While I've not checked with every local official in Minnesota, not one local official has called me to say that the Park Service contacted them. In fact, while I knew the Park Service was considering taking action to curb snowmobile usage in some Parks, I had no idea the Park Service was considering an action so broad, and so extreme, nor did I think they would issue it this quickly. I do not think any local officials thought this would happen. I know those involved in the snowmobile industry had no idea, while talking with this administration, this was going to come down. It was a shot out of the blue.

I believe this quick overreaching by the Park Service was unwarranted. It did not allow time for Federal, State, or local officials to work together on this issue. It did not bring snowmobile users to the table to discuss the impact of this decision on them. It did not allow time for Congress and the administration to look at all of the available options or to differentiate between parks with heavy snowmobile usage and those with occasional usage. This decision stands as a dramatic example of how not to conduct policy formation and formulation. It is an affront to the

consideration American citizens deserve from their elected officials.

I would like to repeat that. This decision stands as a very dramatic example of how not to conduct policy formulation and is an affront to the consideration that I believe American citizens deserve from their elected officials.

I hope we take a hard look at this decision and call the administration before Senate committees for hearings. I believe there has been one scheduled. Senator CRAIG THOMAS, I believe, will be holding such a hearing on May 25 to try to bring some administration officials before Congress and to ask some very simple questions: Why was this

action taken? I have long believed we can have an impact on these matters by holding strong oversight hearings and by forcing the administration to be accountable for their actions. We cannot, however, simply stand by and watch as this administration continues its quest, in its final, waning days, for even greater power, power that will come at the expense of the deliberative, legislative process envisioned by the founders of this country.

Secretary Babbitt, Administrator Browner, and Donald J. Barry may believe they are above working with this Congress. But only we can make sure that they are reminded, and we can do

it in the strongest possible terms, that when they neglect Congress they are neglecting the American people.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate, under the previous order, stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 11, 2000.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:32 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 11, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.