

Let us have honest accounting and let us be careful to get into the position of a surplus and then pay down the debt.

IN OPPOSITION OF AFRICA  
GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 434, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act. The more accurate name would be the NAFTA for Africa Act.

H.R. 434 does little to improve the lives of people in sub-Saharan Africa. In fact, there are no binding labor, environmental, human rights or other public interest provisions in this legislation but plenty of measures to ensure easy access to the region's human and material resources for U.S. corporations.

I understand the frustration of Africa's supporters. We have seen our government side too often with the worst dictators in Africa, respond all too slowly to the evil of apartheid, and turn its back on the victims of genocide in Rwanda.

More pertinent, we have seen Members of Congress who are the staunchest supporters of NAFTA for Africa vote again and again and again against increased aid for that continent.

But a bad bill, Mr. Speaker, is worse than no bill. Last session, this Congress did the right thing in defeating fast track not once but twice, defeated the efforts of some to extend NAFTA to the rest of Latin America. Unfortunately, H.R. 434, NAFTA for Africa, would undo that victory. It completely ignores the all-important test that we established in our fight against fast track: No trade agreement unless labor and environmental problems are written into the core agreement. This bill puts us back where we started.

The supporters of H.R. 434 claim the bill contains labor rights and standards because some of the bill's trade provisions are based on the Generalized System of Preferences, GSP. In fact, GSP labor rights provisions are hampered by weak enforcement mechanisms.

Under GSP, the President merely has to certify that the affected country is "taking steps" towards the protection of labor rights. This vague language has allowed notorious labor rights abusers like Guatemala to be certified as eligible for benefits.

Moreover, GSP labor rights cannot be enforced through private action, meaning that when a country is clearly not taking steps to protect worker rights but nonetheless is certified as doing so, no legal action can be taken by U.S. citizens to force presidential decertification. The only alternative is a time-consuming petition process which ultimately results in the rejection of the petition in every case with no right of appeal.

Finally, GSP labor rights provisions impose no obligations on corporations, just on governments. Corporations that violate worker rights will continue, as they have, to enjoy market access benefits just as long as the country in which they are operating in has been certified as eligible for benefits.

A recent amendment to H.R. 434 offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), placed labor rights on the list of criteria that African countries are supposed to meet in order to obtain benefits under this bill. While this amendment was a step in the right direction, it simply does not provide sufficient protection for workers.

There is no labor enforcement mechanism. Instead, the well-being of African workers rests on the President's determination that the country is making progress toward respecting labor rights.

The amendment that I offered in the Committee on International Relations markup attempted to correct this problem by adding strong enforcement language and giving U.S. citizens the right to challenge the President's country eligibility determination in U.S. district court. Unfortunately, because the backers of H.R. 434 opposed this amendment, it was ruled out of order by the chair.

We need trade agreements that act as if people mattered. Considering the devastating effects that NAFTA has had on Mexico's small, independent manufacturing and retail enterprises and on its small agricultural producers and on the country as a whole, it seems less than generous to expand this regime to Africa. It is certainly not in the interest of the African people. It is certainly not in the interest of the American people.

This Congress should not inflict a rejected and backward trade model on the continent of Africa. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, to support the Jackson trade bill for Africa which includes unambiguous and meaningful enforcement mechanisms to protect the rights and the well-being of African workers.

□ 1300

WHO DECIDES: WASHINGTON OR  
YOU?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am not certain how many Americans heard well the President's recent speeches, but his comments spoke volumes about his views of freedom. It also addressed the great political debate going on in this country today which has been going on since 1994, and it can be summed up on a bumper sticker: "Who Decides, Washington or You?"

The President, in Buffalo shortly after the State of the Union address, was discussing the surplus, a huge surplus, nearly \$5 trillion over the next 15 years, to be collected by the government above and beyond what we need to spend to continue the government, and this is what he said: "We could give it all back to you and hope you spend it right, but—"

That says volumes. The President then proceeded to imply he really cannot give it back to the American people because government makes wiser choices than they do. He does not trust the American people to make these choices on their own behalf. He has embraced in whole cloth, it seems to me, the theme of the 1958 book by John Kenneth Galbraith entitled, "The Affluent Society."

The entire theme of that book is this: It is not that Americans have too little, they have too much, that they make bad choices with their dollars, and it is the obligation of an educated government to tax those dollars from them and make better choices on their behalf. Who decides, Washington or you?

That is the debate we are in. That is the debate on taxes. Looking at nearly \$5 trillion in surpluses over the next 15 years, the President proposed 40 new mandatory spending programs, adding new discretionary spending programs and not one penny for tax relief. Indeed, it does not even protect Social Security because we are increasing the debt to Social Security by about \$1 trillion over 10 years that the government will owe it.

In a recent book entitled, "The Vision of the Anointed," Thomas Sowell points out that for so long as we have had free people, we have had among them those anointed with the vision of how to spend their money, how to make their choices for them.

That is the debate we are in. The President would like to shape a future with your money for our children and grandchildren that is warm and secure and fair. Our side says, "We don't know how to do that." I could not satisfy 10 percent of America because everyone comes to the table with different hopes and dreams and aspirations. I can shape a future that my daughter would love and my son would hate.

So our side says, no, leave those choices in your pockets; and you and 270 million other Americans, acting on your own behalf hundreds of times a week, will shape the future. We trust you to shape that future. We believe in the Ronald Reagan principle: It is not the function of government to bestow happiness. That is your job. And if we can get the government out of your way and let you have more freedom and more opportunity, you will choose a future that most of America will not only enjoy but thrive in.

We would like to do that beginning right now by letting you keep more of what you earn, not collecting \$300 billion a year more than it takes us to