# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, May 23, 1991*

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Give us, O gracious God, the strength to meet the tests we face and the desire to transform those challenges into the values that mark our daily lives. Help us to delight in the great emotions of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving, and enable us also to translate those great gifts into the concerns that face each of us. Bless us this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] will lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BARRETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 121) "Concurrent resolution revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1991 and setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2251) entitled "An Act making dire emergency supplemental appropriations from contributions of foreign governments and/or interest for humanitarian assistance to refugees and displaced persons in and around Iraq as a result of the recent invasion of Kuwait and for peacekeeping activities, and for other urgent needs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 7.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 929. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake interpretive and other programs on public lands and lands withdrawn from the public domain under their jurisdiction, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to designate 1991 as the "Year of Public Health" and to recognize the 75th anniversary of the founding of the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health; and

S.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution marking the seventy-fifth anniversary of chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 101, DISAPPROVING THE EXTENSION OF FAST-TRACK PROCEDURES TO BILLS TO IMPLEMENT TRADE AGREEMENTS, AND HOUSE RESOLUTION 146, REGARDING THE OBJECTIVES TO BE ACHIEVED BY TRADE NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 158 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 158

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, the resolution (H. Res. 101) disapproving the extension of "fast track" procedures to bills to implement trade agreements entered into after May 31, 1991. The resolution shall be debatable for not to exceed two hours, with one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and with one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. After disposition of the resolution, it shall be in order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 146) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the United States objectives that should be achieved in the negotiation of future trade agreements. The resolution shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, with thirty minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and with thirty minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 158 is the rule providing for consideration in the House of two separate resolutions concerning fast-track authority for trade negotiations. The first resolution, House Resolution 101, would deny the President's request to extend fast-track authority for 2 more years beginning June 1. The second resolution, House Resolution 146, expresses conditional support for fast-track authority and sets forth negotiating goals for the administration.

For House Resolution 101, the rule provides for 2 hours of debate: 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

After the House votes on House Resolution 101, the House shall consider House Resolution 146. For that resolution, the rule provides for 1 hour of debate: 30 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 30 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, the two resolutions which this rule makes in order will enable the House of Representatives to decide, first, whether to extend fast-track authority for 2 more years and, second, whether to formally state negotiating goals as a way of signaling the principal concerns of Members of the House and ensuring a role for Congress in the negotiations, as the administration moves forward on the Uru-



AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

guay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] and on the proposed North American Free Trade Agreement.

The first resolution, House Resolution 101, would deny the President the authority to negotiate a free-trade agreement with Mexico, continue negotiations on GATT, or negotiate any other trade agreements in the next 2 years under fast-track procedures—the procedures which apply to congressional consideration of the legislation necessary to implement a trade agreement. Those procedures call for an up-or-down vote on the implementing legislation within 60 days, with no amendments.

I wish to point out, however, that fast-track authority cannot limit the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change its rules, and the majority leader has made it abundantly clear that, should an agreement negotiated by the administration fail to address the major concerns of Members of the House, he will seek to amend the implementing legislation of that agreement.

Extending fast-track authority by voting against House Resolution 101 would merely continue the administration's authority to negotiate, currently contained in the law. It would not constitute approval of any trade agreement itself. Many of us who support extending fast-track authority have very serious concerns about various aspects of both the pending GATT agreement and the proposed agreement with Mexico, and are withholding judgment on those agreements until the administration completes negotiations on them.

The second resolution the House will consider, House Resolution 146, expresses support for the granting of fast-track procedures based on the President's commitments on certain labor, environmental, and health issues. It states overall objectives to be achieved in trade negotiations, and specific objectives to be achieved in the agreement with Mexico, including close, regular consultation with Congress. It also specifically affirms the right of the House to change the rules as they relate to House procedures.

Our committee rules, which considered this issue twice—first as a matter of original jurisdiction, and then for purposes of granting a rule—believes that House Resolution 146 reflects the best efforts of the leadership to take into consideration the principal concerns of Members of the House, particularly with respect to the proposed agreement with Mexico. Again, it is important to note that there are many more steps in the process before any future trade agreement becomes a reality.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee has tried to structure consideration of this very important issue in a way that will allow the full airing of both sides of the debate over whether to grant fast-track authority, without providing so much time that the debate moves beyond the issue we are dealing with today—fast-track procedures—and into details of trade issues that have not yet been negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 158, so that the House can proceed with this important debate.

Mr. Speaker, for reasons stated so well by Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. MOAKLEY. I ask support for the rule—and I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the gentleman has explained the rule very clearly, and I doubt that there will be much controversy. But I will make a statement in support of it anyway.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very straightforward rule. It offers both the supporters and the opponents of fast track the opportunity to fully discuss their views on the House floor.

Some have asked why we have supported a closed rule for this debate. Mr. Speaker, I should say, as a Republican who has consistently pursued efforts to have open rules whenever possible, that this is unusual. This issue is one of the few cases in which a closed rule is appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, this is a unique vote. What we are voting on today is a question of procedure. Extending fast track is an either/or issue. Either we give the President the authority to negotiate with our trading partners or we do not.

A number of our trading partners, including Mexico, have already notified us that they will not negotiate tariff reductions without fast track. This could easily lead to a series of trade wars.

Some have called for a midterm review. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], pointed out in the Committee on Rules yesterday, providing a public review of the negotiations in an election year will only serve to politicize the issue. It will also leave our negotiators in the untenable position of having to divulge their negotiating strategy to the media and to the Mexican negotiators.

Instead, Chairman GIBBONS has promised to bring Ambassador Carla Hills, our Trade Representative, to Congress on a regular basis to discuss these important issues directly with every Member of Congress without the glare of the television camera.

There is not a single Member of this body who has not had the opportunity to participate in this debate. Just yesterday our Committee on Rules had testimony from almost two dozen Members. A number of us have participated in special orders over the past several weeks, and the Republican and Democratic leadership has contacted most, if not all, Members on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule, because I think it is fair. We have provided twice as much time for the resolution of disapproval as we have set aside for the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution in support of fast track.

I believe the rule is very fair to both sides, and I hope very much that my colleagues will join in support of it.

Critics of the fast track like to pretend that granting Bush this authority will only affect the United States-Mexico agreement.

However, without fast-track approval, any future progress in the Uruguay round of the GATT talks will likely be impossible.

According to trade experts, negotiators from the EC, Japan, and a number of Third World countries have said that they will not negotiate with the United States until the issue of the fast track is resolved.

"There is not much point in trying to push the talks here until we find out whether the Amerian delegation has a negotiating mandate or not," said one European official.

With the collapse of the Uruguay round, the FTA has emerged from the shadows of the GATT as the most important United States trade initiative.

The administration has agreed to include a Canadian delegation in the FTA talks. The goal is to create an enormous and prosperous North American trading community.

U.S. firms will be able to offer a wider array of products, to a larger number of people, at reduced prices.

The FTA would encompass more than 360 million people, a GNP of close to $6 trillion, and trade flows of $225 billion.

Mexico is already our third largest trading partner, and trade between the United States and Mexico has increased by 70 percent since 1987.

Mexican citizens are hungry for United States goods, and the economic growth and the resulting higher wages will enable Mexicans to buy more United States products.

The FTA will give North American firms the kind of competitive advantage enjoyed by European firms as a result of EC '92. Asian countries are looking into similar arrangements.

In addition, the International Trade Commission has estimated that the FTA will: expand trade opportunities, lower prices, increase competition, et cetera.

Exports accounted for 90 percent of our growth during the 1980's. Thus, economic growth in the 1990's depends on export growth.

Many of you may know that every billion dollars of exported goods equal 22,000 jobs.

If labor costs alone were the deciding factor in relocating, companies would have already relocated.

The fact is they haven't. And many companies are planning to expand U.S. production facilities even if NAFTA goes through.

For example: Sony builds picture tubes and TV's in San Diego and Tijuana. In spite of the lower wages in Mexico, Sony is in the process of spending $350 million to set up an additional picture tube plant outside Pittsburgh. Why there and not in Mexico? Because of its proximity to a reliable glass supply and the large Northeast market, and a better educated work force. Even in the Mexico plant, 70 to 80 percent of the parts come from the United States.

In addition, the San Diego-Mexico operation is now exporting 32-inch picture tubes and televisions back to Japan. Sony plans to produce all high definition TV's bound for the United States in the United States and Mexico. Without the Maquilas and free trade, these jobs would have been sent to Malaysia or Indonesia.

The Casio Corp. would have closed all of its U.S. facilities had it not been for the Maquiladoras. Their existence allowed Casio to locate certain production facilities in Mexico. These facilities use many U.S. parts. Had Casio moved to Asia, parts would have been supplied by other Asian countries. Casio is now exporting goods jointly produced in the United States-Mexico to Europe.

Honeywell is another company that was planning to relocate to Asia. Instead, they located their plant in Tijuana, and saved several hundred parts production and managerial jobs in San Diego.

Maquila wages have increased substantially since 1987. In addition, Hunter is blowing smoke. If the period of 1980 to 1990 is used, then yes, wages have fallen. But this is almost entirely because of the collapse/devaluation of the peso in 1982. Before 1982 the peso was at 12.5 to the dollar. Now it's at around 3,000 to the dollar. This is the main reason that wages have fallen.

The Bush environmental action plan is the environmental equivalent of the New World Order. It aims to solve difficult problems with a policy of inclusion and consultation. It aims to keep hypothetical concerns from becoming serious problems.

It is a radical step into the future. The President has essentially committed to putting a representative of the independent environmental community on his negotiating team.

The representative will not comment on the trade agreement after it has been negotiated, rather, he/she will actually be there as it is being written.

This is the first time that the administration has ever done anything of this kind.

Environmental organizations will also be asked to join the joint border protection program, which will be in place by the end of this year.

Comprehensive environmental negotiations between the United States and Mexico will take place on a parallel track.

Bush and Secretary Reilly have also committed to establishing a new program to assist small Mexican businesses keep clean.

A program to assist United States environmental protection companies export their technology to Mexico will be undertaken immediately. Exim Bank credits are being considered.

President Salinas has promised strict enforcement of Mexico's excellent environmental law. All new businesses will have to meet these regulations immediately. As newer businesses are built, and newer cars replace older cars, pollution will be reduced, not increased by economic growth.

There have already been 980 temporary and 82 permanent industrial closures because of violations of environmental regulations.

One closure, of Mexico City's largest oil refinery, put 5,000 people out of work.

Salinas has also pledged to require that all new industries complete an environmental impact statement before any construction or expansion begins. If the project would adversely affect the environment, it will be stopped.

However, since 1987, when the de la Madrid/Salinas changes started taking effect, inflation has fallen to only 20 percent or so and real wages have gone up in nearly every sector of the Mexican economy.

The average manufacturing wage is twice the average wage in Mexico, which is the sector Hunter is so concerned about. In this sector, real wage growth was 8.6 percent in 1989 and 6.3 percent in the first half of 1990.

Killing fast track means, very simply, killing Salinas' future and killing his free market economic policies. He would likely be replaced by old-style anti-American politicians.

I think it is also important to point out that Hunter ignored the impact of a deteriorating economy if NAFTA is defeated.

Immigration alone is a major reason to support the NAFTA. There are 40 million Mexicans under the age of 15—this represents one-half of the total population. Unless Mexico's economy grows rapidly, many of these young men and women will be forced to illegally emigrate to the United States. Los Angeles County alone already spends at least $720 million on services for illegal immigrants. They can't afford additional migrants.

The reason that illegal immigration has increased is specifically because of the success of the Maquilas. Not only have they provided employment for Mexicans along the border, but also many from other parts of the country. Mexicans from the interior are migrating to the border to look for jobs. If they cannot find them there, then it's easier for them to migrate over the border to Los Angeles than to return to their home. A NAFTA will expand economic growth in the rest of Mexico, slowing the migration of Mexicans north. Hunter's problem is that he has no long-term vision. We are going to be living with Mexico for the next thousand years, and we have a long term interest in improving their lives.

The National Council of La Raza, a Hispanic civil rights organization, which had earlier expressed labor and environmental concerns about the NAFTA, last week endorsed fast track.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE].

□ 1010

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, today we vote on fast-track authority. I will vote for the Dorgan resolution, and thus against fast track. I will also vote against the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution because it states explicitly that fast track for Mexico should be approved. I very much believe it should not be approved. In fact, it is my grave concern about a United States-Mexico free trade agreement which causes me to vote for the Dorgan disapproval resolution.

Let me make clear that I favor extension of fast-track authority for the Uruguay round of the GATT. I wish I could vote in favor of it today. I wish I could cast two separate votes on fast track. One, in favor of fast track for the GATT, and one against fast track for the Mexican free trade agreement.

Alas, that is not possible. We have been denied the opportunity for separate votes, and so reluctantly I will vote against fast track altogether. I feel strongly that negotiating an FTA with Mexico on a fast track would be a huge mistake for the working people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we have been assured that voting for fast-track authority today merely gives the President the opportunity to negotiate an agreement. We have been assured it does not commit the U.S. Congress. However, if Members believe that, I want Members to look at what is happening on the floor today.

Fast-track votes have been bundled into one vote. We have no opportunity to vote separately on fast track for Uruguay and fast track for Mexico. That was done deliberately. We were denied that opportunity. We are debating fast track today under a closed rule, with only 2 hours of debate on a very important issue. Regarding the

Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution, the rule allows no amendments despite efforts of several Members to get that privilege in the Committee on Rules yesterday.

What Members see, Mr. Speaker, is what we get. What we see is what we will get next year when a Mexico free trade agreement is brought back by the administration. When that agreement comes back we will be told we cannot amend the agreement; we will be told we cannot put into implementing legislation anything that would be contrary to the agreement. We will be told we cannot change House rules and implementing legislation. The agreement will come to us under a closed rule. We will have to vote yes or no.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to stop fast track.

Mr. Speaker, today we face a decision that is critical to the future of congressional involvement in the trade policymaking process. This decision is whether to extend the President's authority to negotiate trade agreement under fast-track procedures as set out in the Trade Act of 1974, as amended in 1984 and 1988.

I am voting against fast-track extension for one primary reason. I am deeply concerned about what is happening to the American middle class and I am convinced that, if given fast-track negotiating authority, the Bush administration will conclude this pact without regard for middle-class manufacturing workers in this country.

By definition, a free-trade agreement [FTA] negotiated with Mexico on the fast track will be an FTA negotiated without a great deal of input from Members of Congress. Contrary to some of the myths that have been circulated over the past several months, under fast track, Congress' power to influence the course of the FTA talks is very limited. And it is the Congress that worries about the fate of workers in the United States, not Mrs. Hills and her negotiators.

In short, under fast-track procedures, Members of Congress are sidelined and the U.S. Trade Representative [USTR] calls all the plays.

It is therefore my belief that an FTA negotiated with Mexico on the fast track will mean a loss of well paying manufacturing jobs for areas like northern Ohio, which are part of America's industrial heartland. An FTA with Mexico will also mean downward pressure on the wages and benefits of manufacturing workers who do keep their jobs.

An FTA with Mexico will squeeze the American middle class even more economically than it has been during the last 10 years. U.S. manufacturing workers have suffered a serious decline in real wages over the last decade. A study by the Economic Policy Institute shows that during the 1980's the average hourly real wages of American workers fell by 9.3 percent. As a result, more and more spouses have had to go to work just to maintain family income.

Workers are getting laid off from well paying factory jobs in alarming numbers—12,000 in one county alone in my district—and with increasing frequency. To add insult to injury, these dislocated workers find far too often that they cannot find new jobs that pay comparable wages.

And this is only the current generation of blue-collar workers. What about the children of the men and women who make up the human capital backbone of our industrial base?

For those young people who are now in high school and who do not and often cannot aspire to college educations, what are the chances of landing decent paying work after graduation? Will the sons and daughters of today's industrial workers be relegated to minimum wage jobs in fast-food restaurants?

I recognize that the decline of the American middle class and the erosion of the U.S. industrial base will continue with or without a United States-Mexico FTA. Increasingly, local factories are owned by multinational corporations that can and do move production—and jobs—around the country and around the world in an effort to increase efficiency and profits.

But, in my view, a United States-Mexico FTA will accelerate this globalization process. Middle class working Americans will be squeezed faster and harder.

Why? Primarily because the FTA will eliminate existing restrictions on American and other foreign investment in the Mexican economy. With barriers such as maximum foreign ownership and export performance requirements gone, American companies will surely be tempted to move their operations south of the border.

After all, Mexico offers very low cost labor—Mexican wages are at least seven times lower on average than American wages—as well as a lax regulatory climate in which failure to comply with environmental protection and worker health and safety laws often goes unpunished. What better way to cut costs of production than to cut corners on labor and regulatory costs.

Additionally, with a friendlier, more stable and predictable investment climate, Mexico will attract more Asian and European multinationals, which, in turn, will seek to export their products north, thereby supplanting domestic American producers. With tariffs as low as they are between the United States and Mexico—average United States tariff on Mexican imports at 4.5 percent and average Mexican tariff on United States imports at 10 percent—even the strictest rule-of-origin will not deter the use of Mexico as an export platform by non-North American trading partners.

At the risk of repeating myself, let me say once again that I am supporting the Dorgan resolution of disapproval because I oppose the extension of fast-track procedures for the purpose of negotiating a United States-Mexico FTA.

I do not oppose the completion of the Uruguay round of the GATT negotiations on the fast track. In fact, I believe that the use of the principle of nonamendability is warranted when negotiating trade agreements with as many as 107 partners.

I also view the fast track as an appropriate treatment of the Uruguay round agreement since this pact would merely sanction closer cooperation among GATT signatories. In contrast, an FTA with Mexico would bring about commercial integration of three economies, one of which is at an altogether different overall level of development.

Unfortunately, we were not given a separate vote on fast track for the United States-Mexico FTA; so I am forced to vote negatively on the entire generic fast-track negotiating authority extension. My feelings about Mexico are strong and my fears are real, strong and real enough to lead me to vote "yea" on House Resolution 101.

With respect to House Resolution 146, I, like many of my colleagues, was disappointed by the Rules Committee's decision to disallow amendments to this initiative. Had my amendments—both technical and substantive—been accepted, I could have voted in favor of the formulation presented by Messrs. GEPHARDT and ROSTENKOWSKI. For reasons outlined in the above paragraphs, I cannot support this resolution as originally introduced, because of the inclusion of a phrase indicating that fast track should be extended for a United States-Mexico FTA.

In conclusion, I would like to note for the record that regardless of how the vote comes out today, I intend to maintain my vigilance over the United States-Mexico FTA negotiations. Mrs. Hills will be hearing from me quite often during the next several months. Someone must keep an eye toward American workers and the global environment as the talks proceed, and I for one, am not confident that USTR will do this without a great deal of help from its friends in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. We have met with the President of the United States on this issue, and as we began the discussion, there were some who worried about whether or not fast track would create jobs or lose jobs. There was divided opinion on that, whether it would help to stem the flow of illegal aliens, or enhance the flow of illegal aliens. There was divided opinion on that. On whether or not the future economy of the United States would show expansion as the result of fast track or not. There was heavy discussion on that.

Because there is a divided opinion on some of the basics on economics, on job creation, there is one issue that rises above all. If all of those other little parts are gambles that we will be taking when we vote for or against fast track, the one overriding issue compels Members to support fast track. That is, that the President of the United States considered it, as many Members do, as an issue of foreign policy.

It is a question of unifying the Western Hemisphere in a trading bloc that will enhance the prestige of America, not only with its immediate neighbor of Mexico, as we did with its immediate neighbor of Canada before, but with one stroke of the pen, the President of Mexico and the President of the United States can wash away years of conflict between the two good neigh-

bors of Mexico and the United States, and in the process, with the wonderful foreign initiative that fast track will mean, we will also be in a position to expand the economy, create jobs, and enhance the future of our country.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, we are now here, folks, about our trade policy.

Let me submit, America has the best free-trade policy that Japan and Germany ever had. But now our free-trade policy is not enough. Now we want fast and free.

I want to pose a question. If free trade is so great, why does Korea not use it? If free trade is so great, why does Taiwan not use it? If free trade is so great, why does Europe not succumb to it? Ladies and gentlemen, if free trade is so great, how come Japan not only will not try it, but will have nothing to do with it, and in fact is the most protectionist nation in the world history? They are cleaning our clocks, like a bunch of fools.

I am disappointed here today. It is not about fast track, slow track, half track. It is about free trade. Let me tell Members what it is: It is a free ride to people overseas. It is a fast track for American workers going to unemployment lines. These policies continue to be drafted by so-called economic experts that never stood in an unemployment line. I am disappointed today because the Republicans have given Members this program, and Democrats continue to ratify it. I am disappointed today in the Democratic Party for not taking up the stand of the American worker, for letting people in my community lose their damn jobs.

I do not want any unemployment compensation. I do not want any adjustment. I want my people to have a job. If Members' rationale is that they want to bring Mexico's tariffs down, pass a free-trade agreement. Let me say this: I think if Congress raises our tariffs, Mexico would drop theirs in a damn hurry.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule. By giving us a rigged rule, you seek to rig the outcome of the vote which is to follow. By refusing to allow us to separate the question of fast-track negotiating authority for a Mexican FreeTrade Agreement from that of extending such negotiating authority for the GATT negotiations, you recognize that virtually unequivocal support for the latter will force unwilling support for the former.

Usually, such rules—which unfortunately have become increasingly common in this Chamber—are utilized by the majority party to restrict opportunity for the minority party to affect disposition of questions before this House. In this instance, you are not only turning your back on numerous members of your own party but upon the entire industrialized heartland of America.

When you, Mr. Speaker, and the majority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, agreed to this ruse, you simply denied an opportunity to separate the question of the proposed Mexican free trade fast-track authority from that of a GATT extension. Let the record clearly show what is happening here, as the Congress is denying itself the exercise of its constitutional authority and obligation in matters pertaining to trade and tariff questions.

Mr. Speaker, I willingly grant that the overwhelming majority of economists agree that in the long term, freer trade with our Mexican neighbor to our south is in the best interest of both nations. But serious questions remain to be settled pertaining to the short-term and medium-term implications of negotiating such an agreement. And they should be faced honestly and deliberately by this body while it has an opportunity to truly participate in the shaping of such an agreement.

If we are going to put the jobs of some Americans at risk on the behalf of strengthening job opportunities for others, is it not proper that we first of all reach some agreements as to worker retraining and transition assistance before taking this step?

If we are going to justify this agreement on the basis of a changed global economy in which we compete with brain power rather than muscle power, ought we not first of all agree to addressing those changes which are going to be needed in our American educational system to meet that challenge?

If the future of American economic strength rests in a more aggressive trade and export policy, why is it, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Commerce today employs fewer people in trade export enhancement and promotion than the Department of Defense employs in seeking to prohibit and restrict trade exports under its export control programs?

Shouldn't we resolve those problems—or at least come to some common understanding of those problems—prior to giving up our ability to shape a trade agreement with Mexico?

Mr. Speaker, my congressional district is part of America's industrial heartland. It is also a major player in the fruit and vegetable industry, which will be severely impacted by an MFT agreement. I believe the legitimate interests of producers and workers can be addressed in reaching such an agreement—and I speak not in the effort to prohibit consideration of such an agreement but to consider it carefully and cautiously with the recognition that the livelihoods of millions of American workers are at stake.

Mr. Speaker, this rule prohibits consideration of the very issues of importance to my constituents at the very time they can be best attended to by those Representatives the people have sent to Washington to represent their local interests. No trade representative inside the Washington Beltway will ever see the hurt that a poorly crafted agreement with Mexico would impose on my constitutents. No macroeconomic analysis of the benefits of a trade agreement addresses the fear I see in the eyes of my industrial workers who will see us taking this momentous step without the guarantee that we will be looking out after their interests.

I am not against free trade with Mexico, Mr. Speaker. But I am for taking every caution we can to insure that the agreement we shall be called upon to ratify at some later date is a careful agreement which addresses these very real questions. And this rule undermines the first opportunity we shall have to offer those very kinds of assurances our workers and constituents have every right to demand.

I am disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that on a matter of such importance to millions of America's workers, you have chosen to frame the question in such a way as to tie fast-track negotiating authority with Mexico to the question of global trade upon which the jobs of millions of other American workers are already tied. And I urge my colleagues to join with me in opposing this rule, so that this House will have an opportunity to separate the questions of a bilateral trade agreement with Mexico from that of multilateral trade agreements stretching across the globe.

□ 1020

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a rule should not be overturned lightly. It should be overturned in this case because there are serious issues involved, American businesses and jobs and the American standard of living.

Before the Ways and Means Committee acted, and even more intently since then, I have been trying to help work out an approach to fast track that would combine an internationalist perspective with a pro-American growth policy.

The irony is that we found a combination that makes sense.

This formula provides for a midterm review by Congress to Mexico. The administration would sit down with us, review progress to date with committees of jurisdiction both as to main trade negotiations and the parallel dis-

cussions on health, labor, and the environment. There would be an impact analysis in the sectors vital to the future of the American economy.

But an administration that claims it wants Congress as partner vehemently opposes a midterm review, and a rule has been crafted that prohibits even its consideration on this floor today.

If there is fear over this amendment on the floor today, one can imagine how meaningful is the pledge of consultation with Congress hereafter.

Why a specific provision for Congress' role in negotiations with Mexico? GATT involves negotiations with 107 nations. NAFTA would involve negotiations with only one, and most importantly, while in GATT we are talking about more trade, with Mexico we would be talking about the integration of two economies at very different stages of development, including highly disparate salary and wage scales. To tell Congress that in such circumstances it should be content with, and cannot be trusted beyond, the normal pattern of trade consultations is an insult, an insult to the importance of the issues and to Congress as an institution.

Congress must be a partner in any NAFTA negotiations, not a consultant. True, only one person can negotiate, but these negotiations must involve Congress more than was said yesterday at a hearing, sending an emissary who will hold its cards to the very end when the deals are made, thus placing Congress in a position simply at the very end to take it or to leave it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have no choice but to vote to reject this rule. If that rejection occurs, I have no doubt that in the week which remains for action, this House will have more than a chance to act on the Hobson's choice now facing it.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST].

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I am a free trader, and I believe there must be fair trade with any negotiated trade agreement. Certain segments of our economy have been left on the short end of the stick in previous trade negotiations. In hearings before the House Agriculture Committee, in letters to our trade negotiators, and in discussions with other Cabinet officials, I have been working to ensure that agriculture and energy do not wind up on the wrong end of the stick under the North American Free-Trade Agreement and the GATT.

I have had some reservations about how these trade negotiations may impact agriculture and energy sectors. Because I represent the largest cotton producing congressional district in the Nation, I am particularly sensitive to cotton producers' concerns, in addition to peanut and sugar producers. These past few weeks, I have been actively involved in discussions with our trade negotiators to ensure that our interests are not negotiated away.

I commend the administration for being responsive to these needs. In her answer to my letter which detailed my concerns for cotton, peanuts, and sugar producers in my district, U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills was very responsive to my questions. She assured me that the United States will make changes in the import quota program which protects these commodities only if other countries match these changes with their own similar reductions. Further, producers will still be afforded income protection assistance, so long as these programs minimize trade distorting patterns. Also, snapback trade provisions will help protect domestic farmers in the event imports unexpectedly increase.

I am satisfied that under the North American Free-Trade Agreement, stringent rules of origin will be in place to ensure that Mexico is not simply a conduit for third country agricultural exports. Also, Secretary Mosbacher has personally assured me that he agrees we need a cotton advisory group and will strongly recommend there be one.

Recently, I met with President Bush to discuss my concerns about energy under the North American Free-Trade Agreement. Although I realize that the Mexican Constitution precludes foreign ownership of their petroleum reserves, an energy agreement which includes oil drilling and other field servicing activities would enable us to help Mexico develop these resources. I would like to insert in the RECORD my letter detailing my concerns regarding the energy industry.

I intend to support the extension of fast track. Additionally, I will continue to work hard to ensure that agriculture and energy are on board steering the engine down the track as we continue the GATT negotiations and the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter to the President:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*May 13, 1991.*

The PRESIDENT,
*The White House,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The proposed North American Free-Trade Agreement negotiations provide an historic opportunity to establish the largest trading market in the world. Energy will be an important part of these trade negotiations. I am pleased to see that your negotiators have recognized that energy, trade, and investment issues should be included in the negotiations and have stated so publicly.

However, the manner in which energy issues are to be handled as part of the negotiations has not been clearly defined. Specifically, to my knowledge, there is no negotiating team or working group established to address energy issues. Energy is too important for our national security and as an integral part of the region's economic development to be subsumed within other sectors or negotiating topics. As the U.S. Trade Representative and her counterparts begin to set up the framework for negotiating the agreement, I strongly urge you to establish a specific U.S. energy negotiating group responsible for conducting this aspect of the negotiations. In this regard, I would appreciate your identifying the procedures your negotiators intend to implement in their approach to energy questions. Specifically, is an energy working group, separate from other sectors or negotiating topics, contemplated?

With regard to the specific areas which should be addressed, I realize that the Mexican government, under its Articles of Constitution, has exclusive ownership of petroleum reserves. This existing prohibition, however, should not be a barrier to negotiations on issues which are much broader than ownership of petroleum reserves. Many innovative arrangements for the development and production of energy could be mutually beneficial and should be considered as appropriate for these negotiations.

Opportunities for investment in natural resources and open access to markets must be significant components of the trade talks. I am vitally interested in establishing a negotiating agenda for energy prior to opening of the negotiations.

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

LARRY COMBEST.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, we are here again and the eyes of the world are upon us. We think this is an eternal matter involving the prerogatives of Congress, but it is far more serious than that.

The policies that we are following here today began as the result of a crisis that was created when the policies of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] were inculcated into the American economy in 1928. Out of that disaster, and I guess the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] would have us relive it, we decided that we had to open our borders, that we were no longer an island, that we had to work and cooperate with the rest of the world, and through the guidance of President Roosevelt, President Truman, President Kennedy, President Johnson, and President Carter and all the Republican Presidents during that time, we have expanded our policy of free and open and competitive and fair trade with the rest of the world.

Now, today if the proponents of that kind of trade lose this battle, America will step backward. We will put the cloak of 1928 and 1930 down upon us. We do not want to ever live through that again.

Now, we have some successful models to point to, a United States-Canadian agreement that was agreed to on this floor by fast track, and fast track is necessary for this negotiation and it is a success.

Our agricultural trade has increased by 35 percent with Canada since we entered into that agreement. Our manufacturing trade has increased almost as fast as that with Canada. Our deficit of trade with Canada has been vastly reduced since that time. The same thing will happen with us and Mexico.

Now, there will be those who will say, "Oh, you don't need fast track."

Well, the world will not negotiate with you. We are not only talking about Mexico, we are talking about the rest of the world. The rest of the world is involved in the Uruguay round negotiations right now.

In 1962 when we sent our negotiators on the Kennedy round, they came back with a few things that the Congress had to approve. We did not have any fast track procedure then, and the Congress just picked them all apart. The rest of the world came to us and said, "Listen, unless you reform your congressional procedures, we aren't dealing with you anymore. You are not a reliable bargainer."

You have go to have fast track in order to be able to keep the bargain.

Now, is Congress cut out? Heck no. The President has other methods of negotiating these treaties. He could go exclusively to the Senate if we wanted to. Everybody points to article I of the Constitution, but there is article II of the Constitution, and he can negotiate only involving the Senate, if he wants to.

□ 1030

If you want to vote down fast track, turn it all over to the Senate, back off from world expansion, then turn down all of this today.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri, the "Show Me" State, Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Missouri is indeed known as the "Show Me" State. As a matter of fact, it was my predecessor many times removed who, in speaking to a national convention back around the turn of the century, was having some difficulty with the proposition that was before the House, and he said, "Sir, I am from Missouri, and you will have to show me."

Well, that is the attitude that I have adopted in approaching this issue that is before us today. I have concluded that we must support this rule and that we must support the proposition that will be before the House.

This is a fast-moving world in which we live. I share all of the fears and concerns and apprehensions expressed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], but unless we let this measure move forward and let the negotiation occur, we will not really know whether those fears are justified or not.

Who, 3 years ago, would have expected or predicted the demise of the Iron Curtain? Who would have expected 2 years ago the fall of the Berlin Wall? Not I; but occur it did.

Events are moving so fast we need to change some structures so that we can better deal with problems that lie before us.

This is the opportunity to address the problems, the fears, the concerns expressed by the gentleman from Ohio. Without it we are on the same old track.

The time to judge whether we are doing the right thing is when an agreement is before us. We should not shut off the process so that negotiations and discussions may not occur.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this rule. There are those that are concerned about the process. We are going to be fully involved in the process.

I have been assured of that by the President, and I have spoken directly to him about this; by the trade ambassador; by the Secretary of Agriculture; and by the Secretary of Commerce.

We will be involved in the process as this matter moves forward. Vote for the rule.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE].

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 158, the rule providing for consideration of House Resolution 101, to disapprove the extension of "fast track" approval procedures of section 1103 of the Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988.

I appreciate the fact that the House will be given an opportunity to vote on the House Resolution 101 despite its disapproval by the Ways and Means Committee. The extension of fast-track authority, together with its potential use for consideration of the proposed North American Free Trade Agreement, are extremely important issues that require extensive consideration by Congress.

Unfortunately, this will not occur under the rule. The rule permits only a yes-or-no vote on House Resolution 101, which disapproves extension of fast-track procedures to all trade agreements submitted to Congress before June 1, 1993. It does not permit consideration of serious constitutional objections to fast-track procedures, nor does it permit a separate vote on whether these procedures should be applied to a free-trade agreement with Mexico.

I have serious objections to the fast-track process and strongly oppose its application to a potential United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement. The President's request for "unencumbered fast-track procedures" seeks to provide final trade agreements with "immunity from congressional amendment." This would apply not only to an agreement produced by the 6-year Uruguay round negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], but also to any agreement produced in future trade negotiations with Mexico.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that this abrogation of future Congressional prerogative and responsibility in the area of foreign trade is something Congress should not provide, and can not provide, even if fast-track procedures are extended. The Constitution is clear in separating the powers of Congress from those of the Executive. Article I, section 8 clearly provides—"The Congress shall have Power * * * to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations * * *."

This clear allocation of authority in the area of foreign commerce, like the power to collect taxes, borrow money, or declare war, is a matter of original jurisdiction to the Congress and a central feature of congressional power and responsibility. The Congress can not forfeit this power, nor should Congress reduce itself to a peripheral role in the exercise of this power, except under the most unusual and compelling circumstances.

Congress also can not be bound in advance by any procedure that limits its deliberations or prevents it from adopting amendments. The whole concept of fast-track authority is ultra vires and unenforceable. Article I, section 5 of the Constitution provides that—"Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings."

This authority may not be impaired or controlled by the rules of any proceding House, nor by any law passed by a prior Congress. Further, either House may change today's rules tomorrow. This is our constitutional prerogative. And no congressional statute can waive this constitutional power in futuro.

These constitutional objections to fast-track procedures are not new arguments. They were strongly expressed by House Members during House debate of the Trade Act of 1974. The fast-track provisions of the act were targeted for specific criticism on the floor as the "broadest sweep of authority yet granted to the President." Yet in that debate, as in this one, Members were not provided with an opportunity to address the serious constitutional implications of the fast-track procedures.

While intended in the 1974 act as a mechanism for preserving congressional prerogatives in addressing what were largely unknown issues involving nontariff barriers, fast-track procedures have become the means for limiting congressional involvement in all trade agreements. Some justification may be found for its continued use for a Uruguay round agreement, involving nontariff barriers of more than a hundred countries. But its use with regard

to a broad free-trade agreement with Mexico, or a regional free-trade agreement has neither precedent nor clear legislative intent.

A broad free-trade agreement with Mexico is unprecedented in seeking to open the Nation's economy to a country whose size and proximity carry the potential to dislocate U.S. production and workers on a massive scale. But despite this broad potential impact of a free trade arrangement, Congress is expected to waive its constitutional right to offer amendments and merely to accept on faith this critical policy concerns will be appropriately addressed and implemented.

This inappropriate application of fast-track procedures is justified with statements that fast-track offers the only means under which negotiations with Mexico can be initiated and critical agreements obtains from Mexico's. This is absurd. It is always more efficient, and certainly more convenient, to try to circumvent the Constitution. As Justice Brandeis observed 75 years ago, the separation of powers doctrine "was not adopted for efficiency, but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power."

Let's not kid ourselves, or the world into thinking that by passing fast-track authority today, we are providing a blank check for any future trade agreements the President chooses to negotiate. That will not occur. As the Rules Committee explained in its report on House Resolution 101, Congress' future ability to modify fast track is no empty threat. Congress retains the option to turn off fast track at any time as it did last October when it revised procedures for consideration of extension of most-favored-nation status to China.

Fast tract is constitutionally unenforceable even in its intended application to a future Uruguay round agreement. Its application to a United States-Mexico free-trade agreement goes beyond congressional intent and all practical logic. The rule does not permit consideration of either of these critical issues.

I urge a vote against the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I also take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD a speech I recently delivered to the Council on the Americas that discusses in greater detail the critical constitutional issues involved in this debate.

AN ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN J. LAFALCE BEFORE THE COUNCIL ON THE AMERICAS

I am delighted to have this opportunity to apepar before you today to discuss a number of concerns regarding the proposed U.S.-Mexico free-trade agreement and the pending Congressional vote on extension of fast-track negotiating authority.

As most of you are aware, President Bush sent to Congress last week a 70-page "action plan" outlining a variety of labor, health and environmental concerns that would be addressed in negotiations with Mexico. While long on assurances, the plan falls short of providing measurable goals for the negotiations and fails to define specific actions to preserve U.S. jobs and wage levels.

By keeping its plans vague and offering only promises that key Congressional concerns will be taken into consideration, the President's statement illustrates what some observers now see as the central issue confronting Congress—Whether Congress trusts the Administration and its negotiators enough to give away its Constitutional powers on this issue?

While the focus on Constitutional power is right on track, I think the issue goes beyond a mere question of trust. It is crucial to understand, Congress does not have the authority to provide, nor can it provide, the type of negotiating freedom the President is seeking. In a letter to Members of Congress last week, President Bush urged support for extension of "unencumbered fast-track procedures." Just what this means was explained in White House statements that negotiations could not proceed unless a final agreement was given "immunity from Congressional amendment." I suggest to you today that this is something Congress will not provide, and can not provide, even if fast-track procedures are extended.

The Constitution is clear in separating the powers of the Congress from those of the Executive—Article I delegates powers to the Congress; Article II defines the powers of the President. Article I, Section 8 clearly states:

"The Congress shall have Power—To lay and collect Duties, Imports and Excises . . . (*and*) To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes."

This clear allocation of authority in the area of foreign commerce, like the power to collect taxes, borrow money or declare war, is a matter of original jurisdiction to the Congress and a central feature of Congressional power. The Congress can not forfeit this power, nor should Congress reduce itself to a peripheral role in the exercise of this power, except under the most unusual and compelling circumstances.

Equally important, Congress can not be barred from exercising its power to regulate foreign commerce simply because an earlier Congress chose not to do so. Indeed, even the same Congress can not be constitutionally bound by its own prior actions with respect to rules. It can constitutionally change its mind and its rules any day of any year.

We witnessed a comparable situation earlier this year with regard to the Persian Gulf crisis. Although President Bush claimed authority to initiate military actions against Iraq, he was very careful not to take action until Congress approved a resolution authorizing the use of force. That Congress may have previously acquiesced in military initiatives by the President did not imply any forfeiture of Congress' power to declare war.

The constitutional problems of the fast-track procedure are not new arguments. They were strongly expressed by House Members in 1973 when, in debating what became the trade Act of 1974, the fast-track proposal was targeted for specific criticism as "the broadest sweep of authority yet granted to the President."

The first to raise these concerns was Mr. Rostenkowski's predecessor as Chairman of the Way and Means Committee, Al Ullman, who then served as Chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, now chaired by Mr. Gibbons. Ullman objected to proposals requested by President Nixon for "delegating broad new powers to the Executive in carrying out trade agreements," and eloquently defined the problem that continues to confront Congress—

"The difficulty in our system of government, particularly in the field of trade, has been this balance of power between the Executive and legislative. I think you can always make an argument in the field of international affairs for more power in the hands of an executive and perhaps even unlimited power. It is certainly more effective in some respects.

"I think it is far more important, however, that we hold to the principles of separation of powers, and that we keep to our constitutional authority, than it is to get a temporary and immediate benefit in this field."

Another former chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, Charles Vanik, also raised strong constitutional arguments regarding the fast-track process and other proposals of the 1974 Act:

"The Congress should legislate trade policy—not abdicate responsibility . . . This bill stakes out extensive authority for executive discretion—and this discretionary authority is carved out of the little that remains of the shattered and torn carcass of constitutional congressional authority and responsiblity. If the Congress should pass this bill . . . it will move the Congress a considerable distance toward becoming an unnecessary branch of government. As far as trade is concerned, there will be little left for the Congress—but remorse for its own folly."

These and other arguments were persuasive in convincing 140 House members to vote against the 1974 Trade Act, including the current Ways and Means Committee Chairman, Mr. Rostenkowski.

Although intended in the 1974 Act as a mechanism for preserving Congressional prerogatives in an uncertain forum of multilateral negotiation of non-tariff barriers, the fast-track process has become the means for limiting Congressional involvement in all trade agreements. Lingering constitutional concerns have been dismissed with arguments that fast-track offers the most efficient and convenient method for obtaining critical agreements from foreign nations and for facilitating prompt approval by Congress. But it is always more convenient, or more efficient, to circumvent the Constitution. As Justice Brandeis observed seventy-five years ago, the separation of powers doctrine "was not adopted for efficiency, but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power."

I am not saying the fast-track process is unconstitutional. I am certain, however, that any fast-track approval process is constitutionally unenforceable.

That Congress can be bound in advance by any procedure that limits its deliberations or prevents it from adopting amendments is illusory. The whole concept of fast-track authority is ultra vires and nonbinding. Article I, Section 5 of the Constitution provides "Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings."

This authority may not be impaired or controlled by the rules of any preceding House, or by any law passed by a prior Congress. Further, either House may change today's rules tomorrow. This is our constitutional prerogative. No congressional statute can waive that constitutional power *in futuro*.

Thus, whether the 100th Congress voted to extend the fast-track process in 1988, or whether Congress votes to extend fast track this month, there will still be no guarantee that a trade agreement will be considered without amendments. If commitments are not kept, or Congressional concerns are ig-

nored, Congress can simply change its rules and amend an agreement. As Congress explained in the 1974 Act, and again in the 1988 extension, fast-track procedures are an "exercise in the rulemaking power" of each House and are enacted "with full recognition of the constitutional rights of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedures of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as any other rule of that House."

While this clause accounts for less than one percent of the wording explaining fast-track procedures, it is critically important. It acknowledges that Congress can not be bound by any specific rule of procedure and that it reserves the right to change its procedures at any time. thus, fast-track is simply an expression of present intentions with respect to future action. It is hortative and in no way conclusive or binding.

Further, I think it is nonsense to say that a trade agreement can not be pursued without fast-track guarantees. During the nearly 200 years from Washington's inauguration in 1789 until 1974, Presidents were able to conclude commercial agreements without fast-track. Indeed, Presidents have always had the choice of submitting a commercial agreement either as a treaty or an agreement. What determined this choice, in many instances, was whether a President thought the agreement could obtain the two-thirds vote necessary for Senate ratification of a treaty. Fast-track now provides a President with the best of both options—a single yes-or-no vote without amendment used in treaty ratification, but with a simple majority vote of the regular legislative process.

I suggest that fast-track has become necessary for negotiating trade agreements not because foreign countries demand it, but because Presidents want it. Foreign governments have long accepted the necessity of dealing with both the President and the Congress. This is an understood difficulty of dealing with the United States. More than foreign governments, it is the President who dislikes Congressional interference. Even when acting as a delegate of Congressional authority, which he clearly is in this context, the President does not wish to see his efforts revised in any way.

In seeking "unencumbered" fast-track authority, President Bush is, in essence, seeking Congress' foreign commerce powers. Administration officials seek to define the goals and the focus of broad trade discussions with Mexico and also negotiate the substance of the trade agreement. Congress' entire role in the process is reduced to something akin to the Senate's role of advice and consent in political treaties. This may permit more effective negotiations, and it is clearly more convenient. But this is not what the Constitution requires.

Even with the failure of a motion to disapprove the extension of fast-track authority, it is not clear that a simple extension of the process would be applicable to an agreement deriving from the proposed North American free trade negotiations. Section 1103(b) of the 1988 Act authorizes use of fast-track procedures only in conjunction with two distinct types of trade agreements—(1) agreements involving the reduction or elimination of "non-tariff barriers," and (2) "bilateral" agreements involving tariffs and non-tariff barriers. The President on March 4, 1991 formally requested extension of fast-track authority for purposes of initiating trilateral negotiations with Mexico and Canada to achieve a regional free trade agreement. Since this agreement would be trilateral rather than bilateral, and would involve both tariff and non-tariff barriers, it would not qualify under either standard for consideration under present fast-track procedures and would be subject to challenge on a point of order.

The House routinely employs a variety of procedures to restrict debate and amendments. Most typical is the "modified closed rule," which permits consideration of a bill with a limited number of amendments. This was the procedure used for passage of the 1974 Trade Act which prevented consideration of constitutional objections to fast-track and other procedures. Occasionally, we have even used a completely closed rule to exclude all amendments. But these rules are adopted by the House membership after the substance of the issue has been addressed in Committee and debated at length, not before. We do not vote on a rule months, and even years, in advance of discussing the substance of the issue, or of even knowing what issues are to be addressed.

A broad free trade agreement with Mexico is unprecedented in seeking to open the world's largest industrial economy to a nation with an economic and social structure that characterize, at best, a developing country. Given Mexico's huge and impoverished population and its proximity on the U.S. border, the agreement carries the potential to dislocate U.S. production and workers on a massive scale. An agreement would affect federal and state law in areas ranging from immigration to public health, as well as enforcement of codes and standards involving such things as product quality and environmental protection.

So pervasive is the potential impact of the agreement, the President's demand for fast-track authority is comparable, in my view, to the President's proposing a sweeping reform of the nation's tax codes and requesting a simple yes-or-no vote for whatever tax system he chooses to develop. This request would be unthinkable to Congress and to the public. And yet, this is not substantially different from the situation now facing Congress.

We are being asked to waive our right and our responsibility to offer amendments to any possible agreement' to accept on faith that our concerns will be addressed and that the best possible agreement will be negotiated.

Further, we have already been told that Mexico has refused to put energy issues on the negotiating table. With oil accounting for 20 percent of U.S. imports from Mexico, how can this question be off the table! We also have little indication that negotiations will attempt to address the need for debt relief, or the problem of Mexico's capital flight. Equally critical is the problem of subsidies, which was a key issue in negotiating the U.S.-Canada agreement. The Canadian negotiations simply deferred consideration of this question. Given the vastly more pervasive role of state subsidies in the Mexcan economy, I would be surprised if this question is ever addressed with Mexico.

Supporters of the fast-track proposal argue that Congress is not being barred from considering these issues, and that it retains the ability to defeat any agreement it finds objectionable. Theoretically, this is true; practically speaking, this is false. Once a Mexican trade agreement is submitted, two major arguments will be raised. The first, by the President's supporters, arguing that the President's international credibility is at stake and defeat of the agreement would undermine the President's ability to conduct foreign affairs. The second, by the President himself, arguing that the agreement is critical to avoid political and economic revolution on our border.

This, I strongly suspect, is the basis on which most Members will ultimately vote on the issue, not on the specific merits of the final agreement. An emotionally-charged political debate will again preclude debate on substantive economic and policy issues. Therefore, it becomes all the more imperative to address these questions now, before fast-track is extended. A successful free trade arrangement with Mexico ultimately requires leadership, not gimmickry.

I believe in liberalized trading arrangements. I have consistently supported our negotiating efforts in the Uruguay Round and have been the strongest advocates in Congress for the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement. I also believe we should open our economy as much as reasonably possible to Mexico and to all of Latin America. I supported the Caribbean Basin Initiative and was the author of the International Debt Management Facility Act, which was the forerunner of the Brady Plan, for providing debt relief to Mexico and to other Latin American countries. Indeed, we must go much further.

And while I think the time has come to establish closer trade relations with Mexico, trade negotiations must be placed in a broader context. Negotiations must seek to address Mexico's major problem of debt and its pressing need for debt relief. Equally urgent are policies to stem capital flight which robs Mexico of needed capital investment. If the wealthy of Mexico are unwilling to invest in their country's economic future, why should the United States?

Negotiations must also address the critical issues of wage disparities and state subsidies that make it virtually impossible for U.S. producers and workers to compete. And U.S. policy must also seek greater democratization of the economic process in Mexico to assure that Mexican workers gain an increasing share of the benefits of economic growth. Perhaps most important, free and open trade should not come until there are free and open elections. We should not even consider a free trade agreement with Mexico without a number of preconditions. One essential precondition being international supervision of the August 1991 federal elections for the Mexican Congress.

Without such efforts, I fear that opening the U.S. economy to Mexico will only encourage the transfer of U.S. production across the border, with little improvement in the glaring social, economic, environmental and political inequities of Mexico, and with little or no reciprocal benefit to the U.S. economy. American jobs would be sacrificed in a political agreement that benefits primarily the transnational corporations and Mexico's wealthy elite.

My greatest concern, however, is that Congress will be confronted with little option but to approve an agreement that encourages American producers to respond to international competition by choosing a low-wage option rather than a strategy of training and technological progress. Instead of improving conditions in Mexico, this may put the United States solidly on Mexico's current path toward lower wages, lower imcomes and lower living standards.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gen-

tleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the Dorgan resolution and for the fast-track authority the President has requested to negotiate the free-trade agreement with Mexico. It is a vote that is consistent with the ideals we have been projecting all over the world and one that is consistent with the confidence I have that America's workers are still the best and most productive in the world.

For years America has been promoting the advantages of free trade. We believe that open markets mean greater prosperity for all nations and all peoples.

We know what happened when Congress passed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff of 1930. Other nations retaliated and turned what might have been a mere economic recession into the Great Depression of the 1930's.

We know that America learned from that experience and committed itself to free trade. In the years after the Second World War, America became one of the world's leading exporters and one of its most prosperous nations.

For years, we have promoted economic and political freedoms around the world. This is no time to pull back.

We must give the President fast-track authority. Without it he will lack sufficient negotiating authority to convince other nations to lower their trade barriers.

Only with this authority can the President have a realistic chance of concluding the GATT Uruguay round, promoting greater trade and investment in Latin America through the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative, and negotiating a free-trade agreement with Mexico.

The North American Free-Trade Agreement between Mexico, Canada, and the United States will create an open market of 360 million people with a gross national product of $6 trillion, one that's larger than the European Common Market.

The agreement would also bring into the same open market 33 percent of the world's oil production—energy that can drive our cars, power our factories, and heat our homes. Having that much oil at our disposal makes us less reliant on the volatile Middle East for oil, a real plus for America's national security.

Another plus will be the jobs the agreement produces. The Department of Labor predicts that the North American Free-Trade Agreement will create as many as 64,000 jobs over the next 10 years, many of them in manufacturing.

What's more, it will save jobs in the long run. And I suspect some union leaders would agree with me. I can think of one union in the automotive industry that has shown it clearly sees the advantages of free trade.

I am referring to a local of the International Union of Electrical Workers. That union local recently joined the management of GM's Delco Products in petitioning the United States Trade Representative for duty-free status for ceramic magnets imported from a Delco facility in Mexico.

They clearly believed their jobs were based on the ability of Delco to remain competitive. And I suspect that many other unions who are willing to take a hard look at the real long-term benefits of freer trade with Mexico will come to the same conclusion I have: This agreement will benefit American workers and American consumers.

Yet there is no doubt that there will be some dislocation. In the short run, some Americans will lose jobs. That's one of the major objections to this legislation. But the President has committed his administration to ensuring an adequate transition period for workers in import-sensitive industries and also to making sure that those who lose their jobs are given assistance and retraining.

It's important to remember that the net impact of the agreement will be a sizable increase in jobs through the whole economy—many of them high wage, high skill manufacturing jobs in high technology industries.

A second objection to this legislation is a concern that Mexico does not have the same environmental standards as America, and that the lower standards in Mexico will mean more cross-border pollution and will give Mexican firms a competitive advantage over United States firms.

I share these concerns. Yet, I also believe President Bush when he says that President Salinas is firmly committed to strengthened environmental protection in Mexico.

The proof is in the pudding. In March, President Salinas ordered the immediate closing of Mexico City's largest Government-operated oil refinery. Mr. Salinas did this for environmental reasons, despite the fact that the shutdown would cost the Government about $500 million, and 2 or 3,000 workers would lose their jobs. It's an indication that Mexico takes the environment a lot more seriously than some would give them credit for.

No agreement is perfect, but this agreement with Mexico has benefits that far outweigh its drawbacks. In a word, this agreement will mean economic growth and jobs for all Americans.

Some of my colleagues say they are objecting only to the way this agreement is being negotiated. They say that they are not necessarily against free trade, but that they are opposed to giving the President fast-track authority on such an important issue.

To them I would respond that the vote we are casting today is not about a procedural matter or about the prerogatives of Congress. It is really about where we see this Nation going in the future.

One vision sees an America sealed off from the future, an America that would henceforth lock its doors to hide from the forces of history. It is a vision based on pessimism, fear, and self-doubt.

The other vision, the one offered by the President, looks with confidence and optimism to the future. It acknowledges that there will be some short-term dislocations, but it is confident that American workers have what it takes to compete in the new world market.

There are always risks in life, but Americans have always shown that they have the stuff to face up to them. That's why we are the world's greatest and most powerful country, and that is why I believe we will continue to be for years to come.

I urge my colleagues to give the President the fast-track authority to negotiate the kind of future that this Nation deserves.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

Mr. McCLOSKEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are not considering today just a trade treaty but a radical restructuring of the entire United States economy and most likely also the Mexican economy. But sad to say, this rule is not fair to the interest of American workers or entire regions of the American economy. We did not get a separate vote on Mexican-American trade with economic issues totally distinct from GATT. We could not get the simple and wise policies of the Levin amendment made in order.

Levin is important to continue qualitative congressional input for the concerns of the American economy. What is the matter with a midterm congressional review by the committees of jurisdiction in the form of formal face-to-face negotiations? What is the matter with written economic impact analyses?

Vote "no" on the rule; make the Levin amendment in order.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of fast track and freer trade. Freer trade means prosperity, freer trade means higher standards of living. Let us not be controlled by our fears and our special interests. Let us be inspired, instead, by our dreamers and

our enterprisers. Let us set our sights on freer trade among all people, free trade, if possible, between the Yucatan and the Yukon.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a historic turning point. Europe '92 is upon us, as is a trading bloc in the Pacific. We are especially at a turning point in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, there is a brave President who has been conducting reform down there. Mexico can go either way. This is not the time to slap Mexico in the face and tell Mexico we no longer want to be Mexico's friend and we are not even willing to talk to the President who is conducting such reforms.

Mexico will be our neighbor in the future; let us vote for progress, let us vote for commerce, let us not shrink back into stagnating protectionist enclaves. Let us start negotiating about possible benefits from trade among all people.

□ 1040

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, by voting against this rule today one does not vote to close borders, but they vote to open up a process, and that is why I urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule. Unfortunately the procedure that is put before us gives us only two choices. One is total fast track, and the other is total derailment. What about the GATT negotiations that have been ongoing for 5 years with 107 nations now being tossed into the same negotiations as Mexico? And that is not fair to have to choose between them.

But I am voting no for another reason. I am not even asking for that separation. I wanted the Levin amendment which simply said that there would be a midterm review, that the administration by March 1 would have to come to Congress and to the various committees of jurisdiction and explain what it is doing, as well as providing an economic analysis. Unfortunately that amendment is not made in order.

For those of my colleagues who support Dorgan in effectively killing fast-track negotiations, this amendment says, "If you lose, you still got some teeth when the Gephardt-Rostenkowski language passes."

For those of my colleagues who are for free trade and for fast track, I say, "This still gives you more certainty of congressional participation under the Gephardt-Rostenkowski language."

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there are some who say that the rule is drafted, if we defeat it, as I am urging, and fast track automatically happens.

But let us be real with one another. I have to believe that our leadership is not going to let this pass out of this House by default with such a voice of protest and would indeed bring it back next week before the June 1 deadline.

Mr. Speaker, we need not be in this process today. Something this serious says that there is something between a total fast track, the express train, and a total derailment, and what I am urging is more congressional participation, and let us get on about the business of opening up our borders in an orderly way, not in this manner.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the chairman of the Republican Research Committee.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the rule, to oppose fast track and to ask my colleagues to consider that the trade policies that we have been following in this postwar era should in fact be changed, and I want to relate that directly to Mexico.

This free-trade agreement, if it follows the course that has been outlined by the administration, is going to create an enduring competition between American workers and workers in Mexico.

Now besides the 8-to-1 disparity in wages and the high productivity, I might add, of Mexican workers, there are three burdens that American workers share that will render this playing field enduringly unequal and tilted in favor of workers in Mexico, and the cost of that work and that competition between those workers is going to be manifest in the fluidity of products going back and forth through an open border that no longer has tariffs.

The first burden that Americans carry is a thousand dollar burden per year per worker paid by the middle class in this country for national security. The Patriot missiles, the M-1 tanks, the Apache helicopters that carried us to victory in Desert Storm were paid for by American blue collar workers who took about a thousand bucks apiece out of their paychecks and put it into national defense for the defense of the West. That is more than half of the real wages that are taken home each year by workers in Mexico. There cannot be a level playing field in that competition.

The environmental burden that is carried by American workers and business is manifest in every single product that we produce. That is not shared by Mexico, and I might add for those Members who have cited the success of the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement that in Canada there is proximate parity in wages with the United States, especially when we consider fringe benefits. There are strong environmental laws that are enforced.

If one looks at the 8-to-1 wage disparity between United States workers and Mexican workers, and one looks at the 80-percent productivity level that is achieved now by General Motors workers in Mexico City, they are 80 percent as productive as Detroit workers; one has to conclude that assembly lines and production lines will be going south. Now some people say that is great for the consumer. However, my colleagues, I define a consumer as an American worker with a job and a paycheck, and there will be less of them after the free-trade agreement.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and fast track. More than 50 percent of America's economic growth comes from trade and exports, so today Congress deals with the premier jobs issue of this session.

But, Mr. Speaker, a United States-Mexico agreement must be about more than jobs. It must address the toxic chemicals, cancer-causing emissions, and polluted water that poison our citizens on both sides of the border. It has to address social justice and fairness for American workers who lose their jobs when a United States company sets up its corporate office on the United States side of the border and its plant on the Mexican side.

However, Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "To solve the problems you have to talk. No talks, no agreement. No agreement, no progress."

But here is the message for the Bush administration. Pro-traders like me are not going to jump ship today. But if the final agreement does not have enforceable environmental standards on air and water quality, if it does not get a fair shake for our workers, we are going to lead the mutiny when it comes back for a final vote.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of House Resolution 101, disapproval of fast-track procedures, and in strong support of House Resolution 146, which supports the extension of fast-track procedures and outlines the objectives to be achieved. Fast-track procedures are necessary and both the United States and Mexico have stated that they will not enter into negotiations if the President is denied the fast-track extension. Under fast track, Congress has a real and important role in drafting the legislation which implements a trade agreement. The President has pledged to consult extensively with Congress and I expect to make contributions to ensure that we end up with an agreement which respects the environment, protects the American worker, and strengthens the economy of both countries.

I have the privilege of representing the 16th Congressional District in Texas. At the heart of my district lies the city of El Paso, whose population of over 500,000 makes it the largest border city in the United States and the

fourth largest city in Texas. Directly across the border, divided by a ribbon of water known as the Rio Grande, is Ciudad Juarez, the largest Mexican border city with a population of 1.2 million residents. Together, these two cities make up the largest international metroplex anywhere in the world. As chairman of the congressional border caucus and representative of the largest American city on the United States-Mexico border, my perspective on whether to extend fast-track procedures reflects the view from the border, an area that will bear the greatest impact of increased commerce in terms of increased border traffic, infrastructure needs, and environmental concerns.

My decision to support the President's request for the authority to negotiate free-trade agreements under the fast-track approach has not been easy and I have taken it very seriously. My support for the fast-track extension hinged on the President's commitment to address my concerns with respect to the labor, environmental, and infrastructure needs of the United States-Mexico border region.

With respect to labor, I urged the President to consider the impact of the proposed trade agreement on retail, textile, and apparel industries. I requested sufficient funding and policy directives for adequate job training and retraining, and I expect the President to fulfill his commitment to "working with Congress to ensure that there is adequate assistance and effective retraining for dislocated workers."

The protection and enhancement of the border's environment has been one of my top priorities since I was elected to Congress in 1982. I believe that Mexico and the United States are concerned with preserving the environment and that both countries want to continue cooperative efforts to develop and implement programs to improve the environmental conditions along the border. The Environmental Protection Agency must be encouraged and supported to work with its Mexican counterpart, SEDUE, to implement programs such as the one authorized by my amendment to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. In testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, EPA's Administrator, William Reilly, stated that the EPA is committed to implementing the new program under section 815 of the act, which allows EPA to "provide Mexico with extensive technical assistance on air quality regulation in the border area."

It is through these joint efforts that the border's environmental problems can be resolved in a comprehensive manner. Mexico has demonstrated that it is serious about doing its share and we must support its efforts; however, our neighbor to the south can only do what its resources allow it to do. A wealthier Mexico means that it can allocate additional inspectors and technology to ensure that its strict environmental regulations are enforced. Keeping Mexico poor is not in our best interest.

Those of us who represent the border have communities which are some of the most economically depressed in the Nation. It is unfortunate that our constituents have few resources, little income, and a low tax base. The region is plagued by the lack of water and wastewater facilities, substandard housing, inadequate infrastructure, high poverty and unemployment rates. I am pleased that so many in Congress have focused their attention on the environmental and economic problems of the United States-Mexico border region and have offered to help alleviate the situation; however, they are wrong when they use these problems as reasons why we should not proceed with the negotiations under fast-track procedures. It is precisely for these reasons that negotiations should move forward. The potential for economic development in the United States-Mexico border area is great, and a well-negotiated North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA] provides the best hope for communities on both sides of the border.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Dorgan resolution and in favor of the Rostenkowski-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we voted $556 million for Kurdish refugees thousands and thousands of miles away. Yet for our own neighbor in our own hemisphere we have difficulty saying yes to free trade with Mexico, a friend.

Mr. Speaker, the vote today is whether we are going to become isolationist, we are going to shut our doors to a stronger hemisphere.

Why is it in our best interest to have a free-trade agreement with Mexico? First, it is more jobs and more markets for the United States. For $1 billion in exports we get 22,000 new jobs in this country. We limit immigration from Mexico coming into the United States, protecting American workers.

The world is moving into trading blocs: Europe in 1992, the Pacific Rim. We need to do the same in our hemisphere. We buttress and strengthen our ties with Mexico, a dynamic young country with a forward-looking President who wants to be our friend 100 percent.

This rule is fair. I say to my colleagues if you're against fast-track, you're against a stronger trade relationship with Mexico. You can vote "no," but the rule provides that. The rule also provides for the Congress for the first time to have a major say in trade negotiations through the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution.

□ 1050

We will have a say in workers' rights. We will have a say on environmental protection. We will have a say in job protection.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important issue that is going to mean whether the United States sits still economically internationally or we move ahead and join the community of nations and become economically No. 1 again.

There are two critical elements to the fast-track procedure:

The first is the authority of the U.S. negotiators to bring a final deal back to the Congress for approval or disapproval without amendment. This is the element that is getting most of the attention and criticism here today.

It has been suggested that there should be some midterm review of that process and that the rejection of that idea by the leadership is somehow a basis to defeat the rule and thus this whole process.

Let me remind my colleagues of the second key element of fast-track—and that is consultation. That is a fancy sounding word that requires USTR to discuss with us here in the Congress and with the private sector what its negotiating positions will be.

Now if there is a deficiency in the fast-track process, it may not be in the final approval process. It may be more the consultation process. We here in the Congress like to accuse the administration of not consulting adequately or even of ignoring our concerns. There are certainly instances of that in the past. But some of the fault may be here in the Congress.

It appears obvious to me that if the consultation process is working to allow us to participate directly in developing the U.S. negotiating positions, there would be no need for a midterm review. We have designated specific Members and committee chairmen to watch over the overall process on a continuous basis.

If that is not doing the job, we need to look at our own structure here in the Congress. This whole idea of a midterm review looks like an attempt to impose our legislative process on a negotiating process. We are a legislature. We like to use those legislative procedures that are familiar to us and effective for managing the development of legislation. I suggest to you that trade negotiations are not a legislative process. And we had better think twice before we try to impose such a process on a negotiating process—particularly in midstream.

Finally, it seems to me that we get the worst of all words with a scheduled midterm review on a date certain. First the negotiators on the other side will delay the tough issues and be unwilling to show their bottom line. Second, we end up airing our negotiating positions publicly and forcing our negotiators to pledge to hold certain U.S. positions and get certain concessions from the other side. In other words we give away much of the U.S. leverage and get nothing in return. Getting such commitments from the administration on legislation is often useful. That is between the Con-

gress and the Executive. But in the case of trade negotiations you have a third party—or a hundred of them—who are not part of the process or making any commitment. It clearly won't work.

It is up to each Member here to represent his or her constituents and be active in the consultation process.

If we are going to have negotiation, let's do it right and not cripple our negotiators and ourselves at the outset.

Mr. DORGAN tries to argue that he supports negotiation as a major trade policy tool and supports negotiations with Mexico. But he thinks Congress should follow the normal or regular order on enabling legislation.

As a practical matter you cannot have it both ways. Certainly that's true on multilateral negotiations, but it applies as well to bilaterals.

The alternative is to not use negotiations to lower trade barriers in other countries. We would have to rely solely on retaliatory tools which set off trade disputes. We do not have a better alternative to negotiations between sovereign governments. Trade does not lend itself well to the use of force.

Congress has constitutional authority to regulate trade but cannot effectively negotiate. Granted the delegation of authority to the Executive can be abused. Mr. DORGAN's complaint may well be valid—with regard to Canadian wheat and rail subsidies. His solutions—elimination of fast-track—is not valid. It will only eliminate the U.S. Government's ability to negotiate effectively.

Additionally, at the outset, the President must notify the Congress of negotiations toward a bilateral trade agreement.

The administration consults with all Members with an interest, especially those on committees of jurisdiction over subject matters to be negotiated.

If there is opposition to negotiation, the Senate Finance or the House Ways and Means Committee may vote to take away fast-track for that negotiation during the 60-day period following notification.

Throughout the negotiating process, the administration consults closely to ensure that U.S. negotiating positions reflect congressional objectives and concerns.

For example, in the Uruguay round, Members of Congress served as advisers on the U.S. delegation. Indeed, at the Brussels ministerial in December, the U.S. delegation included 7 Members and 55 staffers.

After significant negotiating sessions, the administration routinely briefs Members and staff, whose advice on next steps is sought and reflected as negotiating positions evolve.

Congressional participation is not limited to the Finance and Ways and Means Committees.

We consult each committee that would have jurisdiction over the various issues in a trade agreement. In the case of the United States-Canada FTA, for example, that included then a dozen committees.

As the negotiations draw to a close, the President must notify the Congress 90 days before entering into an agreement and must consult with every committee with jurisdiction over legislation involving subject matters that would be affected by the trade agreement.

In the United States-Canada FTA negotiations, consultations with Congress resulted in U.S. negotiators returning to the table to obtain material modifications to the draft agreement during this 90-day period. Those modifications included, for example, deletion of maritime services for the agreement, clarification of some rules of origin, and improved tariff provisions—accelerated reductions for telecommunications equipment and furniture.

The close partnership between Congress and the administration intensifies during the process of crafting legislation to implement a negotiated trade agreement.

Congress and the administration together prepare implementing legislation with full participation and markups in every committee of jurisdiction.

In addition to reviewing the agreement and formulating any implementing legislation, Congress and the administration also work together on the "Statement of Administrative Action," which details how the agreement will be implemented through administrative action.

This process is not subject to time limitations and can go on as long as necessary. It is only after implementing legislation is actually introduced that the fast-track clock begins, requiring a vote in both Houses within 90 legislative days. This fast-track clock does not dictate a rushed process. Ninety legislative days translates into many more calendar days.

Because the administration has worked so closely with Congress during the negotiations and in the crafting of implementing legislation for previous agreements, the Congress has elected to vote its approval much earlier than required by the statute.

The overwhelming majorities by which each of the three agreements submitted under fast-track has been approved is convincing testimony to the success of the consultative process.

Indeed, fast-track actually enhances Congress' role in trade agreements. The notification and consultation requirements mean that the Executive cannot rush through negotiations ignoring congressional concerns. Were it not for fast-track, the administration could have begun negotiations with Mexico last June when Presidents Bush and Salinas endorsed a free-trade agreement and simply presented Congress with a fait accompli.

Fast-track is no more an abdication of congressional authority than it is of Presidential authority.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution vests authority to regulate foreign commerce in the Congress, and article II vests the foreign relations power and the power to negotiate international agreements exclusively in the President.

If some who oppose fast-track had their way, we would each sit on our exclusive constitutional authorities and not be a player in the global economy.

But that is not the path our predecessors elected to go down in 1934, 1974, 1979, or 1988, and that is not the path we should choose today.

Rather, Congress and the Executive recognized that neither branch alone could successfully pursue a trade policy which is effective internationally and supported domestically. The result was the fast-track.

As the committee report on this provision in the 1988 Trade Act notes: Fast-track is a "careful balance between the President's ability to conduct foreign affairs and negotiate agreements and Congress' constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce."

Let us preserve that balance and seize the opportunities at hand to negotiate good and strong agreements—agreements that will have the full support of the Congress and the private sector.

Agreeing to stick by a special procedure for consideration of legislation implementing trade agreements—agreements which the Congress helped shape—is in no way an abdication of Congress' constitutional rights or responsibilities.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. It is wrong to combine fast-track with both Mexican free trade, a new agreement to be, and GATT, as Mr. LAFALCE noted, has been ongoing for 4 to 5 years.

There is a great deal of confusion—deliberately in my opinion—about what fast-track bargaining means. It has been cloaked and presented primarily as fast-track for Mexican free-trade negotiations, which is bad enough. But very little has been said about fast-tracking GATT, the agreement with many, many countries in the world. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that GATT has been in existence since President Harry Truman's time and that in all of the years that GATT has been in existence, only one signatory to that agreement has lived up to all of the terms. And that is the United States of America.

What do we have as a result? A tremendous trade deficit, exportation of jobs, and getting our heads beat off in manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot live only on caviar, movies, and rock music. We are not saying do not negotiate. We are saying let us negotiate with Mexico under similar terms as the European Community negotiated its formation and continues to negotiate slow and easy. We must allow for changes at the end by those responsible for the Constitution of the United States.

We are not saying become isolationists. We are saying do not ram it through. Give Americans time to understand what is going on, both in the Mexican free trade and with the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs. Vote against this rule.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very reluctant support of this rule and will vote yes on the Dorgan motion to disapprove fast-track. The Dorgan resolution is the only vote we have today

that assures binding results. I stand here today on behalf of people on both sides of the border, not just on behalf of corporate profits. I speak out today to President Bush on behalf of every worker in America who has lost or will lose his or her job to Mexico or some other offshore tax haven for transnational corporations headquartered in the United States.

I also speak out on behalf of every exploited Mexican worker, those stooped over the farms of North America and those crammed into Mexico's factories, who are being paid 50 cents to $1 an hour, not even able to buy the fruits of their own labor.

I ask what kind of North America are we building? Would the Creator look kindly on our handiwork?

Today's votes are not really votes about trade; they are really about how Members of Congress can best use their votes to build more just and freer societies here in North America.

If Members have not traveled to Mexico, if Members have not visited its belching industrial and raw agricultural corridors and seen the pain of its people, if Members have no practical experience in dealing with fast-track trade authority, if Members have not stood in unemployment lines here in the United States, and if Members care about the American worker and our families, not just corporate profits, they should vote down fast-track authority today.

If my colleagues believe trade with developing nations should be placed in a larger context of expanded human rights and liberties, if they believe in decent wages, not 50 cents an hour labor, if they do not want Mexico to become a cheap manufacturing platform where foreign companies back door their goods into the United States, if they do not want the United States to become a true net exporting nation and if they believe North American competitiveness rests not on a low wage strategy but on improved productivity, investment in research and development and people's skills, and if they care about a North American that upholds the highest world standard of living, of decency and human liberties, then vote yes on Dorgan.

If a Member is concerned about GATT, the Dorgan motion will not stop GATT. A Member can be certain there will be another GATT bill up here before June 1. If a Member wants to move ahead with a comprehensive agreement with Mexico, that Member can be sure that that will come up here before midsummer, too. Vote yes on Dorgan.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending fast-track authority and in support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending fast-track authority and in support of the rule.

As we consider the extension of fast-track authority and a potential North American Free Trade Agreement, it is vitally important that we take the long view. Over the last 50 years, the world has experienced an explosion of economic growth and prosperity that has been fueled and sustained by the movement toward free trade. Unlike the rather miserable prewar years in which protectionist tariff rates were the rule, tariffs plummeted after the war. The spectacular result, in little more than a generation, is that Europe and Japan have rebuilt themselves from ruins, underdeveloped nations have risen from terrible poverty to enjoy living standards comparable to ours, and our own national income has increased several times over.

Perhaps even more important, free trade has led nations and individuals to consider the world in an entirely new way. It was common in the past for nations to believe that there was a finite amount of wealth in the world, and that the only way they could improve their station was by warring with their neighbors and building empires. Tojo and Hitler lived that mentality. Free trade has destroyed it. Today, nations know that there is a peaceful way to improve their condition; that the good fortune of one country does not mean the misfortune of others; and that they will benefit more by trading with their neighbors than attacking them.

In short, free trade is and has been an immense force for good in the world. Today a future is opening before us in which the nations of the world will be drawn together by peaceful trading relations and confidence that they can work together for their common prosperity. It is a future far happier than the centuries of violence and destitution now closing, and it is a future which depends on free trade.

If we oppose fast-track authority, I fear that we will cripple this free trade movement. We will not only ruin the prospects for a North American Free Trade Agreement, we will destroy the possibility of a new GATT agreement. It is quite possible that the world will begin drifting into hostile trading blocs and international tensions of all kinds will increase. I would not like to predict the consequences beyond that, but I will predict that if we vote down fast-track authority, we will be making a blunder of historic proportions.

Allow me to review briefly the economic case for free trade. It is based on the idea of comparative advantage, the simple insight that nations can benefit by emphasizing the production of those things they are best able to produce. As Adam Smith explained it:

> If a foreign country can supply us with a commodity cheaper than we ourselves can make it, better buy it from them with some produce of our own industry employed in a way in which we have some advantage.* * * In every country it always is and must be the interest of the great body of the people to buy whatever they want of those who sell it cheapest. The proposition is so manifest that it seems ridiculous to take any pains to prove it * * *.

Smith draws an analogy with a private family. Just like a nation, a family could attempt to practice restricted trade. Its members could try to grow their own food, build their own house, sew their own clothes, and they might even scceed. Their lives would, however, always remain hard and poor. Obviously, a much better course would be for the family to emphasize those tasks it does best, and to buy other goods they need from people who can produce them with less effort than the family. Not only would the family members have a much easier life by emphasizing their comparative advantage, but they would find themselves becoming continually more prosperous. Smith concludes: What is prudence in the conduct of a private family can scarce be folly in that of a great kingdom. This insight is as simple as it is profound. And it has remade our world.

The free-trade agreement soon to be considered would perfectly illustrate this view. There is the potential for a great partnership between the United States and Mexico—a partnership in which the high technology and productivity of the United States is teamed with the low labor costs and huge consumer market of Mexico. In the process, we will help the Mexicans rise from poverty and they will help us move to even greater prosperity.

We can get a clear indication of the benefits of trade with Mexico by looking at our experience since 1986, when Mexico first began to open its markets significantly.

From 1986 to 1990, our merchandise exports to Mexico increased by 130 percent, from $12.4 billion to $28.4 billion. This growth rate is almost twice as rapid as the growth rate of U.S. exports world wide.

During the same period, our agriculture exports to Mexico rose 134 percent, to a total of $2.5 billion in 1990. Mexico is now our fourth largest market for agricultural products.

Our exports of consumer goods to Mexico have tripled since 1986, rising from $1 to $3 billion.

This vast expansion of our trade with Mexico has created over 264,000 jobs in the United States since 1986, according to the Commerce Department. There are now over half a million Americans working in jobs related to our merchandise exports to Mexico.

These are enormous gains that would only have been possible through the reduction of Mexican tariffs and other restrictions. A free-trade agreement with Mexico would not only lock in these gains and prevent protectionist elements on either side of the border from destroying the progress that has already been made, it would also allow further progress to be made.

The administration's formal response to FTA issues—transmitted to Congress on May 1—describes three highly respected studies addressing our economic future under a free-trade agreement with Mexico. One was conducted by the International Trade Commission, one by the accounting firm Peat Marwick, and another by scholars led by Dr. Copper Almon. All three studies are unanimous in predicting increased U.S. GNP, increased U.S. exports and increased U.S. employment. Some specifics:

> The ITC predicts higher U.S. wages for both higher and lower skilled U.S. workers.
>
> U.S. exports will increase by an additional $10 billion per year by the end of 10 years. Our exports to Mexico will be 28-percent higher by the end of the decade as a result of an FTA—Clopper Almon.

Our net new job creation will be 64,000 within 10 years.—Clopper Almon.

These benefits are substantial, and there is strong reason to think that they are much understated, especially for the long run.

That a free trade agreement will benefit the United States is clear. But I know that some groups opposing free trade—notably the AFL–CIO, which rarely misses an opportunity to line up on the wrong side of history—argue that it will hurt Mexican workers.

The argument that Mexican workers will be hurt by this agreement leaves me absolutely incredulous. Trade is the only way that we know of by which underdeveloped countries can lift themselves out of poverty. Massive foreign aid doesn't work; it merely makes them dependent. Socialist central planning doesn't work; it merely gives them rusty steelmills and terrible oppression. The only hope that underdeveloped countries have is to find and employ their comparative advantage and trade with other countries. If we deny Mexico the right to trade with the United States, and make it more difficult for our own companies to cooperate with Mexican workers, we will be assigning them to poverty, stagnation, and ultimately political upheaval.

No reasonable person argues that the Mexicans are worse off than they would otherwise be because their country exports billions of dollars of products to the United States. No reasonable person, in my opinion, can argue that they will be worse off if that trade is expanded and their business gets even better. And I might humbly suggest that the Mexican people, who strongly support this agreement, are better judges of their interests than are the lobbyists of the AFL–CIO.

This short-term gain to both sides is important, but again, it pales before the larger significance of the free-trade issue. To our Nation's great glory, we have supported free-trade throughout the modern era. If we betray that cause now by opposing free-trade agreements and the procedural rules that make them possible, we will be sponsoring a great tragedy. Much more is at stake here than many partisans on either side of this issue realize.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of fast-track. A wise man once said, regarding countries, "They can choose their friends, but they cannot choose their neighbors."

Indeed, the neighbors that we have had to the South as well as the North have given us a period of prosperity unknown to most countries in the world. All we have to do is look at the success, so far, of the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement to tell us what the future might be as it relates to our neighbors to the south.

My own State of Ohio, for example, has increased its trade to the point where we are now the fourth largest trading partner with Canadians. As it relates to Mexico, we have increased our trade by 53 percent in the period during the time that President Salinas has been the President of Mexico. The opportunities are endless, if we take the bold initiative that we have to do to create trade.

For every billion dollars of trade that is created in exports, 25,000 jobs are created in the United States of America. I think that is a wonderful record, something we should be proud of, and continue to pursue exports as best we can.

The real question we have today is, are we going to listen to the voices of temerity, of fear, of going backward in a reactionary way? Or are we going to look to the future and what it holds in terms of open and free trade from the Yucatan to the Yukon?

I suspect that we can answer that question by a vote for the rule and against the Dorgan amendment.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purpose of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 158, setting forth the rule for consideration of House Resolution 101 and House Resolution 146 relating to the extension of fast-track procedures for implementation of trade agreements. I believe this rule is fair. It allows for full debate on the issue of fast-track, and gives Members the opportunity to vote on whether fast-track should be extended. It also provides for consideration of House Resolution 146, a sense of the House resolution relating to the extension of fast-track.

As most of you know, under existing rules, it would not have been in order to even consider House Resolution 101 on the floor, unless it was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Ways and Means allowed House Resolution 101 to be reported adversely to the House, even though it was defeated 27 to 9 in committee, so that all Members of the House would have the chance to vote on this important issue.

I recognize that some Members would like to have had the opportunity to offer amendments to House Resolution 146. However, I believe that House Resolution 146 is carefully balanced in its current form. It expresses the concerns of many Members about issues that need to be addressed in trade negotiations. It stresses the importance of the congressional role in the negotiations, and reinforces the need for the administration to fulfill its commitments in order to maintain the fast-track authority. It does all of this without undermining the administration's ability to negotiate an agreement which optimizes U.S. negotiating objectives.

While I actually support the goals of some of the proposed amendments which have been discussed, I strongly oppose others, such as the concept of a midterm review. However, I believe it would be impossible to draw the line to allow some amendments to be offered without allowing others. I believe the whole process would unravel if we started down the road of allowing any amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Resolution 158, and urge the support of my colleagues as well.

□ 1100

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the host of the New York congressional troops.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rulemaking in order House Resolution 101 and House Resolution 146.

This is a complex issue. It is complex because we don't want to offend the sensitivities of the Mexican Government. We don't want to offend the sensitivities of the President. We don't want to offend the sensitivities of the Trade Representative. And we certainly don't want to offend the sensitivities of our business leaders.

However, Mr. Speaker, in all our efforts to be sensitive to needs of all these important people, I am afraid we have lost our sensitivity to the needs of average Americans.

Without question, the single, most important domestic issue facing our country is drugs and drug-related violence. And the problem with extending fast-track authority for talks with the Mexicans is that there is no indication from the administration that narcotics trafficking will have any part in those talks whatsoever.

Today, half the cocaine arriving in the United States comes through Mexico. Mexico is also a major source of heroin and marijuana coming into this country. Assuming these trade negotiations succeed, the resulting increase in cargo will greatly enhance opportunities for transport of illegal drugs across our borders.

I raise this issue as no criticism of President Salinas or his government. Indeed, he has made drug control a central priority of his administration and I am assured that cooperative anti-drug efforts between our two nations are the best they have ever been.

However, I do raise this as a criticism of our own administration, particularly those at the State Department and the Office of the Trade Representative who have consistently and regularly soft-peddled the drug issue in their dialogs with other nations. It is absurd that we in the Congress would allow a rule on trade with Mexico to come to the floor without a provision

allowing debate on the question of international drug trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, violent crime in America increased 10 percent last year. Most of that increase was in some way related to the trafficking and use of illegal drugs. The American people understand that. And it is unfortunate that negotiators like Ambassador Hills and Secretary Baker do not.

It is unfortunate that our policymakers fail to see that this proposed agreement with Mexico is an opportunity—an opportunity to make trafficking in illegal drugs a priority in international relations and to ensure that cooperative antidrug efforts between Mexico and the United States again will continue to be an integral part of our economic future.

I am not a believer in polls. However, I can tell you if you spent a day on any street corner in my district and ask people what the Government could do to make their lives better, you would never hear the words "Free Trade with Mexico."

But, I can tell you that every person you talked with would emphatically say something about illegal drugs. They would tell you they are fed up with being prisoners in their own homes, fed up with drug-related violence on their street corners, and fed up with worrying about the safety of their children as they walk to school or play in a neighborhood park.

They want something done about drugs coming into our country and Mr. Speaker, they don't care whose sensitivities are offended in the process.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of the United States—and certainly our trade policy—should be fully reflective of America's commitment to fight illegal drug trafficking. I would never ask that the President's hands be restrained in diplomatic talks. However, I do believe it is essential that diplomats who speak for our Nation send a clear and unequivocal message that cooperative drug enforcement is an essential component of a sound economic and political relationship with the United States. That has not been the case in the past, and for that reason, I can not in good conscience support a rule which shuts out debate on this issue.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Constitution, article II, section 2, says, "He," meaning the President, "shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties." We can add to that the House of Representatives. Both advice and consent are essential components.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, because I think that the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution should be expanded. We have heard so much in the debate about a Mexican free-trade agreement. There is not any Mexican free-trade agreement. We are debating a phantom.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about today is a procedure, a procedure to allow the President to negotiate, not just with Mexico, but with 107 nations in Europe on the GATT agreements vital to our Nation's future. From 1983 to 1989 we were the world's largest exporter. Today it is Germany. It is going to be part of the European Common Market. It is vital that we reach agreement with the EC and the other 107 nations on a GATT agreement. We cannot do it without fast-track.

But, it is important that the administration has the advice of the Congress. I think we should oppose this rule and get a new rule that would allow the Levin-Regula amendment, which provides: First, midterm review by Congress on these negotiations, second, economic impact analysis; third, a report to Congress on reaching congressional negotiating objectives; and lastly, environmental consequences and labor, health, and safety issues.

Mr. Speaker, those are the concerns expressed in the debate thus far. The Levin-Regula amendment to Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution would allow us to participate in the process, and then we would not be faced with a take-it-or-leave-it agreement at the end of the process, which is a concern of all Members.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members will vote this rule down and that the Rules Committee will come back with a rule that allows the Levin-Regula amendment in order to the Gephardt-Rostenkowski sense of Congress resolution.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a very distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

Mr. GRANDY. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the rule, a closed rule, because I rise in favor of the process today, not necessarily the product.

This closed rule expedites the process in this House, but it also protects dissent. As the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means pointed out, we are considering a resolution today that was defeated 3 to 1 in the committee. Yet, it is before this body today. We are also considering a resolution on fast-track, the Rostenkowski-Gephardt resolution, which would not even be here if the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman of the Committee on Finance in the other body had not insisted on and received concessions from the White House.

Mr. Speaker, why is there a Rostenkowski resolution? Because it was felt necessary to gain some concessions on some accommodation from the White House before we even began the deal. Really, parliamentarily, if we wanted to be cute, all of us that support fast-track should vote against this rule, because then we kill the Dorgan resolution and fast-track proceeds. I do not encourage that. I support the process to expedite the procedure.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line here if one is in favor of the Dorgan resolution, you have to support this rule.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule today on fast-track. It is a straightforward rule. It puts Republicans, myself included, in an unusual position of supporting a rule that is closed, something we do not like, and something I do not normally support.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is the exception that proves, if you will, that rule. I have supported other closed rules on such issues as tax matters. This issue clearly demonstrates the need for a closed rule, because a closed rule is uniquely suited to this fast-track process.

Mr. Speaker, fast-track is a very simple, straightforward, up or down vote. We either today say "yes," or we say "no," to carrying on negotiations with Mexico under a fast-track process. To not have this rule is to open up the process to the amendments of the type we would have if we do not have fast-track. We should keep that in mind in this debate.

The question here is whether we are going to have fast-track, or are we not going to have fast-track. Ironically, much of the opposition we have heard to this, and the opposition we have heard in our offices, has come from labor unions, who say they are not really opposed to a free trade agreement, they are just opposed to fast-track.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to them, we are asking for nothing more today than the process they use in their own labor union negotiations. I know of no labor union that allows for the membership to amend an agreement after it is negotiated, when it comes back to the membership for a vote. There is a simple yes or no vote. If it is rejected, the negotiators go back for a new negotiation and a new agreement. We are asking for the same process.

Mr. Speaker, give the President the same authority that any union leader would have in negotiating, to negotiate the best agreement, and bring it back to the membership, either the membership of the union, or, in this case, the membership of the United States, expressed through the will of their representatives in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this debate, of course, is about more than just the process. The debate we are hearing already is about the substance, and the issue is whether or not we ought to have more trade, more open trade, with our neighbor to the south.

Mr. Speaker, there are those that fear the consequences of that, but I say the benefits are already obvious to us. Exports to Mexico from 1987 to 1989 have risen more than 100 percent, from $12 to $28 billion; 227,000 jobs in the United States have been created since 1987 just by exports to Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, we hear talk about losing jobs. What about the jobs we are gaining, the jobs that are being gained in the United States as a result of our exports to Mexico?

Mexican barriers to trade, tariff and nontariff barriers, will have to be lowered far more than ours under any free trade agreement. So the immediate benefits to the United States will be far greater than they would be to Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, trade is not a sum zero game. We all benefit from greater trade, and we should support this rule and oppose the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr Speaker, to close the debate, I yield 3 minutes to our very distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is rather ironic that I should be here this morning urging a vote for the previous question and the rule to make in order a resolution disapproving what I approve of. But I think we should get back to the process here. I will hopefully have some remarks to make, if the rule is adopted, during the time on the resolution itself and the substance of it.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with process here. I find myelf very proudly in agreement with the Speaker, with the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], and other distinguished Democrats, as well as the vast majority on our side over here who support what the President wants, by way of not necessarily fast-track, but a 2-year extension to be able to negotiate trade agreements.

□ 1110

I think the whole thing has been somewhat of a misnomer, that we are trying to pull a fast one when, as a matter of fact, 2 years is quite an extensive period of time.

But the point is, as the chairman pointed out so well, there may be an overwhelming vote against a motion of disapproval. But we are still honoring a commitment that the House will have an opportunity to vote on it, and respect the rights of each and every one of you who have differing views than I do. This is your opportunity. Ironic then that those who favor the motion of disapproval should say vote down the rule that gives you an opportunity to speak.

Some would prefer that, quite frankly. They would say that this is an easy way to get rid of this baby. There will be no resolution of disapproval in this House, they would say, hopefully there would not be one in the Senate, and we got our way.

But what we are saying here is in the interest of fairness. My friends, we are giving you that opportunity to have your say, up and down, have a full, aerated debate, and that is the way this House, as an institution, ought to operate, giving everybody an opportunity to the lowest minority Member or group of minority Members to express their point of view. Then we will abide by the will of the House on any given day as to what the will of the majority is.

So I would urge you finally, my friends, to think in terms of that agreement that has been cast, yes, by your leadership and those responsible here to vote yes on the previous question, vote for the rule, and then we will take our chances on what happens later in the day.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that this is a closed rule and it is a very unique situation for us to urge support of a closed rule. The gentleman from Illinois covered it very well.

We need to give the President the opportunity to proceed with these negotiations which will create opportunities for Americans as well as Mexicans and Canadians and other members of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. I urge support of this rule.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the House Resolution 158 which guides this body as we address the President's request to the Congress for a 2-year extension of fast-track authority to negotiate this Nation's trade agreements with GATT as well as Mexico. This rule will not provide the opportunity to address this issue completely. As with all trade agreements, the issues are serious and harbor grave consequences. The North American Free Trade Agreement offers no exceptions.

I am not convinced that the legislation that we will consider today goes far enough to assure the necessary safeguards and protections for U.S. industries and its workers facing potentially increased competition from imported products.

This is an important issue for both Mexico and the United States. I believe that all of our colleagues here in the Congress want to see trade barriers broken so that goods and services may flow across many borders and enhance the social and economic well-being for all people, but we must be cautious and make the right deal.

When I think of the Maquiladora Program, I am not so sure that I can say that the social and economic well-being of poor Mexican workers has been improved. One would presuppose that when a manufacturing plant locates in their community, the living conditions would change for the better. Mr. Speaker, this has not been the case in the Maquiladoras. Simply put, Mexican workers are being exploited and the companies are raking in large profits. My concerns for decent labor, health and safety standards, which many others have expressed, do not outweigh my concerns for Hispanics. I have been involved with labor all my life and my convictions for human dignity has not diminished.

I support a North American Free Trade Agreement that is fair and represents sound, responsible social policies. Therefore, I ask my colleagues in the House to vote down this rule so that we may have the opportunity to consider other amendments that would give this body a better opportunity to monitor trade negotiations with Mexico.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

The rule under consideration essentially requires us to vote either yes or no for fast-track procedures for trade agreements with Mexico and GATT.

My view is that we should not be faced with this fast-track or no-track decision. Congress has authority over trade agreements and we should be very reluctant to abdicate our responsibility to legislate.

Effective legislation requires the ability to propose and consider amendments where appropriate. The House has often fashioned rules to permit limited but important amendments to legislation. The same type of rules could certainly be adopted for the consideration of trade agreements.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield my remaining time to the very distinguished chairman of our Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. This rule is a fair rule allowing for a vote on a resolution to disapprove the President's request for an extension of fast-track and a resolution that expresses the sense of the House on negotiating objectives that the Congress is concerned with.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that an effort to defeat this rule is misguided and counterproductive. To defeat this rule is to prohibit any vote on the extension of fast-track. Let me remind

Members that if the Dorgan resolution is not adopted by May 31, the President is given the fast-track authority absent congressional action. To defeat this rule is to not allow the House to express its concerns on negotiating objectives.

Members are complaining that this is a rigged process by not allowing amendments to be offered on drugs, mid-course reporting, and possibly a host of other issues. It is the considered judgment by the Rules Committee that the Dorgan resolution, and the Gephard-Rostenkowski resolution, offer Members the two main choices available. The amendments that were not made in order to the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution are changes on the margins, that don't present major policy decisions, that have to be made by the House. Under this rule the choices are clear, first, do we approve fast-track, and second, do we send a strong signal to the administration that the Congress is concerned about worker rights, environmental protection, health and safety standards, and the possible loss of jobs that may result from a North American Free Trade Agreement.

This is a good and fair rule and I urge Members to support it.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, we missed an important opportunity today.

Representative CHARLES RANGEL, chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, had proposed an amendment to the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution on fast-track. The amendment would have required trade negotiators in Mexico and the United States to assure that aggressive cooperative efforts to stem trafficking in, production, and abuse of, illicit drugs be implemented.

Because the Rules Committee recommended a closed rule, this amendment never had a chance.

Even though I plan to vote in favor of the rule today, I strongly believe this amendment would have helped to enhance United States/Mexican cooperation on counternarcotics. Its concept and intent had great merit.

As we all know, our country continues to do battle with an outrageous drug problem. Mexico is the largest foreign source of marijuana and one of the largest sources of heroin sold in the United States. On top of that, most of the South American cocaine entering this country travels via Mexico. It would make sense, if we are serious about reducing the drug problem, to take steps that would serve to strengthen our hand, rather than limit our options.

As future trade negotiations are considered, I am hopeful some type of counternarcotics provisions can be incorporated into the policy that develops.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule on House Resolution 101, which unwisely fails to separate the issues of fast-track authority for trade negotiations in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] from similar authority to negotiate a North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. I would like to go on record today as one opposed to the extension of such authority for the purposes of negotiating a NAFTA but supportive of fast-track authority for the completion of the GATT Uruguay round talks. Unfortunately, we do not have the opportunity to vote separately on each of these issues. Accordingly, I will be voting against the rule disallowing separate votes on each issue. Having stated my opposition to the rule, however, I cannot in good conscience support a resolution disapproving fast-track authority for the GATT talks. Inasmuch as I oppose fast-track authority for the NAFTA, the GATT negotiations represent the work of many nations over several years. The impending GATT agreement is a combination of several very important international trade accords. To impede its progress at this late hour would be folly. To require congressional involvement in the GATT simply in order to prevent fast-track authority for the NAFTA would also cause more damage than good to America's trade relations with the world.

As the representative of the bountiful 16th district of California, I am elected by a region that includes some of the most productive fruit and vegetable farmland in the country. Viewed in that perspective, the proposal to extend fast-track authority for a North American Free Trade Agreement would be devastating to the farmers and workers I represent.

I speak for a district whose lifeblood is agriculture and a district that has experienced a significant rise in Mexican agricultural competition in several critical commodities. I speak for a district that has seen nine processing plants pull out for cheaper labor and lower standards in Mexico, resulting in a loss of 5,700 jobs. I cannot lend my support to a rule that would exacerbate this condition by lifting Congress' responsibility to approve the particulars of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

It is also my duty and obligation, however, to view such a venture from a national perspective. Most experts agree that free trade with Mexico is a good idea and that it will aid our national economy. In the long term, this analysis is clearly correct. Yet, from both a local and national perspective, serious attention must be paid to the ramifications of such an agreement on specific industries and workers. I support the philosophy and practice of free trade. But trade must be fair in order to be truly free. The administration's strong assurance of fairness in execution is paramount, therefore, in assessing the wisdom of fast-track authority.

The administration cannot ask for, nor expect, congressional support in the absence of specific guarantees. Our concerns, for example, were not adequately addressed through the general report issued by the administration earlier this month, which was meant to assuage short-term anxieties over entering into a free trade agreement with Mexico. The assurances must be concrete, precise, and binding and they must address long-term objectives for industries most likely to suffer, such as fruit and vegetable concerns.

In 1989, the United States imported 90 percent of Mexico's agricultural exports yet supplied only 75 percent of Mexico's imports. Mexico's fruit and vegetable exports have more than doubled from $500 million in 1979 to approximately $1 billion in 1989 and comprise 40 to 45 percent of Mexico's total farm exports to the United States in recent years. These percentages will only increase for Mexico if trade barriers are removed.

A report done by the United States International Trade Commission in 1988 concluded that "since the early 1980's, foreign suppliers, particularly Mexico, have penetrated the United States market, eroding the dominant position United States suppliers have traditionally held in the domestic market." This has resulted in a direct impact on domestic employment in the agriculture industry, with an estimated 32,000 jobs lost. American industries and workers cannot be expected to bear the burden of our efforts to improve economies abroad.

Questions remain on environmental and food safety issues. How can we be sure that standards would not be compromised or at least weakened by an agreement negotiated by the Bush administration and held up to Congress for an up or down vote? There are at least a dozen pesticides not registered for use in the United States but used by Mexican producers. Will the administration, in its rush to conclude an agreement, compromise our standards in this regard? The question may honestly be asked, can Mexico really improve its working conditions, its wages, its environmental laws, and enforcement and its health standards? These are considerations I believe Congress should shoulder in examining both fast-track authority and the final agreement.

I raised these doubts with the President in a recent meeting, and he has given me his personal assurances that my concerns will be addressed in the NAFTA. By law, if fast-track authority is granted, Congress will be consulted on the terms of the agreement. I understand that a balance must be found between the costs and benefits in all industries to improve conditions on both sides of the border as we look toward meeting the challenges of a new century in world trade. However, my reservations about the administration's commitment to my community's concerns remain deep.

As I mentioned, I view the issues of fast-track authority for a NAFTA and for the GATT as discrete questions that ought to be considered separately. I want to affirm my support for the extension of fast-track authority for the GATT negotiations. Fast-track authority is both appropriate and proven in world negotiations. The United States, as one partner in a large group of nations, should not further delay the conclusion of the GATT agreement. The talks remain tenuous enough that I believe the revocation of fast-track authority by Congress might constitute a mortal blow to the talks. Further, we ought not to change the rules of the game at this late stage of the talks, whose multilateral nature prohibits unnecessary congressional interference.

Mr. Speaker, I do not prejudge the character of a North American Free Trade Agreement, but I would argue that the Congress should be involved in overseeing its negotiation. I would welcome the chance to review a NAFTA in detail upon its completion. An agreement of such importance to our Nation's economic, health, and environmental future should be subjected to Congress' closest scrutiny. The fate of our fellow workers demands it. Congress has suc-

cessfully and expeditiously approved many trade agreements in the past 20 years without the benefit of fast-track authority. I regret that we will not, in all likelihood, have the opportunity to assume that responsibility on what will perhaps be the most important trade agreement to Americans in all walks of life. I cannot and will not support the extension of fast-track authority for a free trade agreement that may not be fair to our workers and consumers.

At the same time, I will not be a party to slowing or blocking the conclusion of the GATT talks. Let our GATT negotiators conclude their hard fought and lengthy negotiations. Above all, let us learn from the lessons of this debate: Free trade is not just about tariffs and quotas. It is about jobs gained and lost, about immediate and real effects at every level and aspect of society and the environment and it is about the rights of men, women, and children everywhere. The world's progress in the harmonization of the rights of mankind speeds onward. Caught up in this great rush, we must continue to take care that the poorest of the poor and the bulwark of society—the working classes—do not suffer in the process. If our trade negotiators are enlightened, they will heed the needs of displaced workers, exploited workers, and the fragile environment. Trade must be fair to be truly free.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for consideration of the so-called fast-track resolutions, House Resolution 101 and House Resolution 146.

I am concerned that the closed rule on House Resolution 146, the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution, does not permit an amendment which would separate the question of fast-track authority for a Mexican free-trade agreement from continuing such authority for the GATT [General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs]. Indeed, the rule does not permit an amendment which would protect the prerogatives of the House in a procedure which seems designed to relegate the Congress to the role of being a minor role, ratifying any subsequent trade agreements with Mexico and Canada.

I support a rule which would allow the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] the opportunity of offering an amendment which would require an interim congressional review of the United States-Mexico negotiations, an analysis of the agreement's economic impact, and an assessment by the administration of the progress it has made in meeting its commitments to the Congress in a number of areas related to such an agreement.

Alternatively, if Mr. LEVIN cannot offer his amendment, I will vote for House Resolution 101 by Mr. DORGAN, which specifically disapproves the automatic extension of fast-track negotiating authority on trade agreements.

While there has been substantial progress in the GATT negotiations in a number of critical areas and while the fast-track procedure may be particularly applicable to such a multilateral trade negotiation process, I am deeply concerned about the possible consequences of extending fast-track authority to a bilateral free trade agreement with Mexico. There are simply too many outstanding questions to be resolved in too many critical areas for this Congress to agree to a procedure where we waive the right to amend an agreement that may not prove to be in our Nation's best interest.

President Bush and Ambassador Hills have sent their assurances to Congress that they will work to alleviate concerns about dislocated workers, health, safety, and environmental issues, but we have heard such assurances before which were later ignored. Even in the present instances, while the President states his concern for workers who may be dislocated because of a Mexican free-trade agreement, he does not call for additional funding for existing Federal programs in his current budget submissions.

I am concerned, too, about a procedure which may permit the administration to achieve through a trade agreement ratification process what it cannot achieve separately through the legislative process on questions of deregulation. Indeed, the Bush administration has made plain its desire to use trade agreements to further its deregulatory agenda. Initially, the administration even refused to admit that environmental protections were affected by trade agreements and refused to include such items in trade negotiations. Now, with a Mexican free-trade agreement on the horizon, the administration offers assurances of its good faith on strict enforcement of environmental protections.

Do fast-track trade agreements permit challenges to U.S. environmental laws? Yes, they do. Canada is now challenging the United States ban on asbestos under the 1988 United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement. Also, Mexico is challenging the United States Marine Mammal Protection Act, which restricts tuna caught with dolphin-killing techniques, using GATT. What other challenges against United States laws in the areas of occupational health and safety, workers' rights, and environmental standards may we expect from Mexico if we rush into a free-trade agreement with no right to perfect such an agreement through the amendment process?

I do not believe that we can never negotiate a Free-Trade Agreement with Mexico. The real question before us is will we establish a negotiating process that assures a good agreement which will be both fair and free and which will take full account of American interests. It is definitely not in our interest to support a process which would lead to a mass migration of American jobs to Mexico or a weakening of United States laws which protect our environment. Without a full process for the congressional and public debate of the agreement.

Some have suggested that unless Congress extends fast-track authority, no one will want to negotiate any trade agreements with the United States. I would remind my colleagues that the United States is still the largest, most accessible, and most profitable market in the world. Does any one really believe that our trading partners will ignore that fact? Any trade agreement that is truly in this Nation's best interest will withstand careful scrutiny. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the Dorgan resolution to disapprove the extension of fast-track negotiating authority.

It should be borne in mind that the so-called fast-track authority is a recent procedure and that the Congress and past administration have approved major trade agreements, in fact, almost all our trade agreements without such a truncated procedure. Congress need not subordinate itself regarding the very real concerns with any Mexican free-trade proposal that may be developed. We surely should trust ourselves and fulfill the job that we have assumed as representatives for the people's voice.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule for House Resolution 146, the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution dealing with fast-track trade negotiating authority.

The Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution expresses support for fast-track authority on the expectation that the President will fulfill his commitments regarding labor and environmental concerns in a potential United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement. I support the resolution, and I also believe that the President will honor his commitment to the Congress and the American people by addressing these concerns.

The rule allows the Members of Congress clear up-or-down votes on fast-track. It should be remembered that these votes are procedural—we are not voting on trade agreements today, but on trade negotiating authority. This authority is crucial if our trade negotiators are to enter into meaningful negotiations with Mexico as well as develop a successful conclusion to the Uruguay round of the GATT. At that time, the Congress will look closely at the agreements, weigh the pros and cons of any agreements, and vote accordingly on approval or disapproval of the agreements.

Finally, it is important to note that the Congress is engaged and will continue to be engaged in the trade negotiating process. One merely has to look at the detailed action plan that the President presented to the Congress and the commitments he has made to continue this dialog on trade.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and to support fast-track authority.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I support Representative LEVIN's effort to ensure better congressional oversight of the trade negotiations with Mexico.

I have one overwhelming memory of the Tokyo round trade negotiations that concluded in 1979: Our trade negotiators at that time openly and blatantly and repeatedly lied to the Congress about what they had given away to the Europeans. The issue was DISC: the Domestic International Sales Corporation tax loophole. I didn't like DISC. It was a loophole. In the name of tax reform it should have been repealed.

But a majority of the Congress and the Ways and Means Committee disagreed and did not want it given away. Time and again the committee asked the negotiators whether it was in danger and told them not to give it away. Time and again the negotiators swore it was not going to be negotiated away. When the dust settled, DISC had been promised away—and we basically heard about it from the European press.

Trade negotiators ask you to just trust them. The Tokyo round experience shows they were willing to lie massively to get a deal. And they want us to respect them in the morning and trust them again.

If you don't like surprises that cost your constituents jobs, vote for LEVIN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MICHEL. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, is the question that is put on the previous question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No, it is not.

The previous question is ordered, without objection.

The question is on the resolution.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 274, nays 148, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—274

Allard
Anderson
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Archer
Armey
Aspin
Atkins
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Boucher
Brooks
Broomfield
Bunning
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Chandler
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Eckart
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Fields
Fish
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Grandy
Gray
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
James
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lent
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
Machtley
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McEwen
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nichols
Nussle
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sanders
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Stallings
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torricelli
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waxman
Weber
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wolf
Wyden
Wylie
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—148

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
AuCoin
Bentley
Bilbray
Borski
Boxer
Brewster
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Burton
Carr
Clay
Coble
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Cramer
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Donnelly
Dwyer
Dymally
Early
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Feighan
Flake
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Gaydos
Gonzalez
Goss
Harris
Hayes (IL)
Henry
Hertel
Hoagland
Holloway
Hoyer
Hughes
Hunter
Ireland
Jacobs
Jefferson
Jones (GA)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lehman (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Manton
Mavroules
McCloskey
McDade
McHugh
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mollohan
Moody
Moran
Murphy
Nagle
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Orton
Owens (NY)
Pallone
Panetta
Payne (NJ)
Pease
Pelosi
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Porter
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Roukema
Sabo
Sangmeister
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Smith (FL)
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Tallon
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Weiss
Weldon
Wise
Wolpe
Yates
Yatron

NOT VOTING—9

Browder
Hatcher
Hopkins
Lehman (FL)
McCollum
McGrath
Skelton
Williams
Young (FL)

□ 1136

Messrs. POSHARD, TAYLOR of North Carolina, and MILLER of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LANTOS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## NOTIFICATION OF AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS TO ACCOMPANY INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT

(Mr. McCURDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 monute.)

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to notify all Members of the House that the classified schedule of authorizations and the classified annex to the report accompanying H.R. 2038, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1992, are now available for review by Members in the offices of the Intelligence Committee, room H-405 in the Capitol. Access to these documents, which is restricted to Members only, will be provided from Monday through Friday between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m.

The committee hopes that the intelligence bill will come before the House in the near future. The schedule and annex contain the committee's recommendations on the fiscal year 1992 intelligence and intelligence-related budget, and issues pertaining thereto, which cannot be discussed publicly. Accordingly, I urge Members to avail themselves of the opportunity to thoroughly review these documents so that they may be fully informed about the committee's decisions.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 143

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON] be removed as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 143.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

□ 1140

## DISAPPROVING THE EXTENSION OF FAST-TRACK PROCEDURES TO BILLS TO IMPLEMENT TRADE AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO AFTER MAY 31, 1991

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 158, I call up House Resolution 101 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 101

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives disapproves the request of the President for the extension, under section 1103(b)(1)(B)(i) of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, of the provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 to any implementing bill submitted with respect to any trade agreement entered into under section 1102 (b) and (c) of such Act after May 31, 1991, because sufficient tangible progress has not been made in trade negotiations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Pursuant to House Resolution 158, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 30 minutes, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], and that the gentleman from North Dakota be permitted to yield time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to try to understand the allocation of time, if the Speaker could explain it to us.

My understanding from the Rules Committee was that there would be time allotted for the opponents and proponents of this resolution, 1 hour on each side.

I would like to ask whether the majority on the Rules Committee intends to yield 15 minutes to myself as well.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's request, yes, I intend to yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would further like to inquire on the minority side, the intentions of the minority side with respect to the yielding of time to those who are in support of H.R. 101.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we plan to yield, as the majority has, one-half of our time to those who are proponents.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. And might I inquire, Mr. Speaker, who will be controlling that one-half of the time on the minority side?

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, at this point the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] will be controlling that time.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, once again, do I understand then that the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] will be given 15 minutes time from the minority side on the Rules Committee, and 15 minutes time from the minority side of the Committee on Ways and Means, and that the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] will then control 30 minutes of time?

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, we will be happy to yield half of our time to those who request that time on our side.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, if there are not sufficient requests for the one-half of the time on the minority side, would the minority intend then to yield that time to this side so that we have one-half of the time yielded on the floor here to those who support House Resolution 101?

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER]. If the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] chooses to yield part of that time to Members on the other side of the aisle, he is free to do that.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I will be happy to yield to specific requests from the other side of the aisle if we do not have those requests from our side of the aisle, up to half of my time.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. My understanding then is that the proponents of House Resolution 101 will get the summation of one-half of the time allocated for House Resolution 101, given the procedure we have discussed here, and one-half hour will be yielded to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the way the Chair understands the arrangement.

Without objection, the time will be so allocated.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on the pending resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps the most important economic vote and trade vote that Members will cast in this decade. We are here to debate whether or not we will proceed with negotiations worldwide through the GATT and whether we will sit down at the table and negotiate freely and fairly with our friends from Mexico. That is the issue.

We are not here to ratify any agreement. This is just a decision to go forward with the progress that we have been making over the years.

In my opening statement, I outlined the history of our trade negotiations. We are here today because of the failures of the Kennedy round that were in the lap of Congress. Congress turned down all of its part of the Kennedy round and our trading partners said to us very clearly, "We won't negotiate with you again. We won't reach a bottom line unless you will amend the way in which you bring these agreements back for ratification." It is just that simple.

We cannot get a trade agreement in the world or with Mexico unless we are willing to modify our procedures, as we do in fast-track.

Now, fast-track does not count out the House of Representatives. The President has other options available to him. He can go with a treaty and go exclusively to the Senate, but it has been our tradition that we will take up these trade agreements in both the House and the Senate.

We consult with the trade negotiators all the way through this. We will have midterm reviews, quarterterm reviews, full-term reviews and we will draft the legislation in the respective committees here that come to this floor for ratification.

So we are following a procedure that we must follow, that we should follow, and one that I hope you will vote

against the resolution to disapprove. Vote no on the next vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Chair wishes to clarify the allocation of time.

It is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] has yielded 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

It is also the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has yielded 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], and I ask unanimous consent that he may further yield time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Dorgan resolution disapproves the President's request to extend fast-track procedures for an additional 2 years.

Fast-track refers to a set of procedures, including a prohibition against amendments and the motion to recommit, for the consideration of trade implementing bills. The procedures give assurance that Congress will vote on the eventual product of trade negotiations.

The Omnibus Trade Act of 1988 and the Trade Act of 1974 both include language that the fast-track procedures are enacted as an exercise in the rulemaking powers of each House, with full recognition that each House retains its constitutional right to change its own rules at any time.

Our commitment to fast-track also comes with requirements, in law, for the administration to keep Congress informed and to address our concerns.

The Rules Committee met on the resolutions as a matter of original jurisdiction, reporting both without recommendation.

We are asked to renew our commitment to fast-track as 107 nations conclude the Uruguay round of GATT negotiations and we are asked to give our first impression assurance on discussions with Mexico and Canada.

There are serious concerns about both negotiations. The progress made on a host of issues in the Uruguay round is very encouraging but on textiles and agriculture, we are all a bit uneasy.

On Mexico, there are also environmental concerns but what is most worrisome, especially during a recession, is the wage gap between the two countries.

A North American Free-Trade Agreement is very likely to result in the loss of some American jobs and the movement of some industries out of the United States.

Fast-track is only the first step. There is a lot of difficult work to be done to achieve an agreement that is good for America and that can win the support of the House.

□ 1150

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Chair wishes to clarify the allocation of time on the Republican side of the aisle.

It is the Chair's understanding that the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has yielded 15 minutes of his time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER]. It is further the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] has yielded a similar amount of time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Chair that the gentleman from Texas is honoring specific requests for time in favor of the resolution up to a maximum of half of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the control of time on that side of the aisle shall be: The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] will be recognized for 15 minutes; the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] will be recognized for 15 minutes; and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a lot of horror stories today about the demise of the United States industrial capacity, about the demise of the American worker.

Don't you believe a word of it.

I may not know a lot about legal craftsmanship around here, but I have set up a lot of plants around the world. You do not go to Mexico, most companies do not go to Mexico for low labor rates. If you want to go for low labor rates, you go the Far East. You go there for the market.

But even if I am wrong, that is not the point. The point is are you going to start to sit down and negotiate with people that are already hurting us on a whole variety of issues, such as transshipment of goods from the Far East, or you are not. And if you do not start, you cannot finish. If you do not finish, you cannot get at those issues that are going to be important to us.

I urge everybody to oppose House Resolution 101.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Resolution 101.

In my view, fast-track procedures are essential if we are to establish a position of strength for the United States in international negotiations and if we are to ensure that successful agreements are implemented in a timely manner.

After extensive debate, Congress is poised at this historic juncture. Shall we continue the longstanding partnership between Congress and the President with respect to development of trade policy and implementation of trade agreements?

I say yes. The United States must present a strong, unified position to our trading partners as we proceed with negotiations.

Congress and the administration face, during the next 2 years, the most significant international trade agenda to emerge in decades.

A successful completion of the Uruguay round will expand the world's production by $5 trillion over the next 10 years. New disciplines in services, intellectual property rights, and investment further demonstrate the growing interdependence of all economies.

A North American free trade area, the negotiation of which is just beginning, will serve to unify three major economies and lay the foundation for a highly competitive, growth-oriented common market.

In addition, the President has outlined the Enterprise for the Americas under which other countries in Latin America can enter into a trade partnership with the United States that will improve economic opportunities, reinforce market principles, and encourage democratic ideals throughout our hemisphere.

These are worthy and ambitious goals, but are not without risks to our own economy. The effects of market openings from the Uruguay round and from the NAFTA on sensitive sectors in our economy is of concern to us all.

Yet, the President has pledged to ensure adequate transition periods for adversely affected sectors and to incorporate appropriate adjustment measures. Also, I remain concerned about unresolved issues in the Uruguay round, particularly reform of agriculture policies.

These negotiations have been underway for 4 years, and the patience of Congress is wearing thin.

To bring these talks to a successful conclusion, and to reap the benefits which would result, tough decisions need to be made about future trade disciplines and market access. Bold exercise of political will is necessary from all countries that embrace free trade principles.

Today, Congress has an opportunity to demonstrate that it can meet the challenges necessary to achieve important trade objectives for ourselves and for the world economy.

We must make tough decisions that are uncomfortable for some but that balance the benefits and protections for all Americans. We must demonstrate the political will to resolve problems and to spurn special interests.

We look to our trading partners for similar demonstrations of commitment. There are naysayers and self interests in every country. They must be confronted and pursuaded to join the effort for the common good.

It is not merely a matter of simple philosophy or principle. Our economic future and the well-being of our people depend on whether we continue to work together to assure a thriving and expanding world economy.

Congress can take a significant step forward today by defeating House Resolution 101. It is a shortsighted, parochial resolution that asks our country to move inward and backward.

I am confident that American workers, American business, and American citizens do not want Congress to reject the leadership role that our country has been blessed to achieve among the community of nations. Vote "no" on House Resolution 101.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first let me get all the buzz words out of the way: I support economic opportunity, I support expanded trade, I support economic growth, I support free trade, I support America's economic future; just so we get that straight.

This issue is not a very difficult issue, but even the trade ambassador cannot get it straight.

In a letter this morning in the Washington Post, this is what our ambassador for trade says:

> If Congress takes away fast-track, it will prevent us from taking our seat at the negotiating table.

One wonders how can everyone else get it straight if she cannot? This has nothing to do with whether she is going to sit at the negotiating table. The seat at the negotiating table is ours if we conduct negotiations with anybody in the world, Mexico, Sweden, Djibouti. She can negotiate with anybody she pleases, as far as I am concerned, and the seat will be at the table.

The question is the procedure under which this Congress considers trade legislation or trade negotiations when it comes back to Congress; that is the issue, not a seat at the table.

Never has an issue on trade been as heavily lobbied as this during my 10 years in Congress. The White House almost ran out of eggs Benedict this week, rushing people back and forth to the White House. Of course, the chamber of commerce did not run out of money, but they sure tried. They pulled out all the stops—television spots, newspaper ads.

It was characterized as a debate about whether or not we are going to negotiate. Well, of course, we are going to negotiate. I support negotiations. I support negotiations with Mexico. I hope I do not have to say that again.

I support continued negotiations of GATT. And I hope I do not have to say that again.

The issue is not whether we negotiate trade agreements, the issue is how we are going to negotiate trade agreements and in whose interests are we going to negotiate trade agreements? For whose benefit are we going to negotiate trade agreements? With whose agenda are we going to negotiate these agreements?

We have had a decade of failure in international trade. I would like to hear somebody stand up and chart this as a model of progress in the last 10, 12 years in international trade. We are choking on trade deficits, and have for a decade.

We are not winning, we are losing. This has been a policy of failure. It is the third quarter, we are down 40 points, and the coach says, "Let's keep doing what we are doing. This is just wonderful for America."

Some of us are saying it does not work, let us do it differently.

Let me give you an example about the United States-Canada trade agreement. I have said it before, and I want to say it again because it demonstrates the failure of this chant called free trade.

We negotiated a free-trade agreement with Canada.

Last year they shipped 10 million bushels of durum wheat into the United States, collapsing our market, costing our producers tens of millions of dollars. One North Dakota woman showed up at the border, taking two grocery sacks full of durum wheat to Canada because she was going to bake whole wheat bread. But they stopped her and had her pour it on the ground on the American side because you cannot get American wheat into Canada. That has technically changed in the last couple of days, although there is still going to be no wheat going north.

The point is they could send 10 million bushels south and you could not get two grocery bagsful north, and our negotiators call that free trade. Well, it might be free, from their perspective, but it is not free from mine, and it is certainly not fair.

□ 1200

I would like us to quit talking about free trade just once and start insisting and demanding on fair trade all around the world. That is what we ought to be doing.

Do I trust this administration? Of course not. If I did, I would not be in this well. They want to do in Geneva what they cannot do in this Congress. They want to dump the U.S. farm program. They want to compromise environmental protection. They want to compromise labor laws. They would like to do in trade negotiations what we will not allow them to do here in the U.S. Congress, and I say we ought not let them do it.

The question is: When will we decide it is not a risk to stand up for this country's best economic interest? Protectionist they say, protectionist and parochial. Why on earth are we afraid of being described as protectors of America's interest? Protectionists standing up for this country's interest? What on earth are we elected to do? We are elected to protect this country's interests, not with walls to keep other products out, but with a demand and insistence that we pry open foreign markets overseas.

Let us for a change start representing this country's best interest, and I would ask our trade ambassador, "Is there any plan that you have? Do you have any set of strategic or economic interests in this country's future that you plan to protect? Because I don't see it. Your only mission is free trade."

Mr. Speaker, I was for that in the sixth grade. In fact, do my colleagues know of the book, entitled "All I Really Know I Learned in Kindergarten"? It is probably in that book. That is not that complicated. I am for free trade.

But that is not a plan, that is not a plan with which we confront shrewd, international competition, all of whom have their own agenda. The Japanese have an agenda to protect Japan. The Germans have an agenda to protect Germany, and they negotiate with us. But we do not have an agenda that decides there is anything in this country that is somehow worth nurturing and protecting for this country's long-term economic health.

Fast-track is a wrong track. We ought to get it off the track, get our negotiators negotiating. If they negotiate good agreements and bring them back to the floor of the House, I will tell my colleagues it will be on a track that is approved just like that, and I will support it. And if they negotiate the kind of agreements they had in the past, they do not deserve to bring them to the floor of the House. this issue is not about whether we negotiate. This issue is about when this Congress will stand up and assert the economic interest of this country and insist on fair trade all around this world. When we do that, this country once again will start winning.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my Republican colleagues, I want to address you for a minute as a Member who proudly sports, I think, a 13-percent AFL-CIO rating and appeal to you on the basis that this deal, and we can see some pieces of the deal even though it hasn't been made yet, will accrue to the detriment of American business. This is not a good business deal, and perhaps the fact that we haven't looked at our trade negotiations as business deals over the last 40 years, is one of our problems.

Mr. Speaker, we had a policy following World War II in which we subordinated hard economic interests to foreign policy interests, and that was highly appropriate. We picked nations off their knees after World War II by allowing them to have one-way trade deals with us because it was important to have a strong, unified Western coalition. And this President has acted superbly in utilizing that coalition in situations like the one that just transpired in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to my colleagues today that it is time for a change. It is time for a reevaluation, and I say, "The little nephew that you used to box with with one hand tied behind your back is in some cases Mike Tyson, and so when you say, 'Take your best shot at me,' and he knocks you flat, it's difficult for us to orient ourselves and realize that it's time to shift our position and to shift our policy."

A lot of my colleagues talk about Adam Smith and the great idea of free trade. Adam Smith talked about complementary trade when one nation would raise the wool and another nation would make that into cardigan sweaters, and there was a happy, friendly, collaborative relationship between nations. We are not engaged today in Adam Smith happy trade/complementary trade. We are engaged in adversarial trade where some of our trading partners try to systematically destroy large pieces of the American industrial base. They try to and succeed in destroying many American businesses.

Now where does Mexico fit into all of this? Because certainly Mexico is not threatening us and threatening to put our industries into extinction in the same sense that some of the industrial giants around the world threaten. Well, Mexico could be a piece of our trading plan, a successful trading plan. They could be a base for imports to third countries, and we could utilize that lower labor rate to export to third nations around the world.

But that is not what we are going to do. We are building a window between the United States and Mexico. The American consumer is going to pull this train, and for those who say we are going to develop a middle class in Mexico that will be buying major American consumer wants, let us just go over the facts.

The average worker in Mexico makes about $1,800 a year. That means, if a worker at the Sony plant in Tijuana worked the entire year and starved his family, did not give them an ounce of food, did not pay a penny in utilities and did not pay a penny for a car or shelter, he could not buy a single $2,000 television set that he makes. There is no American business that believes that we are really going to develop these $1,800-a-year citizens into a massive middle class that will buy American consumer goods: like electronics, automobiles. Nobody in industry believes that.

But what industry is interested in, and where our problem, as business-oriented conservatives, comes in, is cheap labor. My friends, American businessmen should have an interest in having a strong working class with buying power.

Now my argument against free trade is not that Mexican workers are not productive. My argument is based on the fact that they are darn productive, and a Mexican worker in Mexico City working for General Motors now has achieved 80-percent of the productivity of an American worker in Detroit for one-tenth of the wages.

I say to my colleagues, if you're trying to make a decision with a shrinking profit margin on where you put your assembly lines and your production plant, and you can achieve a thousand percent reduction in wages with an 80-percent productivity scale, you don't have to be a rocket scientist to decide where you build your new plant.

My point is American consumers are defined as American workers with jobs and paychecks, and, when this deal passes, if it passes, and it is a business deal, we are going to see a lot fewer American consumers with less buying power.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Resolution 101, which would disapprove the President's March 1 request for a 2-year extension of the fast-track procedures for implementing trade agreements. I recognize that this is a very difficult issue for many of our colleagues, and I respect the sincerity of those who truly believe that the extension of fast-track is not in our institutional or national interests.

I strongly disagree, however, with those who say fast-track is not necessary for the President to pursue the Uruguay round negotiations or to initiate talks on a North American Free Trade Agreement. To those who say that the fast-track procedures are an abrogration of congressional constitutional prerogatives, I think you are wrong.

The fast-track procedures have been in place for 17 years, since the Trade Act of 1974. This Congress has reauthorized fast-track on three separate occasions—in 1979, 1984, and 1988.

While the Constitution vests the authority to regulate foreign trade in the Congress, an institution of 535 members cannot embark on multilateral negotiations. Since 1934, we have periodically delegated to the President explicit authority not only to negotiate reciprocal reductions of U.S. tariffs, but also to proclaim the results of those negotiations without coming back to the Congress for approval.

In 1974, it was recognized that future trade negotiations would focus primarily on reductions in a complex array of nontariff barriers and that agreements would require changes in many U.S. statutes for implementation. It was also recognized that it would be difficult for our negotiators to achieve optimum results if our trading partners believed the results of the negotiations would be reopened by the Congress through legislative amendments, as part of the domestic implementing process.

The consultation requirements and fast-track procedures developed in 1974 created an active and close partnership between the Congress and the administration in the negotiation and implementation of trade agreements. This process has been used successfully on three separate occasions—for the Tokyo round multilateral trade agreements, and bilateral free trade agreements with Israel and Canada.

The fast-track procedures require a 60-day advance notification to the Congress of proposed bilateral negotiations with any country. The Committee on Ways and Means or the Senate Finance Committee can then stop such talks simply by saying "no."

Extensive consultations with the Congress and with the private sector are required throughout the negotiations.

I want to emphasize that the President must give the Congress 90-day advance notice of his intention to enter into a trade agreement. During this period, Congress not only can suggest changes to the draft agreement, but the committees of jurisdiction actually draft the implementing legislation in consultation with the administration, through an informal markup and conference with the Senate. In all past instances when fast-track was used, the administration submitted back to Congress the implementing legislation which the Congress had drafted.

Finally, each Member of the Congress has the final say as to whether to approve or disapprove the final agreement. No agreement can enter into force without congressional approval.

Opponents of fast-track extension argue that it puts Congress on the sidelines. Exactly the opposite is true: it

puts Congress on the front lines. Opponents portray the fast-track process as simply a take-it-or-leave-it proposition, as if trade agreements are negotiated in the dark somewhere, then suddenly land in the Congress for the first time for only an up-or-down vote. This portrayal inaccurately represents the actual fast-track process and the active role of the Congress in it.

As demonstrated in the past 3 months, Congress has already strongly influenced the scope, agenda, and course of the North American free trade negotiations before they even begin. As a result of the concerns raised by Members of Congress, the President responded with an 86-page action plan of specific commitments to address the legitimate concerns Members have raised.

When the administration first made its request on March 1 to extend fast-track, it argued that issues such as the environment, worker's rights, and health and safety standards were not appropriate for inclusion in trade negotiations. Now, it is clear, not only to the administration, but also to the Mexican Government that if such issues are not addressed in a meaningful way, a North American Free Trade Agreement will not likely be approved.

On worker adjustment assistance, the administration had maintained that the existing economic dislocation and worker adjustment assistance program was satisfactory. Now we have a commitment from the President to expand existing adjustment assistance programs or develop new ones in consultation with the Congress. The President's commitment includes an assurance that the worker Adjustment Assistance Program will be adequately funded to take care of all workers who may lose their jobs because of a North American Free-Trade Agreement. Such a program will be developed as part of the trade agreement implementing legislation, so the Congress will have control of this process!

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that a North American Free-Trade Agreement can be in our national economic interests. Lower barriers to trade in goods and services, an open investment climate, and assurance of intellectual property right protections will increase exports, create jobs, and promote economic growth in the United States. These negotiations offer the opportunity to address the very disparities in labor, environmental, health and safety, and worker rights that raise concerns today in the absence of an agreement. And in agreement and its implementing legislation can include sufficient safeguard and adjustment measures to minimize potential adverse effects on particular industries or their workers.

Those who oppose such an agreement seem to think that we can isolate ourselves from the forces that are currently at work in the world. Trading blocks are forming in Europe and in the Far East. Macroeconomic forces are at work making it more difficult to compete in the world's marketplace. If we do not move forward, we will fall further behind.

Finally, an issue which has been somewhat overlooked in this debate is the importance of successfully concluding the Uruguay round of the GATT. The round is attempting to lower foreign trade restrictions and strengthen the multilateral trading system. If successful, 108 participating countries will agree to more open market access and international trading rules covering agriculture, services, investment and, for the first time, intellectual property rights.

It may not be possible for Ambassador Hills to deliver a successful Uruguay round package because of European Community intransigence. But I believe she is strongly looking out for the best interests of the United States, and has earned the right to pursue the effort to a successful conclusion.

My colleagues, trade had traditionally been a bipartisan issue where the administration and the Congress try to come together to put the national interest over parochial or partisan interests. From the days of President Roosevelt, through each succeeding administration, Democrats and Republicans have united behind the President to formulate a unified trade policy. The extension of fast-track authority gives us the opportunity to put the bickering behind us, and to put forth a united effort toward achieving expanded world trade, economic growth for our country and higher standards of living for our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the President's request for an extension of fast-track procedures, and urge my colleagues to defeat House Resolution 101.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI].

Mr. KOPETSKI. My colleagues, I rise in opposition to the resolution and in support of the fast-track process. I think Mr. and Mrs. America need to understand what we are talking about. Fast-track is the process by which the Congress will make up its mind. It is not the speed with which America, through our negotiators, will reach an agreement, but rather what Congress will do when it obtains this proposed agreement and acts upon it.

I am a new Member of Congress, and I am learning so much every day, and what we learn today is that the definition of fast, according to Congress, is 60 days. That is how much time the Congress would have to say yes or no to a proposed agreement. My fear is not whether fast is 60 days. My fear is what the Congress' definition of slow is.

□ 1210

How slow is slow according to the U.S. Congress? Do we take 60 days, 90 days, 1 year, 5 years, 10 years to make up our mind on a proposed agreement? I am confident that each and every Member of this Congress has the intellectual ability to make up their minds within 60 days.

I urge a "no" vote on the resolution and a "yes" on fast-track.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution and in support of extending the President's fast-track trade negotiating authority.

Mr. Speaker, a degree of hysteria has muddied the waters of this debate and two points need to be clarified at the outset.

First, we are not voting today on a trade agreement with either Mexico or our GATT trading partners. There are no agreements. Today's vote simply sets the terms under which President Bush will initiate negotiations and eventually submit agreements to Congress for approval, assuming negotiations are successful.

Second, fast-track actually strengthens Congress' hand in trade negotiations. Until 1974, Presidents could argue that they could enter into trade agreements under their constitutional authority to conduct foreign affairs, without submitting agreements to Congress for approval. The 1974 statute establishing fast-track changed this. It was a deal. The President would submit entire trade agreements for congressional approval—or disapproval—and Congress would act expeditiously to write the legislation necessary to implement approved agreements.

Fast-track increases Congress' power in other ways, too. Fast-track requires the President to notify Congress of his/her intent to enter into negotiations and imposes a waiting period before negotiations can proceed. In the case of a North American Free-Trade Agreement with Mexico, this procedure already is paying dividends. Congress has used the waiting period to shape the agenda for the negotiations. Congress put President Bush on notice of its concern on an array of labor and environmental issues. On May 1, the President responded with a 78-page action plan for addressing these concerns. Later today, we will formalize the agenda for the negotiations on the North American Free-Trade Agreement and the standard by which the agreement will be judged when we approve the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution.

Presidents Bush and Salinas announced they wanted to enter into trade negotiations on May 11, 1990. Without fast-track, these negotiations could have proceeded immediately. Without fast-track, Congress might very well be debating today the merits of an agreement over which it had no advance input and only limited authority to change. Fast-track is paying dividends. We should support it.

Unfortunately, for some, an Oregonian headline on June 20, 1989, said it all: "Caterpillar To Follow Through With Dallas Plant Closure." Another, less than 2 weeks ago, read, "Phone Company Lays Off Workers."

The accompanying news stories to these headlines point out that the firms laying off their workers would be carrying on in Mexico

the operations they were closing down in Oregon.

Opponents of extending the President's fast-track trade negotiating authority point to stories like these to show what will happen if Mexico is brought into a North American free-trade agreement. But, fast-track opponents have hoisted themselves on their own petard. For rather than making a case against fast-track, the current migration of United States industry and jobs to Mexico, in the absence of a trade agreement, is the most compelling reason to say yes to fast-track.

Free trade can benefit both the United States and Mexico. U.S. economic growth is pegged to international trade. Last year, exports accounted for 88 percent of the growth portion of our gross national product. New job creation in the United States depends on trade, and Mexico is among the top United States customers. We export more products to Mexico than to any other foreign market, except Canada and Japan. More importantly, Mexico prefers American products; the United States accounts for 70 percent of Mexico's imports. Mexicans per capita buy $32 more United States-produced goods and services than their wealthier European counterparts. A successfully negotiated North American free-trade agreement among the United States, Canada, and Mexico would create a market of 360 million people will combine economic outputs of $6 trillion—20 percent larger than the proposed European Community.

If the past is prologue, my own State of Oregon is in a particularly good position to benefit from increased trade with Mexico. Mexico buys what Oregonians produce: Computers and industrial machinery; agricultural produce; scientific and measuring instruments, transportation equipment; and primary metals. Oregon exports to Mexico increased 121 percent between 1987 to 1990, after Mexico reduced its tariffs signficantly. Mexico's tariffs still remain high, however, averaging 10 percent versus less than 4 percent for United States tariffs.

But, trade agreements can be two way streets. If Mexico wants to enjoy the benefits of free trade with the United States, then the United States can seek in return fair trade. And, fair trade means that an increasingly prosperous Mexico must pay decent wages and vigorously enforce meaningful health, safety, and environmental laws.

Before closing, let me say I have met with Ambassador Carla Hills, the President's chief trade negotiator, and I questioned her as well as other cabinet officials in private and public hearings. I have met with the President. In addition to all our concerns about labor and environmental difficulties, I have raised the issues as I see them from the Oregon perspective. Because of my State and region's diverse economic base—high technology, manufacturing, agriculture, timber, services—I believe it is important that one segment of our economy not be sacrificed for another.

Mr. Speaker, any final trade agreements must be a fair deal for all of our economic interests. Fast-track gives our negotiators the tool they need to get a fair deal. Fast-track is allowing Congress to set the standard for judging any agreement and most importantly, is preserving for Congress the option to say no if an agreement falls short of that standard.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHULZE].

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 101 and in favor of extension of fast-track negotiating authority.

I have long supported a North American Free-Trade Agreement. Given the creation of the protectionist bloc known as EC '92, and the need for the United States to leverage that bloc, completion of a North American FTA is now more important than ever. Fast-track paves the road for such an FTA.

However, my deep disappointment over the hapless GATT process prevents me from supporting fast-track without some reservation.

The fact that fast-track extension would allow the GATT to stumble along hopelessly for another 2 years causes me great distress. And the fact that this plays into the European Community's hands concerns me even more.

As the GATT process marches on, the EC's negotiating position will only become strengthened. Lest we forget that most of the Community's attention is still focused on the conclusion of EC '92 and the increased leverage over its trading partners that it stands to gain as a result.

When we approved the United States-Canada FTA, we should already have been seriously discussing the next logical agreement. Instead, U.S. officials defensively assured the world that we would not upset the multilateral GATT process by concurrently pursuing other bilateral or regional FTA's.

Meanwhile, the EC was hurtling decisively toward EC '92 and gaining enormous leverage over impending GATT negotiations in the process. We did what we felt was in the best interest of the world trading order. The EC did what was best for the EC. Now, it is the EC who holds the cards.

The closer EC '92 comes to fruition, the more immutable the Community can afford to—and surely will—become in the GATT. Indeed, to those who have delusions about the EC addressing the agriculture issue in a sincere and forthright manner, consider this: In a recent meeting with my Trade Subcommittee colleagues and EC trade ministers, I pointed out the importance of the EC instituting agricultural reforms that we all know to be essential.

At once, several of the ministers emphatically rebuked my comment with, "Wait a minute, we didn't promise any reforms * * * we agreed to talk * * * that's it."

I regret that fast-track will allow the belligerent attitude that I just described to continue. The European Community's mischief—and the GATT comedy of errors held hostage by it—are not deserving of a stage on which to perform.

On the positive side, however, fast-track authority will also facilitate the negotiation of a North American FTA, and hemispheric and United States-Taiwan FTA's beyond that.

We are heading into a 21st century that will pose even greater competitive challenges to America than the current century. If U.S. businesses and workers are going to prosper in this brutal environment, we must stop relying on a GATT incapable of leading the way to true global trade expansion.

I am going to support fast-track, but will not relent in my insistence that we negotiate on the basis of what is best for America, and on what strengethens America's hand in the world trading order. The days of doing what makes us popular in the eyes of our trading partners must come to an end.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN], the new ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 101, a resolution of disapproval of the President's request to extend fast-track procedures for 2 years. Fast-track procedures have been included by the Congress in trade legislation in 1974, 1979, and most recently in the 1988 Trade Act. This is a procedure given to the President by the Congress. It assures the Congress' participation throughout the negotiation process and provides two guarantees: A vote on implementing legislation within a specific time period and no amendments to the legislation.

Use of the fast-track procedures preserves the role of the Congress through extensive notification and consultation requirements. Committees of the Congress with jurisdiction over issues within the trade agreements are deeply involved in the process. This procedure is not a diminishment of the role of the Congress; instead, it is a tool provided by the Congress to the President so that trade initiatives can be initiated to advance the economic objectives of the United States of America.

Such an advance through sound trade initiatives can be found in American agriculture. A guaranteed applause line used by politicians in farm country for the better part of two decades goes something like this: "Give the American farmer a level playing field upon which to compete and he'll out produce and out perform any farmer in the world." Soon we will find out if this is mere stump speech rhetoric or a heartfelt belief.

Congress now faces voting an extension of the fast-track negotiating authority provided to the President or ending the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] which began in 1986. The outcome of our action will have a tremendous impact on American agriculture.

Agricultural exports currently account for more than $40 billion a year in sales, which provide about a fifth of our farmers' cash receipts. Indeed, about one-third of United States harvested crop acreage produces for export each year. These exports create a half million farm jobs plus and another half million jobs for people processing, packaging, and shipping these products around the world. As Ambassador Carla

Hills, our Trade Representative, recently noted:

U.S. farmers are the most productive in the world. A freer and fairer trading system will enable U.S. producers to maximize that competitive advantage.

Given the importance of these export markets one might conclude that this sector of international trade is not broken and doesn't need fixing. Not so. World agriculture cries out for reform: Reduction of trade distorting domestic subsidies, improved access to world markets, and the reduction of export subsidies. Our agriculture sector faces a world trade environment in which trade barriers and conflict have increased, while trade distortion policies proliferate.

Agriculture Under Secretary Richard Crowder, in testimony to the House Agriculture Committee, recently summarized the way the current trade system, in which we attempt to compete, operates:

Countries shut out imports and stimulate high production and low consumption with artificially high domestic prices. Then they dump their surplus production on the already over-burdened world market. In this situation, the strong competitive advantages of U.S. farmers and agriculture firms are too often stymied, and the prices that prevail in world markets are chronically low and unstable.

Agriculture is the key to a successfull conclusion of the current negotiations in GATT. As was demonstrated in Brussels last December, United States negotiators were firm and resolute that without concessions on the part of the European Community, Japan, and Korea on Agriculture issues, no GATT agreement was possible. Because of the strong position taken by our negotiators, it now appears a framework is evolving that will enable the talks to go forward with the likelihood for positive results. All parties have now agreed to negotiate on the three important elements of a good agreement—access to markets, internal supports, and export subsidies.

It is clear these reforms must be worldwide. Uniliateral action by the United States would not be in our best interest and would only serve to undercut our own producers. Nor do these reforms preclude Government supports to producers in ways that do not distort production or trade. Such nondistorting payments could be targeted to producers who would need more time to adjust, such as in dairy, sugar, and peanuts. Additionally, implementation of trade agreements does not occur immediately and can be phased in to allow for adjustments, such as some fruit and vegetable producers may need in a North American Free Trade Agreement.

Opportunity is knocking at the door of the Congress. We have a chance to offer additional markets to our agriculture producers and we must make sure the door is opened to these opportunities. President Bush has requested an extension of the so-called fast-track procedures, as provided for in the 1988 Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act. This extension will allow the administration to continue the trade negotiations in the Uruguay round of the GATT, begin discussions of a free-trade agreement with Canada and Mexico, and pursue the trade objectives of the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative.

If and when any of these trade agreements are successfully concluded, the Congress will have an up or down vote without amendments on the implementing legislation. The Trade Act also includes notification and consultation requirements with both the Congress and the private sector through the process. In adopting the fast-track procedure, Congress ensures that it has the final word but also recognizes that foreign governments would not seriously negotiate with us if agreements could be continuously "renegotiated" by congressional amendment and resubmission to over 100 signature nations in a never-ending process.

Under the fast-track procedures it is clearly in the interest of the administration to take into consideration and respond to congressional concerns as the negotiations proceed. Otherwise, rejection of the agreement would follow and years of work would be in vain.

The current status of world agriculture trade is unacceptable. Continuation of the status quo means that present trade barriers, such as the outright ban on imports of certain products, such as rice by Japan and United States beef in Europe, will go on. It means that dumping surplus agriculture products on the market will continue, driving down prices to producers. It means that world agriculture trade as we know it now, unfair and uneven, will not change. It also means that the opportunities for increased trade around the world, such as in Asia and Eastern Europe, may not come to be. These markets are at risk without reform of global trade rules. Without the extension of the fast-track negotiating authority, the American farmer and rancher will have to be content with the current trading system, or worse. Agriculture undoubtedly will become involved in more protracted and contentious trade disputes through which there will be few, if any, winners, and many losers. For American agriculture to be a winner, fast-track procedures must be adopted and followed by vigorous negotiations to correct a trading system that's broken and needs fixing. If we can do that—and it will be tough—we will be putting agriculture trade on the right track as we enter a promising new century for American farmers and ranchers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote today in support of fast-track authority.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE], a respected member of the Ways and Means Committee, to speak in support of House Resolution 101.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I urge a yes vote on the Dorgan resolution. Let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that I do not oppose fast-track for the GATT. My great concern is for the proposed FTA with Mexico and the negative impact it will have on American middle-class manufacturing workers.

As we prepare to cast our votes on the Dorgan resolution, we must ask ourselves these questions:

If a factory in a Member's district moved to Mexico and laid off 1,000 workers in that district, what would happen to those 1,000 workers and their middle-class standard of living?

Would the workers get adequate adjustment assistance? The Bush administration wants to repeal trade adjustment assistance.

Would the workers get extended unemployment benefits? The Bush administration vehemently opposes them.

How many of those 1,000 workers would be able to find in or near a Member's congressional district a job paying anything like the wages comparable to what they were earning?

The answer: precious few. Perhaps 100 would be able to move up to high-technology jobs after retraining, but certainly not close to a majority.

Another question: What will happen to the sons and daughters of those 1,000 workers? Will those sons and daughters be able to find decent jobs? I do not mean the ones training to be doctors or lawyers or computer scientists. I mean ordinary working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that a free-trade agreement with Mexico could be an irresistible temptation for American companies to locate south of the border. My concern is with working average middle-class manufacturing workers. What is happening to the middle-class of our country? Those are the constituents that I worry about, that cause me to vote against fast-track.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dorgan resolution to deny an extension of fast-track authority.

Throughout my career in the Congress, I have been an ardent proponent of free trade, and despite our trade deficit and balance-of-payments problems, I remain opposed to restrictive trade barriers.

The issue, for me, is not only the terms of a free trade agreement, but the process by which we arrive at that agreement.

Can we be sure that we, as elected representatives of the American people, are fully exercising our authority as legislators if we abdicate our power to negotiate and fashion this agreement to faceless bureaucrats in the ex-

ecutive branch, leaving for ourselves only a "yes" or "no" vote on the final product?

I do not think so.

Advocates of fast-track offer assurances that we will have an opportunity, during committee consideration of the treaty, to raise questions and seek modifications. We are told that during the negotiations, our input will be sought and considered.

But as we all know, you're either involved or you're not. You either have the ability to say "no" or you do not.

And granting the unique authority to the President and his negotiators, in my view, effectively removes the Congress from this process and does great damage to the separation of powers and the role of the Congress.

The nature of the legislative process requires that the Congress be active participants in debating and shaping an agreement that could have far-ranging economic, environmental, and diplomatic consequences that affect the jurisdiction of many committees and the constituents we represent.

We are asked to trust that the administration's negotiators will take our views into consideration in designing the treaty.

I'm not sure that provides adequate safeguards for Americans.

Should American workers and their families have to rely on an administration which has failed to use its existing authority to defend their workplace safety and economic security?

Should American families trust an administration to demand strict environmental safeguards and improvements when that same administration has dragged its feet and resisted efforts to enforce environmental laws and programs here at home?

The administration says we can trust them. But the record suggests otherwise.

The administration's plan proposes a weaker environmental assessment review procedure for the North American Free-Trade Agreement than that currently required by U.S. law.

Nor are we assured that State and local laws that exceed the Federal standards will be protected, which is a major concern for California whose environmental protection standards often exceed Federal standards.

Just last year, the Congress overwhelmingly approved an oilspill law that specifically safeguards State standards; we should not place that autonomy in jeopardy by the agreement.

If the administration's negotiators are truly committed to labor safeguards, to reasonable security for the economy of border States, and to environmental protection, as they claim, then they should not fear bringing the treaty before the Congress and defending their final product on those grounds.

But if we approve fast-track, there need be no defense.

We will, instead, be told that "we did the best we could do," and then Congress will either vote up or down on a treaty that will surely be characterized as having enormous diplomatic significance.

I don't believe this House should be put in that awkward position which compromises its constitutional authority and our ability to do what we were sent here to do: Look out for the best interests of our constituents and the Nation.

Let me again reiterate that I oppose fast-tracking without taking a position on the treaty itself. Indeed, it is because we have not seen the treaty that handing over such blank authority to the Executive is such a shortsighted idea.

I also speak as a proponent of closer relations with Mexico, a longtime member of the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Commission where we have discussed the trade and worker protection issues at great length, and as a vigorous supporter of free trade.

I am simply not willing to sacrifice the constitutional and historic role of this body in pursuit of those worthy objectives, and I urge an "aye" vote for the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 101.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 101 would prevent an extension of the fast-track process for negotiation of a GATT and North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA] treaty. My opposition is premised on two basic concerns:

First, I do not believe Congress should largely surrender its constitutional authority to oversee the negotiation of sensitive international trade agreements. This does not mean that GATT or North American trade agreements are necessarily wrong. It simply means that we should not abdicate our ability to retain some meaningful leverage on behalf of our constituents as these major trade agreements are pieced together. Most treaties, including multilateral treaties, are approved without a fast-track process, and rejection of that process in this instance certainly does not mean that trade agreements with our European trading competitors or with Mexico and Canada could not be concluded.

Second, I am particularly wary of fast-track extension out of concern for the Bush administation's professed trade policy goals, and what appears to me to be a lack of commitment to the interests of ordinary family farmers, ranchers, and wage-earning workers. These agreements, I fear, could easy degenerate into bonanzas for multinational corporations, but disasters for middle class working Americans, rural and urban alike.

I want to have the opportunity to reflect my constitutents' views on a GATT agreement that may have an enormous impact on agricultural prosperity. Expanding international trade and greater conformity of health and inspection standards is highly desirable in my view. But in many ways, the American position at GATT appears to be a back-door assault on domestic agricultural programs. If all domestic "trade distorting" programs are repealed, we could be led down the road to production of massive amounts of cheap grain—a result that may be satisfactory to some huge grain dealers and "free trade" ideologues, but which would be the final blow to much of rural America—farmers, ranchers, and main street business owners alike.

I am also concerned about the possibility of an already weakened American dairy industry being destroyed by a flood of imported dairy products.

The pending agreement with Canada and Mexico will absolutely not leave us with a parallel trade zone to the European Community's Common Market. Unless major changes in direction are made, the NAFTA treaty will mostly be a jackpot for large multinational corporations. It's no secret that there are a great many companies extraordinarily interested in the prospect of moving American jobs south of the border were workers can be employed at a fraction of American wages, and where they don't have to pay for workers' compensation, unemployment insurance, health insurance, or abide by American rules for worker safety or environmental standards.

The EC, on the other hand, was created to be a completely different kind of arrangement. If the United States wants to model a North American Free Trade Agreement on the European system, we ought to pay greater attention to the way the EC was put together. The EC's single market contains a "social charter" designed to keep that union from becoming simply a means for corporations to seek out the lowest wages and poorest environmental standards. The EC Charter sets out the rights of a minimum wage, social assistance, collective bargaining, vocational training, and health and safety protection in all its member nations, partly to discourage runaway plants and exploitation of cheap labor. Beyond that, the Europeans have a $68 billion "Regional Development Fund" to help narrow the gap between rich and poor areas. Here, the per capita income gap between Mexico and the United States is a staggering 10–1.

All this is not to say that we cannot or should not reach agreements to foster greater trade with Mexico or Europe. I applaud all efforts to secure arrangements which will lead to expanded fair and equitable economic interaction with all of our trading partners, but as South Dakota's one voice in the House of Representatives, I want to preserve all the leverage possible to make sure that any final agreements which may be reached truly reflect the interests of ordinary working Americans and their families.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very reluctant support of the rule and will vote yes on the Dorgan motion to disapprove fast-track. The Dorgan resolution is the only vote we have today that binding assure results. I also stand here today on behalf of people on both sides of the border, not just profits.

I speak out to President Bush today on behalf of every worker in America who has lost or will lose his or her job to Mexico, or some other offshore tax haven for transnational corporations headquartered in the United States.

I also speak out on behalf of every exploited Mexican worker—those stooped over on the farms of North America and those crammed into Mexican factories—who are being paid 50 cents to $1 an hour, not even able to afford to buy the fruits of their own labor. I ask what kind of world are we building? Would our Creator look kindly on our handiwork?

This vote is not really about trade. It's really about how you as a Member of Congress can best use your vote to build more just and freer societies here in North America.

If you have not traveled to Mexico; if you have not visited its belching industrial and raw agricultural corridors; nor seen the pain of its people; if you have had no practical experience in dealing with fast-track trade authority; if you have not stood on unemployment lines in the United States; if you care about the American worker and our families, not just corporate profits, you should vote down fast-track authority today.

If you believe trade with developing nations should be placed in a larger context of expanded human rights and liberties; if you believe in decent wages, not 57-cents-an-hour labor; if you don't want Mexico to become a cheap manufacturing platform where foreign companies back-door their goods into the United States; if you want the United States to become a net exporting nation; if you believe North American competitiveness rests not on a low wage strategy but on improved productivity, investment in research, development and in peoples skills; and if you care about a North America that upholds the highest world standard of living, of decency, and human liberty, then vote yes on Dorgan.

If you're a Member concerned about GATT, the Dorgan motion will not stop GATT. You can be certain there will be another GATT bill up here before the June 1 deadline. If you want to move ahead with a comprehensive agreement with Mexico, you can be certain there will be another bill up here before midsummer to do just that. Today, however, is the day you have your one and only certain chance to send a strong message of the substance of what you want in an agreement. It is your only chance to move this administration toward a United States-Mexico agreement that sets a world standard for broad economic integration and embodies the best values of our democracy, not just a narrow negotiation on tariffs and trade.

Voting down fast-track and yes on Dorgan is your only binding authority to assure an agreement of which all of North America can be proud.

Think about it—voting yes on Dorgan is your only certain leverage as a Member of Congress. After today, your views will not really matter because you will have given away your right to amend. You will abdicate your legislative power. The Gephardt sense of Congress resolution has no binding authority—no teeth.

Conceptually, we all agree the idea of a free North American, unified market with Mexico, Canada, and the United States in partnership makes sense. But, in fact, this vote is about much more than trade. It is about how trade fits into a broader North American commonwealth integration. This vote actually has less to do with trade and more to do with foreign investment in Mexico and the loss of United States jobs. It has to do with the fact that the Mexican Parliament cannot delete this agreement when Mexico's authoritarian political system squashes debates and dissent. This vote has everything to do with our social covenant with the ordinary people of North America that our Nation should proudly herald. A market system is good for many things. But it cannot protect labor standards. It cannot assure human rights. It cannot guarantee free elections. It cannot assure a healthy environment. It cannot stop the flow of illegal drugs. It cannot resolve legitimate disputes that arise between trading nations. My friends, even today, the exploitation of people and the labor of their hands is still a reality. Only a yes on Dorgan will assure these issues are addressed. One of my most vivid memories of Mexico is visiting a SONY plant and learning that workers there were not earning enough to buy the televisions they were producing. Rather those televisions were all destined for the U.S. market. My friends, that is exploitation and it is wrong.

Exploitation is not only happening in Mexico, where workers cannot buy the goods they produce. It is happening here in America where hard working Americans lose their jobs to low wage economies. Last week, another company in my district with a Mexican affiliate in Metamoras shut down permanently idling another 140 hourly workers.

How can proponents claim an FTA will expand U.S. exports to Mexico and create jobs in the United States. But United States exports to Mexico are not a real new export market, but are reshipments of goods back to the United States. During the 1980's United States exports to Mexico have increased from $15.1 billion to $24.96 billion; Mexican imports to the United States have increased from $12.8 billion to $27.59 billion in the same period. However, 41.5 percent—and a growing share—of Mexican exports to the United States are simply reshipments back to the United States of United States components that have been assembled in Mexico by low-wage workers and then transported back to the United States. Under traditional capitalism, this is not a real expansion of United States export markets—since Mexicans are not buying United States goods. Rather, it is an escape of United States jobs to a low-wage economy where Mexican workers cannot afford to buy the products they make. The target market for sales is the United States market where, theoretically, unemployed United States workers thrown out of work by the loss of jobs to Mexico will be buying with their unemployment checks lowercost goods assembled by low-wage Mexican workers.

This trade agreement will not set the stage for the Mexican market growing as a real United States export opportunity. Rather, Mexico will become a cheap manufacturing platform for foreign companies to back-door their goods into the United States market, as so many maquiladora plants do now.

During the last 10 years, the pace of U.S.-based multinational corporations locating abroad has accelerated—output of these operations has increased 50 percent in the 1980's and now amounts to $15 billion. A growing share of these manufacturing operations have been located in developing economies. Offshore assembly operations have grown from 4 percent of total U.S. imports in the early 1960's to almost 10 percent more recently. Offshore assembly for export to the United States employs 2 million people, 10 percent of total U.S. manufacturing employment.

Can you begin to understand why this proposed fast-track authority with Mexico is so objectionable to me and why I made the effort to come to this well to ask your attention and consideration of my point of view. Every company in my district with a Mexican affiliate has now permanently closed its doors or laid off thousands of workers. Libbey Owens Ford Glass, thousands of workers. Dura Corp., thousands of workers. Midland Ross; Sheller Globe; Champion; Therma Tru.

This proposed agreement with Mexico is truly unique. It is precedent setting. Our Nation has never, I repeat never before negotiated a free-trade agreement with a nation whose standard of living is so starkly different from our own. Also Mexico's population is vast at 90 million and poor; any integration will have profound impacts on people here in the United States. Ohio has already lost 100,000 jobs to Mexico through August of last year, under the limited free-trade that exists now under the maquiladora system. Under the proposed agreement, it is projected by 1999, the United States could lose 405,000–912,000 additional jobs.

May I ask why should the United States be so anxious to negotiate a free-trade agreement with a nation that is not free. Mexico with its single party government, remains one of the most authoritarian in our hemisphere. Fast-track implies much more than a trade agreement and profound differences between the United States and Mexico will affect any trade agreement and directly affect people on both sides of the border. This vote on fast-track is really a vote about justice. It is about how to move political systems toward decent, fair, and honorable treatment of their citizens. This vote should be,

and is, much more than a narrow vote on tariffs and trade.

Octavio Paz, Mexico's renowned and courageous Nobel Laureate poet and writer tells those of us who wish to hear him, in his work "The Other Mexico: Critique of the Pyramid."

Mexico is a modern country. The trouble is that if you look at the picture carefully enough, you can see vast areas of shadow. It is a disturbing sort of modernity.

Mexico continues to be a country of scandalous inequalities. If the government does not attack this problem, (by strengthening the people's buying power), the rhythm of development will slow down and even half. To launch this attack, it must implement a policy of social reform and it must reestablish freedom for its working people within the labor union which at present are controlled by an affluent bureaucracy.

* * * without real freedom of negotiation for the workers, Mexico's development will be interrupted * * * Political revolution destroyed the old institutional order; it did not create a democratic state, but now, for this program to continue, it is equally imperative to achieve social development—that is justice.

Under the present circumstances, the race toward development is mere haste to reach ruin. But we are forbidden to speak of these themes while we still have not achieved the minimal requirement: That free atmosphere that is the natural space in which both critical thought and the imagination unfold.

Above all and before all else: We must conceive viable models of development, models less inhuman, costly, and senseless than those we have now. I have said before that this is an urgent task: The truth is, it is the task of our times.

And he ends with a profound warning to those who are too anxious to take advantage of the Mexican people today for some future economic development objective "the supreme value is not the future but the present * * * Whoever builds a house for future happiness build a prison for the present."

As we fervently debate fast-track today, are you aware that Mexico's Congress will not be allowed to debate nor even consider the proposed free-trade agreement. I ask again, how can we negotiate a free-trade agreement with a society that does not allow free debate, and whose very elections have not been verified by international tribunals—as I have stated; this agreement is less about trade and more about building just societies. Ask yourself, who is it that speaks for the people of Mexico, if negotiations proceed. The majority of them are poor and capable of being exploited. Who might take advantage of them? Who speaks for America's workers thrown onto unemployment lines? Who will stand for their rights as children of God, as laborers in the vineyard. As foreign investment in Mexico has risen at a phenomenal rate—from 17 maquiladoras in 1970 to nearly 1,700 today—the wages of Mexican workers literally have been cut in half. Yet their productivity has risen. What's fair, what's honorable, what is just about that? What is just about an authoritarian government that suppresses wages to achieve other purposes?

Mexico's President Salinas has stated: "He wishes to enact the biggest free-trade area in the world and is convinced that foreign investors would find it very attractive."

I would rather he speak about building a free society where his own parliament can debate this agreement, where different points of view are allowed their day in the Sun, and where true liberty has a chance to flourish. Free markets can only be sustained by free societies.

So, this agreement for the United States goes far beyond trade. The issue is how to move these talks to help Mexico build a more democratic society.

Fast-track talks are not the process through which to address such fundamental issues. More appropriately, the United States should model talks after the European Common Market integration which was negotiated carefully. Portugal, Greece, and Spain's per capita income gap with Europe was only one-seventh as wide as the one between the United States and Mexico—yet their integration took 40 years to achieve. But that agreement contained a social charter setting rights to social assistance, collective bargaining, vocational training and health and safety protections as well as a $68 billion regional development fund to narrow the gap between rich and poor countries. We can do no less with Mexico's population now equal to one-third of our own. Let us also clear up any misunderstandings on what fast-track is.

Fast-track is a rule of the House, not a commandment of trade law. It was first adopted in 1974. Prior to that, multilateral and bilateral negotiations—like GATT itself—were negotiated with full and deliberate consultation between the nations involved, and their respective legislative bodies. In the last 17 years, since 1974 when the fast-track procedure was first adopted, the United States still negotiated the vast majority of recent treaties and agreements—18 of them—outside of fast-track. Since 1974, only three agreements have been negotiated under fast-track—United States-Canada, the Tokyo round of the GATT and United States-Israel. These were either complex multilateral agreements or bilateral agreements with nations whose standards of living were much closer to the United States than is Mexico's. Fast-track is not the only alternative to negotiations. Even complex arms reduction agreements have not gone the route of fast-track. All fast-track does is cut Congress out of affecting the substance of the agreement.

There are three types of agreements that can be conducted by the President: First, a treaty which requires advice and consent by the Senate; second, an agreement on tariff cuts in areas where Congress has delegated negotiating authority to the President; and third, an agreement dealing with nontariff measures which must be enacted by Congress because it generally requires changes in U.S. laws. The type of agreement we are being asked to vote on today is the only type that provides for fast-track procedure.

Is it logical that Mexico would walk away from a trade negotiation with the United States if we do not have fast-track? No because another alternative exists. Just last year, President Salinas claimed he wanted a bilateral agreement immediately with advice and consent of the Senate. In any case, key provisions on worker rights, safety, health, and the environment and drugs must be incorporated into the body of the agreement. Worker adjustment provisions in the United States must be funded before Mexico gets trade benefits. We cannot depend on laws that do not have enforcement, nor programs without proper financing up front. A well-conceived agreement would guarantee our own worker adjustment programs, develop rules of origin for Japanese and other foreign investors in Mexico, and require that some of Mexico's exports go to third countries, not just the United States in order to avoid a giant trade deficit with Mexico by the end of the decade.

Finally, the fast-track procedure places U.S. negotiators at a disadvantage. Without fast-track, the U.S. negotiators' hand would be strengthened because they could always say, I'm not sure Congress would approve that request. The negotiators could come back, for example, on environmental provisions and strengthen the U.S. position. With fast-track, the advantage is given to the other nation that knows there is no possibility of amendment in any agreement. Consultations with Congress strengthens—not weakens—negotiators' positions.

I ask my colleagues to vote against fast-track and for the Dorgan motion to disapprove. It is the just vote. It will not stop negotiations—there are other negotiating alternatives. By voting for the Dorgan motion, you send a strong message to the administration that the implications of this negotiation go far beyond a trade treaty and you expect trade to be put in its proper perspective as only one element in building societies in North America, not just trading nations.

A yes vote on the motion to disapprove strengthens the negotiating hand of the United States and it preserves your constitutional rights as a Member of Congress.

Finally, it is right to stand up for America's workers and Mexico's workers against the forces in the marketplace that would seek only to pit them against one another and to degrade our environment. As the old saying goes:

There are some things worth fighting for. Vote yes on Dorgan.

□ 1220

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding this time.

An expanded GATT that would make agriculture, service industries, and patents subject to international rules is very much in the U.S. public interest.—Baltimore Sun editorial, March 14, 1991.

This one line in my hometown newspaper, back in March, set off a flurry of activity among my research staff to discover just what is being proposed in all of these treaties which the leadership—of both parties—has been so interested in fast-tracking.

Like every other congressional office we have received hundreds of letters and position papers on fast-track and Mexico free-trade, most of them supportive, and for the life of me none of the ones we've read say anything about an international rule making body under which we will operate as a Nation.

This fast-track we are voting on today involves both trade negotiations—one with Mexico and another with GATT, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs—which involves 107 other nations.

Well, after much work—with several noted international law firms who have been monitoring GATT—this is the explanation of the ruling mechanism of these treaties.

The principle underlying not only the expanded GATT negotiations, but the Mexico Free-trade Agreement and the already passed Canadian Free-trade Agreement is that any law of a nation or of a state, inside that nation, which could be interpreted as an impediment to the free flow of goods and services across international borders will be subject to challenge by any of the signators to the treaty before a secret international panel. The burden of proof will fall on the nation defending its law, not on the challenging nation.

Our Constitution says that we are innocent until found guilty.

This proposal strikes at the heart of several Constitutional guarantees; first, the right of citizens to petition their government. The rules under which this nation will operate will be under review of a foreign rule-making body, meeting in secret, and their decisions for our country will not be subject to appeal.

How can we petition—with any effect—men who are not elected by us?

Second, we will be giving up the right of judicial review of challenges to State and Federal regulations. The foreign commissions will be composed of international lawyers meeting in secret who will be empowered to meet on the suitability of our law, not the constitutionality of our law.

Third, in the case of patents—the ownership and protection of real property also will move out from under the protection of the Constitution.

Ideologically, it destroys America's 200-year-old commitment to the value of the individual over all other values. Human rights and the quality of life will fall before the demands of the market place, the free passage of goods, and services.

The section of the proposed expanded GATT which deals with the universal standardization of all internal regulations of each member nation is contained in the section on harmonization, discussing the treatment of domestic technical barriers to the flow of goods.

The Canadian Free-trade Agreement [CFTA] can be viewed as a working model of both MFT and GATT. In the short 2 years since it was ratified, many challenges from Canada have been filed to our domestic law—some under GATT provisions—some under Canadian Free-trade.

The challenges range from trying to force us to drop our ban on asbestos to changing our distribution system for beer and the labeling on bottles for brewery products. I would hope that I am not alone in being shocked at the power that has been handed over to a foreign nation to micromanage our business.

We are now being asked to trust the same negotiators who gave away our sovereignty to Canada—on Mexico and GATT.

Imagine what we will be going through as a Congress and a nation when to the micromanagement of Canada, we add the parliament of Mexico's requests and then, with GATT, 107 additional nations begin to meddle and interfere with our safety standards, our labeling laws, even the laws of the State legislatures will be up for review by most of the nations of the world.

We will not have government in this Nation anymore, we will have anarchy.

Now, if our negotiators really were going into this with the best interests of this Nation—under GATT, as it now stands, the United States Trade Representative, Mrs. Hills, would be filing a challenge to France's recent announcement that it was subsidizing Thomson Electronics and Bull—because of their great financial losses.

Under GATT, subsidies to industry are a no-no. But, if we show the teeth in the new trade accords too soon—the other nations will not sign on.

I implore you before you vote on fast-track to look at the teeth in the Canadian agreement. Look at the interference by a foreign nation in our governmental affairs. Think about 107 additional nations being given that power. Then ask yourself if you want to be held accountable, not only by your constituents but by your children and your grandchildren for having given away this wonderful power, the Constitution of this great country provided for us.

Again, let me say, Mr. Speaker, we do not oppose negotiating with Mexico and GATT, but we want to do it in the same careful manner of the European Community which negotiated for years among its members to achieve agreement and iron out the differences and problems and allowed its members to make changes in their respective parliaments.

Support 101. Vote yes, for the United States of America.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I know we are divided on the merits of what potentially lies down the road, but we are debating like we have a finished package before us, upon which we are imposing our own independent judgments.

Let me remind you, those of little faith, that it was our distinguished U.S. Trade Representative who refused to conclude what in her eyes was an unsatisfactory agreement in the Uruguay round. Because of that, we are in the position of hopefully giving her the authority to go back to the negotiating table and to produce a document that this Congress can accept.

Keep in mind, after they reach the end of what they think are successful negotiations, then we have 90 days to review the product, 90 days to examine it thoroughly, and, if it turns out to be satisfactory, or unsatisfactory, after that, it requires enabling legislation, and that is another 60 days. This body can then vote the product up or down.

The truth is, we have, on the basis of Carla Hills' track record, a tough negotiator. She was not willing to compromise on some of the very fundamental, basic questions in that Uruguay round.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge Members, with all due respect to my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, to vote no on House Resolution 101. Let the process proceed, let us have an opportunity to see the product, and then we will be in a better position to render a judgment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Resolution 101, a resolution that would withdraw fast-track trade negotiating authority from the President. This bill is shortsighted and insular, and would irreparably damage the leadership role of the United States in the world economic community.

In my mind, there is no better competitiveness program for the American economy than the continuation of open market policies made possible through improved trade agreements. There is no better jobs program than a dynamic industrial base with the freedom to produce products the world wants to buy. To reject the challenge of open trade is to scale back our future to one defined by minimal job creation and lackluster economic performance.

Setting aside the significance of the Uruguay round for a moment, I will turn first to the Mexican proposal because it has been such a lightning rod for criticism. In my view, the debate should center on the validity of the President's vision of a North American Free-Trade Agreement as the future course for American international economic policy. Those who want the talks called off are finding refuge in the allegation that the fast-track process somehow allows the administration to disregard congressional concerns.

No statement could be more unfair. Responding to the challenge posed by opponents of trade talks with Mexico the administration conducted an intensive, unprecedented study of congressional concerns regarding free-trade with Mexico. Following this bill we will consider here on the floor a resolution reflecting the President's personal commitment to close bipartisan cooperation with Congress throughout the negotiations and beyond.

In an exchange of letters the President says "in seeking to expand our economic growth, I am committed to achieving a balance that recognizes the need to preserve the environment, protect worker safety, and facilitate adjustment." He goes on to spell out a formidable action plan to achieve these aims. As a Member concerned about the power of government to cripple business with restrictions in these areas, I am less comfortable than some with suggestions that the Mexicans adopt our regulatory maze.

Nevertheless, I congratulate our U.S. Trade Representative for the sophisticated level of congressional involvement she has solicited. We have kept her occupied for several months here on the Hill, and it is now time for her to return to the negotiating table with our trading partners. The potential economic opportunities to be had are formidable, and Ambassador Hills has demonstrated that we can trust her to be tough.

In light of the sweeping economic reforms which have occurred in Mexico, the time could not be better for integrating North America under market oriented principles. Seventy cents of every dollar Mexico spends on imports returns directly to the United States. Two-way trade with Mexico totaled $58 billion last year and United States exports have more than doubled since 1987. While Mexican tariffs have been reduced, they are still 2½ times higher than United States duties and remain subject to increase since they are unbound under GATT. Further trade and economic links will lock in tariff reductions while encouraging stability and opportunity along our northern and southern borders.

Unfortunately, we hear exaggerated forecasts of United States plants streaming south to Mexico in search of low wage workers the day an FTA is signed. In testimony, industry after industry discounted this definition of comparative advantage, as one that ignores a host of other elements including technology, capital, land, natural resources, market appeal, and most importantly, worker productivity. I remind my colleagues that low wages in Mexico are a direct reflection of an average worker productivity one-sixth of that in the United States. Furthermore, any company with an investment strategy driven by low wages has already made the move given the current low tariffs on products exported to the United States from Mexico. The average United States tariff vis-a-vis Mexico is 3.9 percent, with 45 percent of imports entering duty free—13 percent free under MFN, 9 percent free from GSP, 22 percent free under H.S. section 9802.

Turning now to the multilateral talks, a successful Uruguay round would contribute literally trillions of dollars to world GNP over the next 10 years. Prospects for a successful outcome, however, are more dim, I believe than for a NAFTA. Because of the important objectives of the private sector in areas such as intellectual property rights protection, services, market access, and agriculture we cannot afford to deny one final attempt to get a multilateral agreement. Yet it is apparent to the world that the Uruguay round is faltering under the weight of the European Communities' trade distorting farm policies.

On this point Congress and the administration are united: Dramatic movement in agriculture must occur immediately following the renewal of fast-track. Otherwise no GATT agreement will be possible or desirable. Getting away with the bare minimum of movement or the illusion of reform will no longer be enough to keep the Uruguay round talks in motion. The painful political choices will be made now or not at all. It would be a mistake to interpret this debate on fast-track renewal any differently.

Whatever the outcome of the two sets of negotiations proposed to us by the President, Congress retains final authority over whether to implement any agreement. Preserving fast-track allows Congress to meet its constitutional responsibilities to shape trade agreements without making it impossible for the Executive to negotiate them. The President deserves the commitment of the House to review each trade agreement in total, as a balance of concessions and economic opportunity. Today, let us not turn our backs on the challenge.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on House Resolution 101.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, time and again we have come to this well to condemn those who would close their markets and challenge those who would discriminate against our products. In raising the prospect today of a North American free-trade area, we do not contribute to that problem. We provide the answer. For in those debates, we argue that with barriers lowered, we would outthink, we would outwork, we would outsell anyone.

Today we do many things, but, most significantly, we test that confidence.

I understand the uncertainty of change. Isolated, secure for two centuries, nature afforded America a market we were unchallenged and without peer in. But those days have ended.

Mr. Speaker, we have always been an ambitous people. Two hundred years ago we formed this Union because individually as States we could not provide the market or the competition to give ourselves the quality of life that we demanded.

Today it is time to change the rules again, to form the world's largest market, a base from which American industry and American workers can challenge the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of the Gordon amendment. I urge support for fast-track. Create a market from which America can truly challenge the world.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I am not against free-trade; I am for it. But I am opposing the fast-track package we have before us, and therefore, am in favor of House Resolution 101.

Mr. Speaker, there are two main reasons for my position. First, on process. This is an important delegation, of congressional authority to the administrative branch. For 185 years this country did not have anything called fast-track. We dealt with trade negotiations with Congress fully involved in the process.

In the last several years we have seen a tremendous transfer of authority to the executive branch. One example of this is the very package we have before us. We are being asked to vote yes or no on a take-it-or-leave-it basis right now.

□ 1230

That itself takes Congress out of the picture. We are doing this to ourselves.

And when the Mexico free-trade agreement comes back before us, it is going to be another take-it-or-leave-it. We will be transferring power and authority away to the executive branch.

The other issue is on substance. If you take a 250-million-person lucrative consumer market and fuse it with an 80-million-person cheap labor market, guess what happens to American jobs? It is pretty darn simple. They are going to leave.

The key is that this is not just a trade bill as advertised, it is actually an investment bill. All of the studies that assume U.S. losses will be minor assume there is no change in investment. But that is the key to the bill. That is the key to the bill in the Mexicans' minds, and the key to the bill in the international companies' minds. They know it is an investment bill, and there will be a tremendous temptation for United States companies to make them more competitive by taking investment out of the United States and putting it in Mexico where the labor is so cheap. That will rob us of jobs.

The administration says this is a competitiveness measure. But the only way it improves competitiveness by is tapping into that 80-million-person market of cheap labor.

The other way in which this bill really is an investment bill is this: In Mexico they do not yet have the standards

on health and safety, child labor, the environment, OSHA, and collective bargaining rights that we have here, and the ones they do have are not enforced. But not meeting U.S. level standards on OSHA, health and safety, child labor, and the environment, United States firms that invest in Mexico can lower their costs of production tremendously. This, in other words, will again make them competitive at our expense, not the world's expense.

I think we need to stand up for America, stand up for this country, stand up for the middle-class people who are working in our districts every day and who expect us to be protecting them.

Free-trade is great in theory, but in actual fact it will hurt us in this particular instance if we do not build in these safeguards. That is why we should vote for House Resolution 101 and against fast-track.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of House Resolution 101 offered by Congressman BYRON DORGAN of North Dakota. H.R. 101 disapproves the extension of fast-track procedures to negotiate international trade agreements.

I am voting against authorizing the extension of fast-track for negotiating the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, more commonly known as GATT, and the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] between Mexico, the United States, and Canada. My decision today is not based on protectionist sentiments nor anti-Mexican bias. Rather, I am not convinced that the desired economic benefits that a free-trade agreement could possibly bring under a NAFTA, as negotiated under fast-track, will be achieved.

My father was a Mexican immigrant who came to the United States in search of work. My cultural and family ties with Mexico have continued over the years. And, as a child growing up in the Southwest and now as a legislator, I have longed for the day Mexico would improve the living standards of its people.

As a Mexican-American, I would like to see Mexico become economically prosperous. I would like to see a Mexico that can become an industrial giant in this global economic community; a Mexico, with over 80 million people, that can shake off the shackles of poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, substandard health care, an inadequate educational system, and a host of other social ills; a Mexico that could put to rest the stigma of the "mordida"—or bribery—in a truly respected judiciary system; a Mexico that is truly democratic and respectful of the rights of all its citizens, and a Mexico that can become a leader among our Latin American neighbors.

To extend fast-track negotiating authority so that this administration and the Mexican Government can craft a free-trade agreement will not solve Mexico's economic ills. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that fast-track is the necessary means to achieve the economic ends that the President so eloquently speaks of. Rather, fast-track is set up to give the executive branch excessive power while stripping Congress of the right to participate in trade policy.

As an advocate of the small business community, one of the fastest growing sectors in our economy, I oppose the extension of fast-track. Using fast-track, particularly for the Uruguay round of the GATT negotiations, could be a death blow to U.S. procurement of services for small and disadvantaged businesses. In its 1991 report, the Commission of the European Communities sent a list of U.S. trade barriers that it would not accept. Among this list, is the Federal procurement to small and disadvantaged businesses. The European Community wants more than trade barriers eliminated, it wants to reduce U.S. procurement services to small and disadvantaged businesses; this, they say, is an impediment to free-trade.

Equally unacceptable is allowing other countries or governing bodies to determine what is a U.S. nontariff trade barrier. Throughout the world, the United States is recognized as a leader in consumer protection and safety. However, under fast-track some of our domestic laws set up to protect consumers could very well be labeled as a nontariff trade barrier by either Mexico, Canada, or some other European countries. By keeping Congress out of the negotiations, the fast-track mechanism becomes a threat to our consumer protection laws, and is thus unacceptable.

While I believe that free and fair trade is beneficial to the United States, I am opposed to extending fast-track negotiating authority. To authorize fast-track would limit congressional duty to actively oversee the NAFTA negotiations. In fact, granting fast-track would allow the administration to structure any agreement it wanted and would restrict congresssional action to a yea or nay vote. Further, since fast-track eliminates the possibility of any congressional amendments, the Congress would be making a mistake if it were to give up its powers to oversee or revise the final agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Dorgan resolution against fast-track negotiating authority.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House today to vote for the Dorgan resolution. I believe that we ought to have a free-trade negotiation with Mexico. I believe we need GATT negotiations. But I do not believe that the Congress ought to irresponsibly abdicate its opportunities and responsibilities to review in detail what comes out of those negotiations.

I have another problem with the administration's position on the Mexico issue. The administration's argument is that we ought to be prepared to accept the loss of low paying jobs, and we ought to instead aim the American economy at capturing high paying jobs, because that inevitably is what is going to happen in world trade. I happen to agree with that. I think that is what is going to happen.

But the problem with fast-track and the problem with the administration's position is that they do not have any plan to transition those workers from poor paying jobs into decent paying jobs.

The Secretary of the Treasury is coming up to my office this afternoon to try to persuade me to support the Initiative for the Americas. The Initiative for the Americas contains funds for job training for workers in Latin America who are displaced because of privatization efforts. Yet, our own job training programs here in this country have been cut by 50 percent since the day Ronald Reagan walked into the White House in 1981.

It just seems to me that before we abdicate our opportunity to take a look at each of the pieces in these trade packages, we ought to know that the administration has a game plan to provide decent job training, decent education, and a decent tax structure so that we can in fact transition those low paid workers who are going to lose their jobs into better jobs. This administration does not have a clue about how to do that, and until they do we ought not to give up our leverage; we ought to vote no on fast-track.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great reluctance and concern to state that I have decided to support the extension of fast-track authority to negotiate a free-trade agreement with Mexico and to vote against the Dorgan amendment of disapproval.

I emphasize my reluctance because I believe our Democratic leadership has not gotten meaningful commitments from the administration regarding the protection of American jobs, the environment, and the enforcement of Mexican labor standards. And why they did not take this opportunity to get these commitments in advance is something I do not understand in view of the disastrous record of this administration and the predecessor Republican administration regarding trade.

Yet I believe deeply that we must finally turn our attention to our own

hemisphere and particularly to our best friend and neighbor in this hemisphere—Mexico. Because of the possibility that this opportunity might finally result in a recognition that our Nation's business is in this hemisphere and might result in an economic and cultural union that will join our economies and our peoples together in a just relationship, I intend to vote against the motion for disapproval.

But I want to make it very clear: If this agreement comes back to this House without being accompanied by realistic requirements protecting American jobs, protecting the American consumer, protecting the North American environment, and protecting the safety and working conditions and freedom of the Mexican work force, I will vote against the agreement when the implementing legislation for this agreement comes before the House. And I would hope that in that case I would be joined by the Democratic leadership of this House in standing up for the American worker.

□ 1240

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER], a diligent, hard-working member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most crucial votes, I believe, we will cast this decade. It is a vote about trade, and it is a vote about American leadership.

Out in my district at the beginning of every month, families, five schoolkids in tow, come into volume and discount stores seeking to buy five pairs of sneakers and having only $50. They are able to do that. They are able to do that because of trade, because of imports.

In another part of my district, high-technology companies have sprouted up along a corridor with thousands of new jobs. That is happening because of trade, because it exports.

Most of the economic growth in the world since World War II has come about because of trade, but this is a vote not only about trade but about American leadership, just as that vote in January on the Persian Gulf was. That was a vote about American diplomatic and military leadership. This is a vote about American economic leadership.

My colleagues, let it not be said that a nation that had the courage to send half a million troops halfway around the world was so lacking in courage that we kept our trade negotiators at home.

Let us defeat this disapproval resolution. Let us support fast-track. Let us support more and fairer trade.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD] to speak in support of House Resolution 101.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, last year the President sent a Clean Air Act over here, the Congress passed it, and asked the people of this country to accept it, because there is a rational environmental need for clean air.

The coal miners of my district didn't like it because it's probably going to cost 10,000 of them their jobs. But they were told they would have to make the sacrifice for the greater good of the country because we value a clean environment here. No one argued then or now with the need—but it sure doesn't make the sacrifice of their jobs any easier.

The coal mines that are still operating in my district, Mr. Speaker, are visited regularly by a Federal or State inspector whose responsibility it is to see that the health and safety standards in those mines are adhered to. They make a thorough check and if something is wrong they make sure it gets fixed. And sometimes they even shut down the mine until the problem is corrected. That creates some additional expense for the employer and a little less money in the pocket of the employee, but those inspections and those corrections in the safety code are made because in this country we value the welfare, safety, and the life of our employees.

Some of the coal miners in my district are into the fourth and fifth generations of their family to work in the mines. Just think of that. Its taken nearly 80 years for a grandfather whose father in 1910 worked for 80-cents an hour to now see his grandson make $15 an hour for this back-breaking work. Now that's a good wage, Mr. Speaker, but its taken 80 years to get there. And in the factories of this country its taken at least that same amount of time to get to $10 and $12 an hour. And even at those wages, if you have a family, you're barely making ends meet. But we've always said in this country that people have a right to a decent wage, that the employer should share fairly in the profits with the workers. In that way, everyone benefits and our standard of living rises. Government has the responsibility of being fair and even-handed with both employer and employees to see that the process works for both.

Well here's the point I'm trying to make. The coal and textile industries in my district and others are suffering, in part because we value a clean environment, workplace safety, and a living wage for our people. But all of a sudden we're willing to toss that in file 13 so we can enter into a trade agreement with the Republic of Mexico.

I have watched the textile industry in my district dwindle away to almost nothing. Those used to be hundreds of goods jobs for American workers but now they're gone forever. Without the environmental, wage, and safety issues—demands for basic human dignity—the foreign competitors have an unfair advantage over American businesses. And our country not only seems to have little interest in that fact but seems eager to speed up the export of American jobs.

I believe in an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. But I do not see any solid guarantees that the three pillars of our domestic economy—wages, safety, and environmental sensitivity—will be built into this free-trade agreement with Mexico.

Our Government is pushing jobs out of our communities and taking opportunities away from our children. And please do not think I have anything against the people of Mexico, for it's people who matter most to me in this whole debate. If we really want to help them, and we should, negotiate a tough trade agreement that stops people from working 14 hours a day for a buck an hour. Demand the same kind of workplace safety to prevent people from being maimed and blinded, then replaced on the assembly line like an interchangeable part. and tell our trading partners we're tired of passing laws on clean air and water only to have our efforts hamstrung by our next-door neighbors.

What I have heard about the corruption in the Mexican Government makes me wonder why we are this anxious to have formal trade agreements in the first place. It continues this fascinating double standard of demanding a high moral code for America but accepting far less from others. And every time we do that we hurt the American people.

I am against a free-trade agreement with Mexico under fast-track procedures which give us little opportunity to correct its mistakes. We should slam on the brakes and give the American family in the Heartland of this country a chance to keep its way of life intact. By continuing to emphasize those ideas that protect our own way of life continue to assist others in need. But when this country grows so eager to turn its back on its own people it's a very dark day indeed.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentelman from Georgia [Mr. JENKINS], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JENKINS], my colleague from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, every single Member in this body, just a few weeks ago, was inundated with people in their district offices wanting to go

to Kuwait to find employment. Does it disturb you as an American that your district offices have been inundated with Americans wanting to go to a Third World country to find employment? It ought to be of some concern to this body.

From some of the people who are for fast-track and talking about how great we have done, let us go back to 1973, because this is an important vote for the future; oh, there may not be much interest today, but there will be a great deal of interest in the next 18 months.

Let us go back to 1973 when we delegated legislative authority to the White House, and as I look at the report in 1973, we had a trade deficit of $6 billion; and the Speaker at that time said, talking about that deficit, that that was the worst we had experienced for decades. Since 1973, when you delegated our legislative authority to the White House, we have accumulated a trillion dollars since 1973 in trade deficits, a trillion dollars since you delegated your authority.

Whose responsibility is it? It is yours and mine, because the Constitution says that we have the responsibility in trade; and, we are giving that authority away to the White House.

Who are those people who negotiate for us, and 2 years later we find them in the employ of foreign governments? They are not elected by the American people. They are appointed people, and we have no control over them.

Oh, yes, you can delegate your responsibility in fast-track. You can do so very easily. But it ought to disturb you that we are searching ways today to try to find some way to encourage savings by Americans, IRA's, all of these various things. My God, the American, working people cannot save. We are losing our high paying jobs to other countries and we are becoming a debtor Nation, and we no longer have families who can save.

We are voting to give authority to the executive branch to negotiate a trade agreement to compete in our own market-place.

I say to you, my colleagues, that you may have made a decision to support fast-track without really looking as to what you are doing. You say, "Well, I will have an opportunity to vote up or down when I see the agreement. I will have that opportunity to vote it up or down." No; you will be stamped at that time. As a former chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, Charlie Vanik, said in 1973, "The Congress should legislate trade policy, not abandon its responsibility."

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, we all heard many thoughtful and provocative remarks on the question of burden sharing during debate on the Defense authorization bill, on how much it costs the United States—in dollars, in jobs, and ultimately, in terms of our long-term economic security—to defend our interests and those of our allies around the world. Proponents of burden sharing, the 357 of us who voted to approve the Dorgan amendment, share the simple, pragmatic understanding that in a vastly different world, politically and economically, those benefiting from our defensive efforts ought to pay their fair share of the costs of those efforts.

Today's debate is not about free-trade. We all support the elimination of trade barriers and the opening of markets. The United States has led the way in this regard. I certainly support these goals. Exports from my home State have increased in recent years and hopefully will continue to do so in the years ahead. More trade is critical to the U.S. economy and to economic growth worldwide.

The American people support free-trade, but 72 percent of those responding to a recent Garin-Hart research poll said they oppose fast-track.

This debate is about fairness, about looking out for U.S. economic interests here at home and assuring that when concessions are made at the bargaining table we get something concrete in return. Recent experience proves otherwise, and so this debate is also about the procedure under which trade agreements are considered by the Congress.

The administration says that without fast-track no trading partner will sit down and negotiate with us. I cannot buy that argument. Investment in the American market is the premier attraction for Asian and European businesses, and the American consumer is still the foreign producer's best customer.

Our trade policy resembles, at best, a scattered approach to achieving our foreign policy objectives rather than a definition and defense of our national economic interests.

According to a January 18, 1991, Washington Times column by economist Paul Craig Roberts, Chrysler Corp. recently learned, while in the process of closing down a United States jeep production facility, that the Japanese had struck a deal with the Bush administration for the purchase of Japanese-made jeeps by the United States military in exchange for Japanese contributions to the Persian Gulf force. For its support of the gulf operation, Turkey sought and was granted a 25-percent increase in its quota limit on textile exports to the United States. Interestingly, Turkey is said to have requested a similar deal from the European Community but was turned down.

Textile concessions are a favorite give-away of our foreign policy program, action hardly consistent with the administration's pledge to correct the textile import problem.

A brief history of the proposed textile agreement in the Uruguay round of the GATT demonstrates the willingness of our negotiators to bargain away our interests here at home without requiring something in return of benefit to our own export industries.

The USTR's initial negotiating position, formulated with congressional and industry leaders, consisted of a plan to:

First, phase out the multi-fiber arrangement, the country-by-country system of quotas governing textile trade, in exchange for the imposition of a global quota system with annual growth rates ranging from 1 to 6 percent and tied to product import sensitivity;

Second, allow no reduction in U.S. tariff rates;

Third, link the phaseout of the MFA to strengthened safeguards, including those concerning the antidumping rules and with respect to government subsidies of production and exports; and

Fourth, the negotiation of broader market access rules, particularly with respect to developing countries, for U.S. products.

The proposed GATT textile agreement is a far cry from that administration/industry starting position. First, the Multifiber Arrangement is indeed headed for a phaseout, and although the agreement contemplates a new quota system, it will not be the global system expected. In fact, the basis on which any new quota system may be imposed is uncertain. In addition, annual growth rate increases will not be limited to between 1 and 6 percent, but will average 8 percent, and the rates will not be tied to product sensitivity to imports. Furthermore, tariffs, safeguards, and market access issues have been addressed in the context of other negotiations, a review of which shows that U.S. tariffs will be lowered and no discernible progress has been made in the area of stronger safeguards or freer market access. It's easy to see where the U.S. industry loses in this deal; but how we could possibly gain is not so clear.

Based on a historical analysis of domestic market growth, the U.S. textile industry projects an annual growth in demand for textile and apparel products of 1 percent per year over the next 10 years. By the year 2001, domestic demand could reach 33 billion square meters of textile and apparel products. Based on Commerce Department projections of import growth under the proposed GATT agreement, the industry estimates imports of textiles to grow at the rate of 8 percent per year over the next 10 years.

Import penetration over this period could result in the loss of two-thirds of domestic production and the loss of 1.4 million jobs in an industry that today employs 1.75 million people. In addition, another 350,000 jobs, of a total of 619,000, in textile support industries, such as, cotton, wool, and man-made fiber production and textile machinery manufacture, could be lost.

The efficiencies of world-wide economies of scale are a grand ideal, but the practical result of this proposed agreement is disaster for the U.S. textile industry, its employees and their families, and the economies of the States and communities in which the businesses reside. Lost tax revenues and increased government payments to the displaced will only add to the extraordinary costs of this ill-advised policy.

We greatly enhanced our status in the world through the success of the Persian Gulf operation. We can further enhance our position by bringing our might to bear in behalf of free and fair trade, and by following a policy that defines and firmly defends our national economic interests.

An equally important question has been raised concerning the propriety of the delegation of authority over foreign trade matters to the President embodied in the fast-track procedure.

We tend to confuse trade pacts with treaties. The Constitution does not. While the

Constitution provides that the Senate "shall advise and consent" with respect to treaties, it explicitly vests jurisdiction over and responsibility for foreign trade to the legislative branch. Article 1, section 8 states:

The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises * * * To regulate commerce with foreign nations.

Under fast-track, we have not merely delegated, we have relinquished all authority over the regulation of foreign commerce to the President, contrary to the direction of the Founding Fathers. It is time to reclaim our authority and to exercise it on behalf of those who elect us to do so.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today we are voting on whether to extend for 2 years fast-track authority to the President for the negotiation of a new multilateral trade agreement under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] and for a North American Free-trade Agreement [NAFTA] with Mexico and Canada.

If extended, Congress will have only 60 days to analyze and vote, up or down on the entire package, on agreements which could set into motion changes of fundamental importance to our trading relationships with the rest of the world and change or repeal a myriad of domestic laws.

After considering both sides of this issue, I have decided that this vote is more about procedure and process, than it is about the probable substance or ramifications of the agreements in question, as proponents of fast-track argue. This is a vote about whether to limit severely the right and responsibility of Congress, and by extension the American people, to set policies which will govern businesses, workers, consumers, the environment, health and safety regulations, and indeed our whole economy.

The fundamental rationale for fast-track authority is to smooth out the bumps in the normal legislative process. It is, as I recall an administrative official telling me during congressional hearings, "impractical" or inconvenient for Congress to meddle in such complicated matters.

There is no doubt that this vote will determine how America will deal with its competitors in the world economy in the 21st century. It is our constitutional duty to make sure our constituents are protected from any bad deals made by unaccountable bureaucrats and appointed officials in the administration. These trade agreements demand the greatest possible public and congressional review, not the least possible, as Ambassador Carla Hills, the President and the rest of the administration seem to want.

Since 1958, when the European Community began its integration process to form a one-market economy, every participating country's representative body had the ability to amend or rescind any or all of its negotiators' agreements every step of the way. When the single EC market takes affect next year, there is no doubt that every citizen will know that his or her interest was taken into account during this lengthy but successful process.

If the Americas and Canada are trying to imitate or have an answer for an integrated Europe, I think the administration's scope is severely limited and insufficient. At the start of its market integration process, EC participants determined social objectives were necessary to include in order for all countries to benefit from a single-market economy. Standards and guidelines for labor, health, safety, and the environment were established for each EC country to adopt and regulate. As the EC closes in on effectuating a single market, it is assured of harmonization which protects not only workers, but citizens and businesses as well.

As far as I can tell, the administration has no such social goals in mind. It has only given us unbinding assurances that it will not dislocate workers, harm the environment, and so on. In my opinion, this administration is missing the mark. It could have taken this opportunity to work with Congress to create social objectives within the frame work of the trade negotiations that not only would have benefited Mexico, but this country as well. Without a social goal or objective in mind, this administration runs the risk of doing more harm to small businesses, our workers and the environment. For this reason, Congress should play a significant role in the negotiations to ensure that the administration does not forget its constituency.

Unfortunately, in the past, Congress has been too quick to relinquish its prerogatives. First established in the 1930's, fast-track authority then gave the executive branch the ability to negotiate and determine tariff levels. As multilateral trade negotiations grew more complex and increasingly involved nontariff matters, successive Presidents sought to enhance the relatively minor fast-track authority granted by Congress during the Depression. Ironically, it was the Nixon administration which first obtained fast-track authority as it is currently used.

After a quarter of a century of sitting on the sidelines and having trade policy basically dictated by the executive branch, it is time for Congress to reassert its role in international economic and trade policies as envisioned by the Founding Fathers. It is time to reverse the trend of the past 25 years which have witnessed a flight of American jobs and businesses offshore, increasing numbers of markets closed to American products, and relative decline in the share of American exports in world markets.

But fast-track is a vote our Founding Fathers would have never cast. Their position with respect to the role of Congress in such matters was clear, unequivocal, and stated succinctly in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution: "The Congress shall have the power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign Nations." Ensuring the role of the legislature in trade policy was an "impracticability" of highest priority to the framers. I went back and read the Federalist Papers—That is very interesting reading. I say to my colleagues. Of all the matters the new government would consider, James Madison argued in The Federalist, "[T]he objects of Federal legislation * * * which are of most importance, and which seem most to require local knowledge, are commerce * * *."

Proponents of fast-track fear Congress might become beholden to special interests and adopt major amendments to the agreements. That is why proponents are seeking to limit the amending power of the Congress. The Founding Fathers, on the other hand, who had fought a successful revolution against an overbearing, dictatorial central government, were careful to emphasize the necessity for the representation of local knowledge—the special interests of the 18th century—in matters of fundamental importance.

They sought to ensure and magnify the role of Congress in such matters, not limit it. Alexander Hamilton wrote in The Federalist while "the executive [is] the most fit agent in [the management of foreign negotiations] the vast importance of trust and the operation of treaties as laws plead strongly for the participation of * * * the legislative body in the office of making them."

There is no reason to believe that a new GATT agreement or NAFTA would not be approved and implemented by this Congress. Without fast-track, Congress has approved at least 89 multilateral treaties, conventions, and trade agreements under the normal legislative process in the past 25 years.

Some of these agreements, such as the 144-nation telecommunication agreement or the 100-nation trademark treaty were nearly as complex as those now under negotiation. In addition, Congress has given its approval to a series of arms control agreements without fast-track authority. In short, when in the national interest, Congress has a strong record of approving treaties and agreements.

There is no question these ongoing negotiations could affect millions of jobs. The negotiations will also affect the every day lives of all citizens. If Congress relinquishes its amending powers by approving fast-track, the American people run the risk of seeing domestic health, safety, and environmental protection dismantled under the rubric of removing nontariff trade

barriers. For example, under the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement, Canada is now suing the United States for its ban on asbestos claiming it is an unnecessary barrier to trade. Some analysts contend fast-track approval would constrain the ability of Congress to insist on domestic food safety legislation which limits the use of such cancer-causing substances such as DDT.

While opening trade with our neighbors and allies is a necessity in this era of global economics, the procedure must be consistent with constitutional prescriptions in favor of congressional preemption. Our Founding Fathers would have never jeopardized the economic security of average Americans. They would have insisted on strong congressional control and so should we.

I have voted against most efforts to restrict free-trade, but will oppose extending fast-track. As chairman of the Grains Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, I hope to be able to vote again for reducing trade barriers with all nations, including Mexico. I remain encouraged substantive agreements can be reached in the current round of trade talks. All I am asking for is an accountable, democratic procedure to make sure the agreements are arrived at fairly and equitably.

□ 1250

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is the most important issue and vote on international trade this Congress has faced in the last quarter century. Our friends in Mexico understand that. Recently, President Salinas summed up what is at stake in a speech to the Texas Legislature. He said: "We are at a stage in history when we can take meaningful steps that ensure the competitiveness of our countries and the welfare of our peoples for generations. Seldom do these opportunities arise in the course of history. We cannot afford to limit ourselves to short-term and local interests."

The talented leadership in Mexico has taken steps to increase trade and improve the quality of life in that country. That leadership has unilaterally reduced tariffs by 80 percent since 1986, and in the process our exports to Mexico have more than doubled and 400,000 new jobs for American workers have been created. This kind of progressive economic policy will help the economies of both our countries to grow.

Rejection of fast-track would greatly undermine our President and our Nation's ability to negotiate agreements with our trading partners, not just in this hemisphere but throughout the world. Rejection of this trade procedure would do long-term harm to the interests of our Nation.

I firmly believe that fast-track is a procedure that is both practical and fair. It allows our negotiators to do their job, but it also ensures that they must listen and consider the concerns of Americans who will have to live with the results of a trade agreement. Killing fast-track will only hurt our chances of reaching any future trade agreements.

Recently I met with local leaders in El Paso, TX, an important city on our border with Mexico. Government, business, academic, and health care leaders spoke to me about what this opportunity means to them. Environmental problems make this a local issue in many towns and cities along our border, but it is far from a parochial concern because that border stretches for 2,000 miles. Most of those local leaders feel this is an opportunity for positive change. The Rio Grande River is one of the most polluted rivers in this hemisphere. Many people in that region feel isolated, remote, and ignored. This vote is a chance to improve the quality of life on both sides of the border. Let us not waste this opportunity. We must seize this moment to begin to correct the serious environmental problems that exist along our Southern border, to increase the standard of living for Americans and Mexicans, to make our Nation more competitive in the world marketplace and to be a responsible friend to our neighbors in this hemisphere.

I urge rejection of the Dorgan resolution and endorsement of the fast-track procedure.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER], my hardworking friend from the Lehigh Valley.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, the good news in the American economy is that manufactured goods are our leading exports, export-led growth is the bright spot in the American economy.

Industrial heartland States like Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania export $42 billion a year, nearly all of which is manufactured products. A billion dollars means 20, 25,000 jobs. We need more, not less.

The barriers with Mexico are higher for exports from America to Mexico than they are from Mexico to the United States. Let Members lower them. We can export more to Mexico. Pennsylvania exported $8.5 billion worth of largely manufacturing goods to the world in 1991, and Mexico ranked fifth out of the 177 markets for Pennsylvania products. No one can tell me that the Lehigh Valley of Mexico will not benefit from an expanded trade agreement.

We are in the industrial heartland, we have jobs at AT&T, Air Products and Chemicals, Bethlehem Steel, Binney and Smith, Daytimers, Fuller, Ingersoll-Rand, ITT, Just Born Candies, Lutron, Mack Trucks, Pfizer, Rexroth, Rodale Press, Stanley Vidmar, Union Pacific, Victaulic, all agree that we will expand employment opportunities for our manufacturing workers in Pennsylvania. Blue collar America, industrial heartland State Democrats should be for this bill because it expands manufactured exports, the leading light in the U.S. economy today.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 101 in order to allow fast-track negotiations to take place.

I want to point out the issue here today is, do we negotiate or not? I can assure Members that without fast-track authority, we are not not going to get a negotiated agreement of any kind.

In our State of Washington, one in five jobs is involved in international trade. Men and women who work for the ports, in agriculture, in forest products, manufacturing, especially aerospace and electronics. We have found that free-trade, fair trade, like that negotiated with Canada, not only creates but saves jobs.

Now Mexico has already reduced tariffs, yet their tariffs are 250 percent higher than ours, 10 percent on the average on products going into Mexico, 4 percent on goods coming into the United States. Why are we against trying to reduce the tariffs and level that playing field, those Members who support the Dorgan resolution?

We face unprecedented economic competition in 1992 with the European Market. Why would it not make sense to form a North American common market as well with 360 million consumers, $6 trillion in economic output, 20 percent larger than Europe?

It was pointed out earlier, Mr. Speaker, the average salary in Mexico is $1,800 a year. We have heard talk about concerns for human rights and the environment. Then, why do Members not want to see free and fair trade agreements that can impact those very diversities that we all abhor?

Members tell me why poverty in Mexico was such a good deal, and why do not want a free-trade, a fair trade agreement that is going to allow economic growth to occur on both sides of that border, and address those very problems? Explain that to me.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the President be given the tools needed to open foreign markets to U.S. goods and services and to promote free-trade relations worldwide. To advance U.S. interests competing in an international marketplace, the President also needs the flexibility to work with other countries to negotiate rules to ensure fair trade. Extending fast-track authority to the President will allow him to do all three.

The export of U.S. goods and services is vital to the health of our economy. Increased opportunities to sell U.S. products in other countries is necessary to reduce the U.S. trade deficit and to keep U.S. workers employed. Unless we give President Bush the authority to go to the table and negotiate a free-trade agreement with Mexico, Canada, or with any other country, we risk sacrificing the benefits our country so badly needs to gain.

I firmly believe that a North American Free-trade Agreement would serve as a catalyst for future economic growth and development in the United States, Mexico, and Canada. An

agreement that phases out remaining Mexican and United States barriers will place industries on both sides of the border in a better position to compete with Asia and Europe. The creation of a North American Free-Trade Agreement would unite the three nations of North America into the world's largest free-trade area—20 percent larger than the European Community. It would be comprised of 360 million consumers and $6 trillion in output.

As we have already witnessed in our trading relations with Canada, a free-trade agreement will increase the exchange of goods and services, reduce prices, and increase the variety of products available to consumers. Since 1986, under the leadership of President Carlos Salinas, Mexico has made great strides in opening its markets to foreign imports by significantly reducing import tariffs and licensing requirements. The United States has been the prime beneficiary of Mexico's increased openness. United States-Mexican trade exceeded $58.6 billion in 1990, double the amount in 1986. The United States accounts for two-thirds of Mexico's trade. We supply Mexico with more than two-thirds of its imports and take nearly 70 percent of its exports.

United States exports to Mexico have more than doubled over the past 4 years, rising from $12.4 billion in 1986 to $28.4 billion in 1990. In the State of Washington, where one in every five jobs is dependent on international trade, exports to Mexico increased 25 percent during this same period. This export growth has meant hundreds of thousands of jobs for Americans. It is estimated that some 538,000 United States jobs are related to our exports to Mexico.

Despite these encouraging statistics, Mexico still has more restrictive trade barriers than the United States. Mexico's average duty is 10 percent, compared to 4 percent in the United States. Significant nontariff barriers remain in Mexico, including import licenses and investment restrictions that affect both investment and trade. In negotiating a North American Free-Trade Agreement, we could lock in current Mexican reforms as well as move toward even greater openness in the Mexican economy. A Labor Department-contracted study projects a net job increase of 64,000 jobs in the United States resulting from a free-trade agreement with Mexico.

It is important that the United States encourage the efforts of President Salinas and work to forge a fair and free-trading agreement. The goal of both countries in doing so should be to increase the standard of living in both countries. Creating new employment opportunities in Mexico will help the United States increase its exports of consumer and capital goods. At the same time, it will help to widen the Mexican industrial base which will in turn improve the Mexican economy. This will serve to further increase the demand for United States goods and services in Mexico. I believe it is incumbent upon the opponents of a Mexican-American Free-Trade Agreement to explain how the United States would benefit from a weakened and unstable neighbor to our south.

The establishment of a free-trading bloc with our neighbors will be essential if the United States is to compete in a global market. It is especially important as we look toward competing with a united European marketplace in the near future. Other countries are also working out new regional and other trade arrangements. Unless the President has the authority to represent U.S. interests at the negotiating table, these new trading arrangements would be accomplished without our input.

The Uruguay round negotiations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade represent 4 years of effort on the part of Congress, the private sector, and the administration to develop internationally agreed upon rules to improve trade relations worldwide. Substantial progress has been made to develop rules in the areas of services, intellectual property rights, and investment. The President needs the authority to send Carla Hills back to finish the job.

At a time of great economic upheaval in Eastern Europe and rapid change in Latin America it is vital that the United States continue to lead and be ready to negotiate the rules of a new international economic order. A collapse of the Uruguay round triggered by the removal of fast-track would increase world wide pressures to raise trade barriers and could contribute to a global recession.

The United States has an excellent opportunity to negotiate both a trilateral and a multilateral trade agreement which are vital to improving the economic health of our Nation. If fast-track authority to the President is denied, both are in jeopardy. I greatly fear that all international trade negotiations with the United States would be discontinued. We cannot expect any country to negotiate with us unless our representative has the same authority as our trading partner—the authority to enter into an agreement.

Under fast-track procedures, Congress will be consulted on the contents of any agreement and has the authority to reject it if its concerns are not properly addressed. I am confident that the administration will listen to my concerns and those of my colleagues. We will work together to ensure that U.S. interests are fully advanced. But we must give the President the ability to at least go to the negotiating table.

Mr. Speaker, I support extending fast-track authority to the President for an additional two years. I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposing House Resolution 101.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state my strong support for fast-track trade negotiating authority, and my opposition to the resolution of disapproval. This authority will allow the administration to negotiate a North American Free-Trade Agreement with Mexico, as well as conclude the Uruguay round of the GATT talks.

Fast-track is a procedure, and the upcoming fast-track vote is a procedural one. It is important to remember that the Congress has final say on any trade agreement that is reached. It is also vitally important to know that the Congress will not be shut out of these crucial trade negotiations. President Bush and U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills have shown a commitment to engage the Congress in the negotiation process.

President Bush has delivered to the Congress his action plan for the negotiations. I have studied that plan carefully, and I believe that it shows the President is personally committed to addressing the tough workers' rights and environmental issues involved in the Mexico talks. He has also stated his firm support for providing effective adjustment assistance and retraining for workers in the United States that may be affected by any agreement. I believe him.

The United States and Mexico are already linked by unbreakable ties of culture, family, and community. We share more than just billions of dollars in trade—we share a continent and millions of people that daily cross our long border. Mexico, of course, suffers from problems of poverty, environmental degradation, emigration of skilled workers, and an uneven distribution of wealth. Now is not the time to turn our backs on our Mexican neighbors, but instead to engage them as full commercial partners as we do the Canadians. Only through economic growth and increased wealth will Mexico be able to address these problems. And the best way to increase wealth is through increased trade.

A Mexico agreement, as well as a successful completion of the Uruguay round of the GATT, will also result in tremendous new export opportunities for our country. For my State of Minnesota, and for other agricultural economies in the Midwest, Mexico is a tremendous market for farm goods. Since the Mexican Government lowered tariffs on certain products in 1987, Minnesota's exports to Mexico have increased in value by 81 percent. In fact, United States agricultural exports to Mexico have risen 134 percent since 1986, and today we account for three-fourths of Mexico's total agricultural imports. By further lowering tariffs and eliminating nontariff barriers, our agricultural exports to Mexico will increase even more dramatically.

Let us vote down the Dorgan resolution—support fast-track negotiating authority, continue to work with the administration to address the concerns we have with the negotiations, and create jobs and strengthen the economies of the United States, Mexico, and Canada through increased trade.

□ 1300

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. LONG].

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time, and rise in support of his resolution. My experiences in business and agriculture have made me believe that the decision we make today will be one of the most significant we will make during the 102d Congress. Our decision will have

enduring impact on our Nation's economy, business, and most importantly—working families.

I studied the research and data, long and hard, before coming to a decision.

I support the Dorgan resolution because I believe extending fast-track authority will hurt those in our society who can least afford another hit, middle-income families and small businesses.

During the past decade, middle-American families have seen their incomes erode. Extending fast-track authority to American-Mexico negotiations will result in further exporting of our jobs to Mexico and put our workers in competition with workers in a country that has shown little respect for fair wages or working conditions. And small businesses, unlike big corporations, cannot afford high-priced lobbyists to be their voice in Washington—they depend on their Representative to be their voice in Washington. Fast-track authority diminishes their voice.

I urge my colleagues to support middle-American families and small business by supporting the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] is recognized for a total of 2 minutes.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental issue is whether we are a Congress with a President under a Constitution, or whether we are Parliament under a Prime Minister. Over 200 years ago in Philadelphia we decided that question. We decided that we would be a Congress under a President, rather than a Parliament under a Prime Minister, that we would have the right not only to regulate commerce, but we would have the inherent right to offer amendments.

President Nixon in his imperial Presidency said, "Eliminate the power to offer amendments. Just vote yes or no on what I negotiate."

Unfortunately, that Congress went along at that time and today we have come to such a point that President George Bush has said, "If Congress denies me this fast-track authority, they will be infringing upon my power." He interprets the Constitution in an upside-down way.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the issue is not one of trade. The issue is one of investment. Where will the future investment of business go? Will it go where the wages are $10, $15 an hour, or will it go where the wages are $1 an hour, and what type of business are we talking about?

I come here as the chairman of the Small Business Committee. The Small Business community is not clamoring for this. It is the big business community, and it is not the American big business community. There is no such thing as American big business anymore. There is not even multinational business. There is only transnational business, corporations that owe allegiance to no country, corporations that owe allegiance only to the bottom line and want to invest where they can operate at the lowest possible cost with the greatest possible market to sell to. That is what is at stake here, the loss of American jobs, the turning of the U.S. Congress into a parliamentary body under not a President, but a Prime Minister.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Vermont. [Mr. SANDERS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for a total of 2 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank both gentlemen for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 101, the Dorgan resolution. Every sensible person believes in free-trade when free-trade will benefit the workers of our country and the workers and the people of our trading countries that we deal with, when both sides gain. This fast-track agreement will not do that.

Mr. Speaker, there is an excellent reason why millions of American workers and their unions are opposed to fast-track, why tens of thousands of farmers and their organizations are opposed to fast-track, why virtually every environmental organization in this country is opposed to fast-track.

There is also a good reason why the major multinational corporations, without exception, believe that fast-track makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Speaker, let us acknowledge what has happened in this country in the last 20 years, and that is that the standard of living of the American people has dropped precipitously. We are poorer right now. We used to be first in the world. We are now ninth in the world in terms of wages and benefits our workers receive, and why is that? One of the reasons is that the major multinational corporations have thrown millions of our workers out on the street as they have gone to Mexico, to Asia, in search of slave labor to pay people $1 an hour, rather than the $15 or $20 an hour that our working people deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support a fast-track agreement with Mexico when our workers are asked to compete with people who are living in desperation, who are forced to work for starvation wages, who are forced to compete against workers who cannot join free-trade unions, who cannot participate in free elections, who cannot gain from environmental standards that we enjoy here today.

Mr. Speaker, I also as a former mayor am deeply concerned about other aspects of this fast-track agreement.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Dorgan amendment, and in support of the fast-track agreement.

Mr. Speaker, during the past several months a great deal has been said about the ramifications of granting the administration fast-track authority to conduct free-trade negotiations with our most important Latin American neighbor, Mexico. A number of concerns have been made about the potential threat that a free-trade agreement may pose to American jobs and the environment along the United States/Mexico border. Others have raised questions about worker rights in Mexico and the possibility that free-trade between our two countries will result in a higher degree of drug trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, some of these concerns are legitimate, but others, I am afraid, have been exaggerated. The point is that the administration has made explicit commitments to address these concerns in the course of the negotiations. But most importantly, Congress will be intimately involved throughout this process. The House Democratic leadership and the Committee on Ways and Means, chaired by our colleague, DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, will be consulted and participate in drafting any final treaty that may be reached with Mexico. I have faith that the gentleman from Illinois will ensure that the administration holds to its commitments to address these important issues.

But if the administration chooses to ignore Congress and submits a free-trade agreement with Mexico that fails to ease the burden of any job displacement, or which fails to provide environmental protection measures, then we in Congress will have not only an opportunity, but a responsibility to defeat the final agreement.

Mr. Speaker, others before me have pointed out the enormous potential economic benefits that a fair free-trade agreement will bring to both the United States and Mexico. Every unbiased study of this issue has concluded that the elimination of trade barriers between our two countries will result in new markets for American exports, economic growth, and the creation of new jobs.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a special appeal to my Democratic colleagues and urge them to vote against the Dorgan resolution and support fast-track authority. I urge my Democratic colleagues to consider this issue from a historical perspective because, for much of the last 130 years, it has been the Democratic Party which has fought the protectionist policies of previous Republican administrations. It was the Democratic Party which opposed the most protectionist legislation in this country's history—the Smoot-Hawley Act—which was passed by a Republican Congress

and signed by a Republican President in 1930.

Moreover, it has been the Democratic Party which has traditionally sought to improve our relations with Latin America and encourage the growth of democracy in this hemisphere.

It was a Democratic President, Franklin Roosevelt, who had the foresight to initiate the "Good Neighbor Policy," which was designed to put the improvement of our relations with Latin America on a fast-track. Free-trade was essential to Roosevelt's vision. "We desire by every legitimate means," Roosevelt said, "to promote freedom of trade."

Thirty years later, it was another Democratic President, John Kennedy, who sought to overturn 8 years of Republican neglect toward Latin America by establishing the Alliance for Progress. Again, free-trade was at the heart of his dream. "Let us not miss the point," Kennedy once told a group of dock workers, "the new jobs opened through trade will be far greater than any jobs which will be adversely affected."

Mr. Speaker, a free-trade agreement with Mexico, if freely and fairly negotiated, will be one more monument to the Democratic Party's traditional commitment to creating jobs through trade. We must welcome, not fear, the prospect of tearing down economic barriers and competing with an economy that is a fraction of the size of ours.

By voting for fast-track, Democrats can reclaim the mantle of free-trade and international cooperation with Latin America. We can send a bold message to Americans north and south of the Rio Grande: The expansion and consolidation of economic ties through free-trade is good for the United States, Mexico, and every other country which chooses to join us.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I support the fast-track and oppose the resolution, for a multiplicity of reasons.

One, very seriously, you cannot move the Great Wall of China and place it around the United States of America.

Second, you cannot bring down the Berlin Wall and place it between us and Mexico.

The best interests of the United States of America, indeed, our very national security, demands a stable Mexico, economically, socially, and politically. This is what it is all about.

As chairman of the Agricultural Committee, I was one of the negotiators when we worked out the agreement with Canada, and we will be major players when we work with Mexico and as we work with GATT. I can assure you of that, no matter who says what. We were major participants. We will be major participants. The needs of agriculture will be met, I can assure you of that; but the most important thing is, we cannot wall ourselves in. We cannot stop the world and jump off.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] a hard-working member of the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 101 and in strong support for renewing fast-track authority for trade negotiations. It is very important to differentiate between providing the authority to negotiate foreign trade agreements and any actual future agreements themselves. Too many participating in the debate on fast-track, whether here in Congress or in the public at large, are confusing these two very different issues.

Today's vote on fast-track is really a vote on whether or not the United States should enter into international trade agreements. Fast-track is nothing more than a procedure to get foreign trade agreements enacted, along with the implementing legislation that they require. Fast-track is a tool providing the President with the authority to negotiate any trade agreements that require legislation, as most major ones do.

Today's vote is not a vote for or against the proposed United States-Mexico free-trade agreement or the GATT Uruguay round. The free-trade agreement with Mexico has not even been negotiated yet. The complex worldwide GATT talks are presently stuck in a deadlock over agricultural issues. Today's vote is on fast-track, a procedure giving the President the authority to negotiate these and other important trade agreements. A vote against fast-track is, quite simply, a vote against any foreign trade agreements at all.

Continuing and expanding international trade is an essential element of U.S. economic growth and prosperity. Last year alone, exports were responsible for 80 percent of total United States economic growth. That percentage continues to grow higher. Without fast-track authority to reach new agreements which expand the United States export market, we will eliminate almost all of our economic growth potential. That is irresponsible and unwise.

Fast-track is not new. Since 1934, Congress and the President have worked together to get tariffs reduced around the world. Congress first created fast-track in 1974 as an effective means to deal with our increasingly complex trade agenda. Fast-track has governed every major trade negotiation in the 17 years since.

Fast-track is poorly named, for it is neither fast nor on a track. It does not mean that negotiators are rushed, or that anyone is railroaded into approving any agreement that might be negotiated. Fast-track simply provides two guarantees essential to a successful trade negotiation. It does not allow trade agreements to be amended to death and it assures our trading partners that there will be a vote on the agreement within a fixed period of time.

Fast-track gives the President the same bargaining power already possessed by his counterparts, namely the ability to assure that the deal they make at the negotiating table will be the deal that is voted on by Congress. Without that assurance, foreign governments are very reluctant to negotiate with the United States, and will not make tough concessions. No negotiating partner will give its bottom line knowing that the bargain could be reopended.

The U.S. Constitution vests the President with the power to negotiate with foreign governments and the Congress with the power to regulate international commerce. The President's negotiators, in an agreement, can commit the United States to change its laws—like reduce certain tariffs. But, only Congress can enact those changes. If Congress does not like the agreement our negotiators present, Congress can reject it and the bargaining process begins again.

Congress is certainly not left out of the process and has far more input than an up-or-down vote on the final agreement. Based on the experience of the last three agreements we have enacted under fast-track, a lot happens prior to that vote. In earlier trade talks, the administration brought draft agreements back to Congress while they were still being negotiated and briefed Congress in detail on what was being discussed. The trade-related committees in the House and Senate held what could best be called shadow markups; where Congress objected, our negotiators went back to the table for changes. In fact, this process strengthens the hand of our negotiators. By the time Congress must either approve or reject a final agreement, the treaty has already been carefully reviewed and actually revised by Congress. Further, there is no doubt that the current debate here in Congress and the numerous official exchanges between Congress and the administration have clearly outlined the issues of concern that must be satisfactorily addressed before agreeing to any new trade agreement.

Additionally, we have before us today, House Resolution 146, the legislation introduced by the Democratic majority leader Mr. GEPHARDT that clearly states the objectives to be achieved by trade negotiations between the United States and Mexico. As if the administration didn't know our concerns already, this measure restates them and instructs that any new free-trade agreement: First, must provide adequate transitional safeguards to minimize industry, agriculture, and

worker dislocations; second, be accompanied by an effective worker adjustment program serving workers displaced by the United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement; and third, be accompanied by a joint program to address border environmental problems related to air and water pollution, hazardous wastes, chemical spills, pesticides, and enforcement.

I support President Bush's trade objectives to use the fast-track process to negotiate a North American free-trade agreement and a successful completion of the GATT Uruguay round. Both agreements will be beneficial to our economy. The United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement underscores that. Since the United States-Canada free-trade accord, bilateral trade has grown despite recessions in both countries. Incidentally, Canada's recession is worse. Our deficit has narrowed and U.S. agricultural exports have risen 35 percent.

Just 2 weeks ago, I had the opportunity to participate in the 31st Mexico-United States and Interparliamentary Conference. I began my participation in these interparliamentary meetings when I was first elected to Congress in 1974. I've seen many changes, some good and some not so good, in United States-Mexican relations during this time. I can safely say that Mexico has come a long way in economic, political, social, and environmental areas, among others.

A good portion of this year's conference was devoted to the issue of free-trade between the United States and Mexico. Based on all of the information I have received from a very wide variety of sources and based on my comprehensive discussions in Mexico, I believe that a free-trade agreement is essential not only for improved ties between our two countries but also for the stimulus it will provide for both the United States and the Mexican economies.

It has become apparent already that discussions on a free-trade agreement have helped advance talks on other important bilateral issues. The Bush administration and the Salinas administration have strengthened the operation of the Binational Commission which brings together many of the cabinet officials of our two countries in regular working meetings. These meetings focus on the various projects and problems which affect each nation. The positive effect of a free-trade agreement will mean economic growth for both nations and will help contribute toward solving some of the other problems we face.

The strong emphasis of the Bush administration on securing a free-trade agreement with Mexico is also tied in with the President's Enterprise for the Americas initiative and the objective of securing a hemisphere-wide free-trade area. Some might say that is unrealistic, but when looking at the movement in Europe to form in 1992 a common economic market, it becomes imperative that the nations of our hemisphere join together in order to meet the economic challenge presented by Europe '92.

The support of the United States for the concept of a free-trade agreement with Mexico demonstrates for the rest of the world the commitment of our country to promoting open trading and investment relations. By this example, we reinforce the importance for all nations of liberalizing their trading regimes. This can have a significant influence on the GATT negotiations on agricultural subsidies, the issues which led to the collapse of the Uruguay round. I believe it is vital that we continue to press for substantial reduction of agricultural subsidies from the European Community and from Japan and Taiwan.

Above all, the achievement of a free-trade agreement between the United States and Mexico would signal a historic advance in the nature of the relationship between our two countries. I believe it would represent a turning point which leaves behind all the negative, antagonistic conflicts that have affected our ties over the past century and a half.

I am very concerned, however, that a rejection by the Congress of the President's request for fast-track authority to negotiate this agreement would be viewed as a slap in the face of Mexico. The fallout both in Mexico and in United States-Mexican relations would be severe, negatively affecting the illegal narcotics, illegal immigration, and environmental problems among others. President Salinas has put his country's future, not to mention his own political future, on the line by instituting major free market economic reforms, including privatization. Unlike in the past, we are now able to consider a free-trade agreement because of these significant economic changes. Failure to pass fast-track and proceed with free-trade negotiations could result in a dramatic swing back to the left in Mexico, hurting both Mexican and American economies and other bilateral issues.

The free-trade agreement will increase the demand for labor in the United States and in Mexico. It will have a substantial positive effect on real income and increased employment in Mexico. The free-trade agreement will improve the trade balance between both nations and most other trading partners. The free-trade agreement should also increase the return on United States investment made in Mexico, will increase the return on Mexican capital investment, and will mean increased domestic savings and investment in Mexico. The free-trade agreement will mean reduced prices for imports of Mexican goods into the United States and it will increase the prices United States and Mexican exporters receive for their goods in trade with other nations.

With all the benefits that will accrue to both nations, it is difficult to understand why the debate over the free-trade agreement is so heated. The fears of labor groups in the United States that additional jobs will be lost ignore the fact that even without a free-trade agreement, new investment and new industries will be locating in Mexico. It is very clear that if Mexico cannot reach an agreement with the United States, it will look elsewhere for establishing a liberalized trading regime and Japan offers an obvious target. If the United States fails to achieve an accord with Mexico, the United States will be the biggest loser, not Mexico.

I cannot emphasize often enough that by entering into a free-trade agreement with Mexico, the United States is not only helping Mexico, but also is contributing to the expansion of the United States economy and the growth of United States jobs. Right now, Mexico has reasonably good access to the United States market, and a free-trade agreement would help the United States gain fairer access to the Mexican market.

I would like to address the often repeated but inaccurate concerns about a United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement. It is important to note that many of these concerns have been raised directly with the administration by leading Democrats who were previously skeptical about fast-track. The lengthy, detailed reply from President Bush addressing these specific concerns and providing solid assurances that they would be positively taken care of, not ignored or bargained away, resulted in these former opponents changing to now support fast-track.

Environmental concerns are among those that have been raised. The best way to address the environmental problems in Mexico is through a new free-trade agreement. In order to reach such an agreement, Mexico would be required to implement strict environmental standards. The economic benefits resulting from increased trade and investment would provide Mexico with the financial ability to enforce tough environmental laws, something Mexico presently is unable to do fully.

Recognizing the positive influence the United States can have on improving environmental awareness and standards, many major American environmental groups like the National Audubon Society, the National Resources Defense Council, and the National Wildlife Federation have all endorsed fast-track and negotiating a United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement.

Knowing that agriculture is an important part of the local economies of

Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties, along with others I have expressed concerns about the impact of a United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement on local agriculture, particularly avocados and citrus. The President has assured Congress that any new agreement would address a number of achievable goals including strict rules of origin, harmonized standards for agricultural chemicals, a quick snapback tariff remedy for sudden import surges, and maintenance of quality directed marketing orders. American laws against illegal product dumping and other unfair trade practices would not be changed and will be enforced.

A key element to any future GATT or free-trade agreement with Mexico will be the establishment of a scientifically based sanitary and phytosanitary code for agricultural products. Such a code is critical to the protection of U.S. agricultural areas from diseases and pests foreign to this country. Under an agreement, U.S. agencies would continue to set health and safety standards as they do today. A free-trade agreement would not remove or lower U.S. food safety requirements.

However, a sanitary and phytosanitary code would prevent other countries from erecting trade barriers under the guise of food safety precautions. Nonscientific standards imposed capriciously to limit trade would be strictly prohibited.

Avocados are particularly import sensitive for phytosanitary reasons. The seed weevil pest has infested all Avocado-growing areas in Mexico, and there are no known methods for eradicating the pest. If the seed weevil were to spread to the United States, California growers would be devastated.

I have been in close contact with U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Yeutter and the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service [APHIS] regarding the FTA and avacado imports. APHIS has assured me that USDA recognizes the seed weevil infestation in Mexico. USDA does not accept the notion of seed weevil free areas. In short, the USDA has required Mexico to prove: First, that seed weevils are not present in Mexico; and second that the pests can be eradicated. The USDA does not expect a response from Mexico because they are unable to respond to these requirements in the affirmative.

Because every free-trade agreement is not 100 percent free and open, we can and will include special provisions and restrictions to ensure that pests like the seed weevil do not infect the United States. Incidentally, our concerns about the negative effects of Mexican agriculture should diminish with the free-trade agreement. As with other environmental issues, Mexico will have the wherewithal to confront problems like the seed weevil and the excessive use of pesticides. Today, Mexico does not have the economy capability to do so, yet Mexican agriculture does cross our borders.

The domestic market for citrus products is fully developed. Sunkist, the leading citrus cooperative, does not expect domestic consumption of citrus products to significantly increase in the near or distant future. As a result, there will be no opportunity for increased California citrus production unless foreign markets are opened to the United States.

The United States currently applies a 1-cent per pound tariff on Mexican citrus products. Because this tariff is so small, Sunkist believes the Mexican share of the United States citrus market would not increase appreciably under a FTA. However, Sunkist is currently excluded from the Mexican market because of prohibitive licensing requirements. The FTA would eliminate these nontariff barriers.

Worldwide barriers to American agriculture, including locally grown products like citrus and wine, are many. It is always interesting to me—and somewhat painful—to observe that there always seems to be more French wine in Mexico than California wine. A successful completion of the GATT Uruguay round should help remove these barriers opening up important new markets for California products. But, without fast-track, we cannot complete GATT and realize the economic benefits it will bring us. That is why the Farm Bureau and over 50 other major U.S. farms groups, including Blue Diamond, Sunkist and the avocado growers support fast-track and the trade agreements it could produce.

Labor has raised many concerns about new trade agreements, particularly the United States-Mexico Free-trade Agreement. I've already touched on some labor issues. Let me expand further. It is true that some jobs will be lost. But, it is also true that they will be lost with or without a United States-Mexico FTA. Many companies are moving out of the United States because of high labor costs and government regulations, moving to Mexico, especially if it is linked to the United States by a comprehensive free-trade agreement is far more beneficial to the United States than its moving to Malaysia or Korea and purchasing all its materials from Japan. Without the new trade agreements fast-track will provide that open up markets for U.S. goods, we will have no new job opportunities for labor whose jobs are presently leaving the United States anyway. American industry is constantly changing as we gain and lose competitive advantage in various sectors. We succeed and prosper because we are able to adapt to changes and take advantage of new opportunities to replace lost ones. Without fast-track, we lose these new opportunities.

Further, President Bush has announced a new, special job training and reemployment program to offset any new possible negative effects of a United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement.

Consider this example presented recently in an editorial from the Washington Post.

> In the 1950's, low-wage industries like textiles were moving from New England to the South—over the bitter protests of the labor unions that are now fighting fast-track. That southward migration certainly cost some New Englanders their jobs. But now, a generation later, New England is not only richer. It is richer in relation to the national average than it was 40 years ago, when the flight of the mills was beginning. Meanwhile southern prosperity has grown even faster. The disparities between the country's richest states and its poorest are significantly narrower than they were in 1950. The process that has worked across state borders will also work across national borders. The choice on fast-track and trade is a choice about economic growth.

According to the United States Department of Labor, far more jobs will be gained in the United States from a United States-Mexico FTA and completion of GATT than lost. Recognizing that the economic advantages of fast-track certainly outweigh the disadvantages, hundreds of American industries and business associations, including many local Santa Barbara and Ventura County businesses and groups, support fast-track including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Consumer groups, like the Consumers Union, have also endorsed fast-track. Fast-track is extremely important to California and California trade.

The United States-Mexico free-trade agreement will also help raise the standard of living for Mexican labor and provide many new products to Mexican consumers. That's why a majority of Mexicans, including Mexican labor unions, and important Hispanic-American groups like the Council of La Raza support fast-track. Further, by improving economic and social standards in Mexico, more Mexicans will find worthwhile employment at home and therefore will not cross illegally into the United States. The United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement could be the most successful means of stemming the flow of illegal immigration and the problems associated with it. However, I would urge our negotiators to do what can be done to see that Mexican labor, particularly agricultural labor, share in increased prosperity.

I would like to direct my colleagues' attention to the letters I've received from President Bush, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and Governor Pete Wilson of California which further address the issues associated with fast-track.

Positive international trade agreements are the foundation for future

American economic growth and prosperity. Fast-track is the process required to achieve these agreements. I believe that Congress won't have a better opportunity this year to vote for real economic growth and prosperity for Americans than the one we have today on fast-track authority.

I urge my colleagues to reject protectionism and support real economic growth by voting no on House Resolution 101 and supporting fast-track.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, May 1, 1991.*

Hon. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR BOB: Through the better part of this century, successive Congresses and Administrations—Republican and Democratic—have worked to open markets and expand American exports. This partnership has resulted in unparalleled growth in world trade and huge economic benefits for the United States. Opening foreign markets means economic growth and jobs for all Americans.

Historically, the fast-track procedures established by the Congress have served us well. On March 1, I requested an extension of fast-track so that we could continue to realize increased economic growth and the other benefits of expanded trade. The fast-track in no way limits the ability of Congress to review any agreement negotiated, including the Uruguay Round or a North American Free-trade Agreement (NAFTA). If Congress is not satisfied, it retains the unqualified right to reject whatever is negotiated. But refusing to extend the fast-track would end negotiations before they have even begun and relinquish a critical opportunity for future economic growth.

Initiatives to open markets will enhance the global competitiveness of the United States and create new opportunities for American workers, American exports, and American economic growth. The Uruguay Round offers a vital opportunity to eliminate barriers to our goods, investment, services, and ideas. A NAFTA offers an historic opportunity to bring together the energies and talents of three great nations, already bound by strong ties of family, business, and culture. Prime Minister Mulroney and President Salinas are both leaders of great vision. They believe, as do I, that a NAFTA would enhance the well-being of our peoples. They are ready to move forward with us in this unprecedented enterprise.

In seeking to expand our economic growth, I am committed to achieving a balance that recognizes the need to preserve the environment, protect worker safety, and facilitate adjustment. In letters to me from Majority Leader Gephardt and Chairman Rostenkowski, a number of important Congressional concerns about free-trade with Mexico were conveyed. At my direction, Ambassador Hills and my Economic Policy Council have undertaken an intensive review of our NAFTA objectives and strategy to ensure thorough consideration of the economic, labor, and environmental issues raised in these letters. The Administration's response is presented in the attached report. Let me emphasize the following:

First, you have my personal commitment to close bipartisan cooperation in the negotiations and beyond. And you have my personal assurance that we will take the time necessary to conclude agreements in which both the Congress and the Administration can take pride.

Second, while economic studies show that a free-trade agreement would create jobs and promote growth in the United States, I know there is concern about adjustment in some sectors. These concerns will be addressed through provisions in the NAFTA designed to ease the transition for import-sensitive industries. In addition, my Administration is committed to working with the Congress to ensure that there is adequate assistance and effective retraining for dislocated workers.

Third, based on my discussions with President Salinas, I am convinced that he is firmly committed to strengthened environmental protection, and that there is strong support for this objective among the Mexican people. Because economic growth can and should be supported by enhanced environmental protection, we will develop and implement an expanded program of environmental cooperation in parallel with the free-trade talks.

Fourth, President Salinas has also made it clear to me that his objective in pursuing free-trade is to better the lives of Mexican working people. Mexico has strong laws regulating labor standards and worker rights. Beyond what Mexico is already doing, we will work through new initiatives to expand U.S.-Mexico labor cooperation.

Thus, our efforts toward economic integration will be complemented by expanded programs of cooperation on labor and the environment. The catalyst for these efforts is the promise of economic growth that a NAFTA can provide, and the key to these efforts is the extension of unencumbered fast-track procedures.

There are great challenges ahead. The world is changing dramatically, as nations move toward democracy and free markets. The United States must continue to open new markets and lead in technological innovation, confident that American can and will prevail in this new and emerging world. By working together, we can negotiate good trade agreements that assure a strong and healthy America as we prepare to meet the challenges of the next century.

Sincerely,

GEORGE BUSH.

---

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
*Washington, May 7, 1991.*

Hon. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR BOB: I wanted to follow up personally on the President's recent letter to Chairman Rostenkowski regarding the critical importance of extending fast-track negotiating authority.

I firmly believe that without such authority, the United States will be forced to abandon its leadership role in the field of international trade.

We have just again demonstrated our capacity to lead the world on both political and security grounds. Some critics ask whether the United States can complement these achievements with international economic leadership.

In the field of trade, we are pursuing an ambitious agenda—in the Uruguay Round, through the North American Free-trade Agreement, and through the prospects for trade agreements under the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative.

These are agreements that will enable the United States to demonstrate our economic leadership and meet the challenges of the next century. And they will advance American interests—by creating American jobs, providing growth opportunities for American companies, and securing markets for American exports.

We expect to reap great rewards from the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round. A successful Round will stimulate increased world—and U.S.—growth. Over the last four years, export expansion has been responsible for 40 percent of total growth in U.S. GNP. An open multilateral trading system is the best guarantee that U.S. export opportunities continue to expand into the next century. The Uruguay Round is the most important initiative to expand these opportunities.

The promise of the North American Free-trade Agreement is enormous. We would create a market with 360 million consumers and a combined Gross National Product of $6 trillion. We have a clear, strong interest in improving trade and investment ties with Canada, our largest trading partner, and with Mexico, our third largest. U.S. exports to Mexico have doubled over the last four years. Manufactured goods accounted for 80 percent of our exports to Mexico in 1989. The U.S. has a 70 percent share of Mexico's total trade.

A North American Free-trade Agreement will build a foundation for stronger cooperation, cohesion, and growth. It will strengthen links between our economies and lock in market-opening changes in Mexico. And it will benefit American workers. Conservative studies suggest that a North American Free-trade Agreement could create on net up to 64,000 U.S. jobs over the next ten years; other studies conclude even more U.S. jobs would be created.

I appreciate that some people are concerned about environmental issues. The U.S. and Mexico are already committed to working together to improve the environment; indeed, given the importance of the environment, we have added environmental issues to the Cabinet-level discussions of the U.S.-Mexico Binational Commission. No one can doubt that as Mexico becomes more prosperous, it will devote even more resources to environmental issues.

A North American Free-trade Agreement also has wider implications for Latin America and the United States. Mexico's aggressive economic reforms, which are already showing positive results, set a good example for other countries in the region. By negotiating an FTA with Mexico, we would send a strong signal to our other Latin American trading partners that we stand by the open market principles we have espoused for years. And we signal our mutual interest in drawing the nations of our hemisphere into a competitive world market. Moreover, increased growth in Latin America means more U.S. exports to the region. And improvements in Latin America's economic health help promote political stability.

Fast-track extension will ensure the continuation of the Congressional-Executive partnership established in 1934. It will enable us to effectively negotiate far-reaching and clearly beneficial trade initiatives that will help U.S. firms compete not only in our own hemisphere but globally as well. And it will give us the opportunity to demonstrate, in one more arena, that the United States is truly the world leader.

We are committed to making fast-track work, and will consult with Congress and the private sector at each step along the way—in the development of negotiating objectives, during the negotiations themselves, and in fashioning implementing legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. BAKER III.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
*Washington, May 9, 1991.*

Hon. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR BOB: I wanted to follow up personally on the President's May 1 letter to you regarding the critical importance of extending, unencumbered, fast-track negotiating authority. The President has requested this extension to carry out a far-reaching trade agenda which includes: The Uruguay Round, the North American Free-trade Agreement (NAFTA), and the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative. Without the extension, our negotiating credibility would be called into question, seriously undermining the U.S. leadership role in world trade and our prospects for a strong global economy.

In the debate on fast-track, Congress has focused on the proposed NAFTA. In my view, the case for giving the Administration the traditional tools to negotiate a NAFTA is compelling.

Mexico has embarked upon a process of economic reforms that has caused a dramatic increase in its market potential for U.S. exports. Already U.S. exports to Mexico have increased from $12.2 billion in 1986 to $28.4 billion in 1990, as Mexican economic growth has accelerated. Further liberalization under a free-trade arrangement is certain to result in additional economic gains for both our countries:

Mexico still has higher trade barriers than the United States, with tariffs averaging 10% as opposed to 4% for the United States. Significant nontariff barriers also remain, so there is room for greater U.S. export expansion.

As Mexico develops economically, its consumers and industries will demand more goods and services. The United States particularly benefits from Mexican growth: for each dollar Mexico spends on imports, 70 cents is spent on U.S. goods; for each dollar of GNP growth in Mexico, 15 cents is spent on U.S. goods.

According to the International Trade Commision, a NAFTA could present many new opportunities for U.S. exports, in such areas as: manufacturing, including telecommunications, computers, and electronic components; grain and oilseed growers; cement; and service providers, including U.S. banking and securities firms.

Environmental and labor issues have been the center of much attention in Congress. The President has sent to you a report outlining what has already been achieved and our plan for future bilateral efforts on these issues. Combined with Mexico's strong commitment, and the economic development Mexico will achieve through a NAFTA, our joint efforts will result in higher living standards, a better workplace and cleaner environment for all.

Mexico is taking a courageous and historic step by linking the future of its economy to ours. Both of our countries will draw strength and prosper from A NAFTA. With your support and your input, I am sure we can achieve this goal. I can assure you that we will continue consulting closely with Congress every step of the way to ensure that the agreement reached is in the best interest of the American people.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS F. BRADY.

---

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, DC, May 3, 1991.*

Hon. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. LAGOMARSINO: I am seeking your support for President Bush's request to extend fast-track authority for negotiating trade agreements. Without this authority, trade initiatives including the Uruguay Round and the North American Free-trade Agreement will fail. Successful conclusion of these initiatives will enhance economic growth and create jobs in the United States. The expiration of fast-track means losing economic opportunities for this country.

Our goal is to retain U.S. leadership in the international economic arena. As part of this, I firmly believe that a North American Free-trade Agreement is critical to the economic future of all Americans—large firms, as well as small businesses, workers and consumers alike. The creation of the largest free market in the world will ensure U.S.-made products are more competitive both at home and in the global marketplace. Without it, we risk future exports, we risk future jobs, and we risk our competitive leadership.

I recently returned from Mexico where I spoke to thousands of Mexican businessmen and businesswomen, excited by the prospect of free-trade with their northern neighbors. These businesspeople are fully aware of the enormous changes Mexico has undergone in its embrace of free markets, yet they are confident and willing to face the competitive challenges of a new century and a new partnership with the United States. They are willing to compete, and we can do no less. Failure to even try to work out a free-trade agreement with Mexico under fast-track procedures would set back our bilateral relations years, if not decades.

Europe's resurgence certainly demonstrates that dismantling trade barriers spurs growth, brings productivity gains and creates jobs. A North American Free-trade Agreement will place the United States in the middle of a market of over 360 million consumers, with a combined output of $6 trillion—20 percent larger than the European Community. It does not take an economic model to demonstrate that more exports equals more jobs, and the explosion of U.S. exports to Mexico over the past four years (from $12 billion to nearly $29 billion) has been a powerful job generator for American workers. Commerce Department estimates indicate that 538,000 jobs are related to U.S. exports to Mexico. Half of these jobs have been generated since 1986 as a direct result of Mexico's trade liberalization.

The potential for growth in the Mexican market alone is impressive. The citizens of Mexico today import more per capita from the United States than do the citizens of the European Community. By the year 2000, Mexico will be an even more dynamic and prosperous market of 100 million consumers.

Opportunities to build a better life for all of our citizens do not come often. By creating the largest free market in the world, our three countries can face the challenges of the next century with confidence. We owe it to ourselves, to our neighbors and our children to make this vision a reality—more jobs in the United States, Mexico and Canada, a better standard of living for all, and a more competitive America.

But we will not achieve this vision without the extension of the fast-track procedures. The prospect of a balanced and carefully crafted agreement subjected to unravelling by special interests would doom the negotiations before they begin.

The United States has seen its trade position improve dramatically in recent years. With Europe, for example, for the first time since 1983, we have developed a positive trade balance. Fast-track, by allowing us to open more trade opportunities through the Uruguay Round and the North American Free-trade Agreement negotiations, will continue those trends. Failure to obtain fast-track could reverse our export momentum.

As President Bush has said, "We did not win the Cold War just to start a trade war. An extension of fast-track will let us help turn the post-Cold War world into a world of freedom, growth, and opportunity." Countries that seize the opportunities created by economic cooperation will deliver rising standards of living to their citizens. Countries that do not are in danger of being left behind. I hope you will support the extension of fast-track authority so that we can bring back for your review and ultimate approval an agreement that will secure America's future.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. MOSBACHER.

---

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY,
*Washington, DC, May 7, 1991.*

Hon. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. LAGOMARSINO: On May 1 President Bush sent you a detailed Administration action plan to address a number of concerns expressed about a North American Free-trade Agreement. Included was a paper outlining why we believe a free-trade agreement with Mexico can add momentum to cooperative efforts to protect the environment.

I believe that a free-trade agreement offers an unprecedented chance to improve environmental protection, not just along the border, but throughout Mexico.

I am impressed with President Salinas' commitment and that of his government to environmental protection. He has already taken serious steps—to close hundreds of manufacturing plants, at least temporarily, that violate pollution laws, and to shut down a major refinery because of pollution problems. Mexico is eliminating lead from its gasoline and recently set a goal of phasing out CFCs by the year 2000, instead of 2010 as called for under the Montreal Protocol. These are good faith indications of what we can expect from our neighbor to the South.

Mexico already has a comprehensive environmental law and the government is proceeding forcefully to implement its requirements. Mexican environmental officials have stated that new investors relocating in Mexico will have to comply with emission standards at least as strict as those in effect where they are located now, and companies must file an environmental impact statement to show how they will comply. To do more, as the Mexicans hope and expect to, the Mexican government clearly needs new resources, and an invigorated economy is the best way to ensure their availability. Free-trade will stimulate needed growth.

At the same time, EPA is pursuing an ambitious cooperative program with Mexico on environmental matters. We are building on a longstanding working relationship; our 1983 Border Environment Agreement, for example, is a model in bilateral cooperation on environmental issues. The interest raised by the FTA negotiations has now made it possible for EPA and the Mexican Secretariat of Urban Development and Ecology (SEDUE) to strengthen greatly joint programs of envi-

ronmental protection. One early priority in our work is the preparation of an integrated plan for improvement of the environment of the border area.

Trade Representative Ambassador Carla Hills has taken steps to assure that environmental concerns are addressed in the negotiations that will follow if Congress approves fast-track authority. We have met jointly with a number of leaders in the environmental community, listened to them, and responded—as evidenced in the report President Bush sent you. We will continue to seek their advice, indeed involve them closely as negotiations proceed. EPA with our counterparts at SEDUE will be working in parallel with the FTA negotiations to make sure that increased trade and growth are consistent with sound environmental practices.

If Congress disapproves the President's request to extend fast-track authority for negotiating trade agreements, we could well lose much of the momentum behind this cooperative environmental work with Mexico. Disapproval of fast-track would be interpreted in Mexico as a vote against economic cooperation in a North American setting, with clear consequences for our environmental agenda.

I might add that in no way does fast-track preordain approval of any trade agreement yet to be negotiated—Congress retains the unqualified right to vote down any agreement that it does not consider in the best interest of the United States.

I invite your inquiries on any issues relating to environmental progress in Mexico. For your information, I enclose my recent article in the Wall Street Journal (April 19, 1991).

Free-trade with Mexico offers an unprecedented opportunity to improve the living conditions of 85 million Mexicans. Part of that, as President Salinas made clear in remarks at his meeting with President Bush in Monterey last fall, means improving environmental conditions for his people. By preserving fast-track authority, you can help realize this vision.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM K. REILLY.

---

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
*Sacramento, May 10, 1991.*

Hon. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR BOB: As you know, the House will soon consider a resolution that would effectively deny the President the ability to negotiate a free-trade agreement with Mexico. I urge you to support the expansion of international trade opportunities by opposing this resolution.

Economic growth in California is dependent on export expansion. Without increased export opportunities, we will not be able to engender strong economic growth to create jobs and support vital government services, from health care to early education to law enforcement.

Simply put, a vote against fast-track is a vote against a major economic opportunity for all Californians.

Of course, our emphasis must be on opportunity, for only a comprehensive and balanced agreement will actually benefit all sectors of our state's diverse economy. Conversely, a bad agreement would result in some sectors facing severe losses.

There are a number of keys to achieving the former and avoiding the latter: A skilled negotiator; an understanding of the risks to certain business sectors and their need for time to adjust; an appreciation of the public's concerns about food safety and the environment; and a commitment to achieve a truly comprehensive agreement—one that addresses investment, services, the environment, and intellectual property protection.

After extensive discussions with Carla Hills and review of the President's response to Chairman Rostenkowski's concerns about labor and the environment, I am convinced that each of these key components is present and there is full justification for proceeding with negotiations for NAFTA—North American Free-trade Agreement.

Just last week, Ambassador Hills met with leaders in California's high technology, agriculture, entertainment, and environmental communities to both explain the President's trade agenda and listen to concerns. Each meeting provided a valuable forum for discussion, and participants in each were understandably impressed by the Ambassador's presentation and openness to what she was told.

High technology and entertainment industry executives indicated their strong support for NAFTA negotiations as a mechanism to achieve increased market access and protection for copyrights, trademarks, and patents.

Agricultural leaders expressed their support for an agreement that would address a number of achievable goals, such as strict rules of origin, harmonized standards for agricultural chemicals, a quick "snap-back" remedy for sudden import surges, and maintenance of quality-directed marketing orders.

Environmentalists were told of the President's commitment to full maintenance of existing U.S. safety standards, as well as California's right to provide additional consumer protections.

They were also informed of the major steps already taken by Mexico's President Salinas to clean up his country's environment: Closure of a major oil refinery in Mexico City at a cost of thousands of jobs and $500 million dollars; implementation of a major 1988 law that requires all new investments to meet stringent environmental standards and requires older businesses to meet the new standards over time; closure of more than 80 companies for environmental violations and sanctions against almost 1,000 others.

Indeed, after reviewing the President's reply to Chairman Rostenkowski, a number of major environmental groups have endorsed fast-track for the NAFTA negotiations.

Of course, no one is providing a proxy in favor of an actual agreement. With all of the tough issues to be resolved, the final agreement must be subjected to detailed scrutiny. It must: Provide real export opportunities for products and services; meet our environmental and safety concerns; include protection for intellectual property and direct investment; and allow adequate time for adjustment for those industries that will face increased competition.

Beyond our own economic and social interests, we are not indifferent to a neighbor whose culture and people are so close to our own. As President Bush has said, why would anyone "oppose prosperity in Mexico?" Prosperity in Mexico will provide our good neighbor to the south a chance to export its products rather than its people. Prosperity in Mexico will allow Mexican families to achieve their dreams in their homeland, giving them the option to travel north because they want to—not because they have no other choice for economic opportunity. And, prosperity in Mexico will provide support for the major economic reforms made by the Salinas Administration—with the added benefit of regional and hemispheric stability.

NAFTA can strengthen ties between the U.S. and Mexico so that, working together, we can face the challenges of an increasingly competitive global economy. In an era when the Berlin Wall and the Iron Curtain have fallen, surely we can allow the Administration to negotiate the lowering of economic barriers throughout North America.

For all of these reasons, I urge you to support fast-track for a North American Free-trade Agreement.

Sincerely,

PETE WILSON.

□ 1310

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I rise in support of the Dorgan amendment and against fast-track, even though we recognize that this is one fast-track that has already been greased. This thing is getting out of town fast, and it seems to me that the Congress should have some input.

If America wants to bring any changes about in our balance of trade, make no mistake about it, we need a work force that is going to be competitive and productive. One of the most serious problems facing our Nation today is drugs at the workplace, drug in our schools, drugs in our board rooms. For us to say that this is too sensitive a matter, even to raise it while complimenting our friends for the efforts that they are making in Mexico, is absolutely ridiculous. We have to recognize that if we are going to increase legal trade, we are giving the opportunity for those bums in Mexico and in the United States to try to get more illicit trade.

What is wrong in saying that we have to be more vigilant about that?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, fast-track kicks Congress out of the picture. Fast-track, what are we rushing to do? Are we rushing to decrease wages to middle-class America? That can happen if Congress is out of the picture.

Are we rushing to get more firms to leave America? That could happen if Congress is out of the picture.

Are we rushing to weaken pesticide laws, environmental laws? What are we rushing to do?

Mr. Speaker, I support free-trade, and I voted for free-trade on this floor; but I came here to do my job, to fight for the environment, to fight for prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, what is the rush to give that responsibility up?

Legislatures, my colleagues, in Japan, Mexico, Canada, all have the right to amend trade treaties. Should

we do any less for our people? I think not.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, whatever we do here today, whatever James Madison and our Founding Fathers said, whatever our constitutional scholars believe, one fact remains: Mexico is a country with, presently, 80 million people. That will grow to 100 million people by the end of the century. About 40 percent of them are under the age of 20. If there is no opportunity in Mexico, America will get Mexicans. That is what is going to happen.

Now, it is because of that that you hear statements from yesterday's Washington Post:

> While some uncertainty remains, considerable progress has been made. Now we believe the Administration deserves our trust and that of Congress to proceed acccordingly.

Is this some Republican shill for free-trade? No, this is the president of the National Wildlife Federation giving support to fast-track.

However, if you support the Dorgan amendment, you must believe it is because, as the resolution states, "Sufficient tangible progress has not been made in trade negotiations."

What deal are we talking about? The one with Mexico that has not even begun? Or the one with Europe that is in progress and, ladies and gentleman, progress is being made.

Since December, when we walked from the table, the European Community has agreed to, among other things, a 40-percent cut in grain support prices, new environmental payments to promote less intensive farming, and a 10-percent cut in milk prices. These are policies that we believe could not be negotiated, and yet here they are being proposed at a time when we are ready to pull the plug on both negotiations.

Let me just advise my colleagues that if we want to kill progress, we should support Dorgan because under the OBRA resolution that Congress passed last year, there is a provision that provides that if an agreement is not entered into involving GATT by June 30, 1993, then all of the measures involving the farm cuts that we passed last year will sunset.

Unless under section 1302 the President can certify that Congress disapproved of fast-track. If you want to stop progress, if you want to reinstate farm cuts, if you want to prevent agriculture from moving forward, then you must support House Resolution 101. This Member chooses to vote "no".

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the fine gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, could we find out the time remaining on the various sides before the gentleman from Texas speaks?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] has 12½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 7 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has 5 minutes remaining; the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] has 7 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] has 7½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 6 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] now yields 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion for disapproval. I recognize, and I think we all recognize, labor's opposition to this fast-track legislation. But I believe that labor's fears are overexaggerated and based more on emotion and politics, pure politics, than factual analyses.

As things stand now, we do have problems on our border, and we, in the Southwest, are very mindful of that and we in the State of Texas are more affected by that than anyone.

But I do not think the free-trade will hurt. It will help the situation. We must find a way to work closely with Mexico. In the long run, this would help raise their standard of living, instead of fighting a losing and a negative battle. It is a losing battle.

Free and open markets are the economic markets, are the economic future in our global economy, and we must be part of that tide. Economic growth and the advancement of free-trade have gone hand in hand as long as we have had free markets.

Mr. Speaker, labor should recognize that opening up markets has helped workers and that it is better to sell our exports to Mexico than to oppose free-trade with Mexico for short-term political gain. We should support this fast-track.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Resolution 101, the resolution to disapprove fast-track trade negotiating authority for the President, and in strong support of fast-track authority.

First, I want to commend the administration on being responsive to the legitimate concerns regarding a free-trade agreement with Mexico. Environmental groups will have input to ensure that a United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement doesn't diminish environmental standards. And there will be sufficient worker retraining assistance for those workers who are displaced by a free-trade agreement.

I recognize labor's opposition to fast-track and a free-trade agreement with Mexico. But I believe that labor's fears are overexaggerated, and based more on emotion and politics than factual analysis. As things stand now, the United States-Mexico border is open enough so that business can move to Mexico if it wants, and Mexican citizens can come to America for jobs if they want. It's a serious issue for us in the southwest already. I don't think a free-trade agreement will worsen things, but instead would help. We must find a way to work closely with Mexico and in the long-term, raise the standard of living there. It is better to do that through free-trade and a better business climate in Mexico, than fight a negative and losing battle.

And it is a losing battle. Free and open markets are the economic future in our global economy and we must be part of the tide. Economic growth and the advancement of free-trade have gone hand in hand for as long as free markets have been in existence. It is no surprise that the tremendous economic growth that has occurred worldwide in the past 40 years has coincided with the growth and expansion of the system we have to open up trade, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]. Labor should recognize that opening up markets has helped workers, and that it is better to sell our exports to Mexico than to oppose free-trade with Mexico for short-term political reasons.

Everyone agrees that we are a long way from free, open, and fair trade in the world economy. Establishing the rules for opening up markets is a tough job, and we need to give our negotiators every advantage when they sit across the table from our economic competitors. Fast-track enables our negotiators to say: "This is the best offer we can make—you won't get any better, or worse, when we take this to the U.S. Congress for implementing legislation."

In granting the President fast-track authority, this body does not give up its chance to influence the content of trade agreements. The U.S. Trade Representative has in the past, and will in the future, consult with Congress as negotiations proceed, with the full knowledge that Congress will reject an unacceptable trade agreement. Fast-track doesn't mean Congress is a rubber stamp for a trade agreement, and the administration knows it. But in granting fast-track authority, we give the President an indispensible tool for any meaningful trade agreement.

The stakes are high in this debate, and they revolve around two issues. One has to do with the fact that this country is in a recession. The economic vitality we have shown in the last few months has come from exports. We must look for new markets. Mexico, which is opening up and modernizing its economy, is just the kind of market we should be looking to penetrate—one that requires the high-technology goods in which this country remains strong. Ultimately, that means good paying jobs for American workers.

The other has to do with how this Congress and my Democratic colleagues view free-trade. Free-trade is not some fixed goal that we can attain one day, and then rest. It is a process involving a lot of hard work, a process which I liken to riding a bicycle. If you don't move forward, you don't move at all. You collapse. We've got to move fast-track forward if we are to advance free-trade and avoid the collapse of the process which advances free-trade. This is the best course for more and better jobs for Americans. It is the best course for future economic growth in this country.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Resolution 101, introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota. This vote is undoubtedly one of the most important votes in the House this session. House Resolution 101 would deny the extension of the so-called fast-track authority that is necessary for the President to complete the Uruguay round of trade negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT].

Fast-track is not a procedure that has been forced upon the Congress by the President, but rather, it is a process first developed by the Congress in 1974 and it has been extended twice since then. Fast-track grants the President the authority to engage in international trade negotiations and preestablishes rules for the consideration of any eventual trade agreement by the Congress. Given executive-legislative balance of power in American government, this process is absolutely necessary if the United States is to be an effective participant in multilateral world trade negotiations. Over 100 countries are now involved in the Uruguay round of negotiations under the [GATT]. It would simply be foolish for any of these countries to offer concessions and negotiate delicate compromises if 535 Members of Congress were subsequently able to amend these compromises to make them better represent their own interests.

Extension of fast-track authority at this juncture should not be controversial. There is no GATT treaty or implementing legislation to be considered. It is not possible for this or any Member to judge the merits of a GATT agreement at this time because no agreement exists.

Currently, the United States only has a negotiating position. This is a position that has been strategically developed to advance the interests of the United States in a final agreement. Excessive concern over a negotiating position, and a fear of the content of a final agreement should not preclude our willingness to negotiate. If fast-track is extended, the Congress still holds the ultimate authority to approve or disapprove any agreement that the President may present to the Congress. Fast-track does not impair the ability of the Congress to carefully and fully consider an eventual agreement. It simply enables the agreement to be considered expeditiously.

Approval of the Dorgan resolution will most assuredly and prematurely end the most ambitious, comprehensive, and meaningful reform of world trading rules ever attempted under the multilateral GATT system. Preventing reform of the world trading system would deny each of our constituents, and indeed the people of the world, an incredible array of opportunities—including the basic opportunities to expand, to grow and to improve individual and national standards of living.

The U.S. Trade Representative has estimated that the lowering of tariff and nontariff barriers that would occur with a successful Uruguay round could increase U.S. output, in total, by $1.1 trillion over the next 10 years. This translates to $17,000 for every American family of four. It is estimated that American entrepreneurs lose $60 billion annually through theft and counterfeiting of their ideas due to inadequate rules to protect intellectual property; the major reforms in GATT address that problem. Services would be included in the GATT following a successful round and would open new markets to U.S. firms. Service firms export $115 billion annually and create 90 percent of new U.S. jobs. A successful round would open new investment markets to U.S. firms that now help generate $240 billion of U.S. exports—two-thirds of our total exports. Full participation of developing countries in the GATT could increase U.S. exports by 50 percent, or $200 billion by the year 2000.

Reforms in agriculture trading rules would allow world agriculture exports to grow by $100 billion—one-third of world agriculture trade. American agriculture is among the most competitive and most efficient in the world. Development of fair agricultural trading rules will allow American farmers to further benefit from their comparative advantage and efficiency.

Since the inception of the GATT following World War II, tariff rates have been reduced by over 75 percent. As a direct result, world trade has increased from $60 billion in 1950 to nearly $4 trillion this year. This increase in trade has caused the U.S. and world economies to experience greater growth over the past 40 years than at any other time in history.

Exports are of critical importance to the recovery and continued growth of the U.S. economy. In 1990, U.S. exports grew at twice the rate of imports. U.S. exports grew over 8 percent in 1990, and accounted for 88 percent of our economic growth last year. Extending multilateral trade rules to sectors such as investment, banking and other services, as well as gaining better protections for American intellectual property, will create opportunities to further expand our exports in areas where the United States has significant competitive advantage. Expanding job opportunities for Americans in these highly skilled professions is most definitely in the best interest of the United States and will occur with a good GATT agreement.

In December 1990, 4 years of negotiations under the Uruguay round collapsed soley because of the European Community's unwillingness to engage in meaningful and significant reforms in the area of agriculture. Agreements in the 14 other negotiating areas, such as services, intellectual property and market access were very close or could be envisioned. The remaining issues were easily seen as negotiable and quickly achievable. Indeed, the 15 areas have now been formally reduced to seven in large part because of the number of issues that have been resolved. (Some major negotiating areas are: Market Access, Services, TRIPS (Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property), Textiles, Antidumping, TRIMS (Trade Related Investment Measures), Government Procurement, and Dispute Settlement).

Lack of political will on the part of the European Community in the area of agriculture continues to be the major obstacle to completing the round. The European Community was almost completely isolated in the position on agriculture. Japan and South Korea found cover behind the EC but would have compromised without the skirts of the EC to hide behind.

This Member would like to heartily commend the U.S. Trade Representative, Ambassador Hills and the former USTR and Secretary of Agriculture, Clayton Yeutter, for their invaluable contribution to the current negotiations. Both have proven very skilled and energetic in protecting and promoting United States interests in the Uruguay round and trade matters throughout the world.

Some self-serving European opponents of the Uruguay round occasionally mistakenly blame the United States negotiators for the collapse in the negotiations last December. Such criticism is sorely misplaced and most definitely a total misrepresentation of fact. The European Community's unwillingness to even seriously engage in discussion of meaningful agriculture reforms caused members of the Cairns Group, led by Brazil and Argentina to walk out of the negotiations. This Member would again commend the U.S. negotiators for standing firm last December in their refusal to bring an unacceptable agreement back to the U.S. Congress.

Much of the debate around extension of fast-track has focused on the North American Free-trade Agreement [NAFTA]. While NAFTA is important, it is, at this point, as the New York Times said, a "side show." What is predominantly important to the United States is the conclusion of the Uruguay round of the GATT. This member heartily shares the opinion of the New York Times in its May 21, 1991, editorial where it states:

Mexican trade is a sideshow to what's really at stake, the five-year Uruguay Round of

international trade talks scheduled to be completed this year. It will slash tariffs and other trade barriers, thereby adding trillions to the world's economies by the end of the decade. Few, if any, government policies in the U.S. or anywhere else will do more for economic growth.

The Uruguay round has been stalled over Europe's refusal to scale back policies that lock out food imports. But once this roadblock is overcome, the benefits will be enormous . . .

Members may eventually find that they cannot support a NAFTA—I hope that is not the case. While I may regret the combining of the fast-track request for the Uruguay round with the NAFTA, it is certainly not unreasonable to simply give the President and U.S. Trade Representative the authority to begin negotiations with Mexico on NAFTA.

One overlooked advantage of the controversy over the extension of fast-track, and the concept of NAFTA itself, is that the executive branch will now undoubtedly be properly aggressive in insisting that United States trade interests are fully protected, and that existing trade agreements are honored in a prompt and continuing fashion by our trading partners. In other words, the administrations during this negotiating period, must keep the American people and Congress satisfied with their protection of the national economic interest. If they do not, Congress will not approve NAFTA. That is incredible leverage given to Congress during this negotiating period.

This Member expects to be kept fully informed by the administration of any progress made on, and details of, both the GATT agreement and the NAFTA as they are developed over the next 2 years. This Member would also serve notice to the administration that he will go over the eventual NAFTA with a fine-toothed comb.

Truly much is at stake in the Uruguay round. This Member urges his colleagues to support the extensions of fast-track, and vote against the Dorgan amendment. In this way, the Congress will continue to extend the negotiating authority to the President that is necessary for him to craft a good, beneficial and fair GATT agreement that will provide significant benefit to America, far into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the Dorgan resolution.

□ 1320

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support a trade agreement with Mexico. I do not subscribe to the beggar-my-neighbor philosophy of some, but there are reasons why Congress should not surrender its constitutional authority to review this Mexican treaty in its specifics, and that is why I support the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

If my colleagues have ever flown into Mexico City, the pall of pollution over that city is incredible. My colleagues may recall the "60 Minutes" segment that spoke of the border rivers which have become toxic cesspools because of Mexican pollution. Mexico, like most undeveloped nations, considers environmental protection a luxury of super-rich nations. We have placed restrictions on American businesses with our Clean Air and Clean Water Acts which are both sensible and costly. Now will we give Mexican firms, unburdened by these standards, a cost advantage, or will we lose American firms who find it cheaper to build dirty south of the border?

And there is a second reason. I think it is naive to believe that Mexican labor will only replace Asian labor. Mexico will move into capital-intensive processing as Taiwan, South Korea, and Hong Kong have done before them.

There is no stopping the outmigration of automation. Every Member of this body has looked into the eyes of an American worker unemployed by foreign competition. We all know the grim reality, that these workers are virtually helpless in America because we, as a Nation, do not condone economic planning, we do not fund worker training realistically, and we are not committed to making our schools the kind of first-class training facilities they should be for America's workers. We have not laid the groundwork for transition in the American work force.

Mr. Speaker, fast-track is an abdication of congressional responsibility. Just as this institution has allowed the steady erosion of congressional constitutional authority to declare war, a vote for fast-track surrenders our constitutional right to approve trade treaties.

I support the resolution of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute, as well, to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by commending my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for his diligence and leadership on this issue. In addition I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] for her commitment and work on behalf of the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to look at this issue in the context of recent history. In 1981 the Reagan-Bush administration cut taxes on corporations and the wealthy in this country. They said this would lead to increased investment in plant and equipment. This, they said, would help American workers with the state-of-the-art equipment. American plants would be more productive they said. There would be more jobs for American workers.

Mr. Speaker, what happened is something quite different. American corporations took the taxpayers' money and ran. Instead of investing in this country they took their business offshore. They were there to exploit Third World labor markets and cheap labor. They used their tax breaks to invest in Mexican maquiladoras. By the mid-1980's many of these multinational corporations were paying no taxes at all. Some even got rebates. In the process they exploited Third World workers to the tune of 60 cents an hour. According to the GAO, 1.3 million American workers were dislocated in 1983 and 1984. Fifty-seven percent of these dislocated were due to increased foreign competition, according to the report. Today we are in a recession. Unemployment is at its highest in 8 years. On top of this, our economic infrastructure is crumbling. For many workers there is no hope.

Now the Bush administration is asking us to trust them to negotiate a free-trade agreement with Mexico that is fair to American workers. Let me tell my colleagues what this administration will do. To have expanded markets in Mexico this administration is going to have to guarantee more jobs, more plants in Mexico, more earnings for Mexican workers to purchase American goods. There will be great displacement of American workers, yet the Bush administration in this year's budget request proposed killing the trade adjustment assistance program.

Mr. Speaker, and Members, I ask for support of the resolution of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dorgan resolution.

I believe the Nation must provide leadership in bringing about a more integrated world economy. However, I believe our pursuit of such a world has blinded our trade negotiators to some basic realities of industries such as our textile industry—the industry with more workers than any other industrial sector in this country. Our GATT negotiators have preliminarily agreed to terms that will make it impossible for our textile industry to adapt to a world without global textile quotas.

Mr. Speaker, the textile industry long ago agreed to a phaseout of all quotas. What our negotiators have brought back is a phaseout plan that will eliminate many quotas on a sec-

tor-by-sector basis rather than a staged decline across all sectors.

I know that no business can sensibly make competitive decisions under such an irrational phaseout scheme. Until our negotiators display some commonsense understanding of the realities of the working world and the marketplace in the important textile industry, I must oppose any process that facilitates the destruction of the textile industry and puts thousands of American workers out of work. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 101.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RINALDO].

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Dorgan resolution to deny the extension of fast-track trade negotiating authority.

First of all, I think we should make it clear right now as to what we are not voting on today. We are not voting on a free-trade pact with Mexico.

The issue here today is whether we should give our negotiating team the practical ability to do its job without being second guessed by 535 Monday morning quarterbacks at every step of the way. Opponents of the fast-track procedure argue that it puts Congress on the sidelines and takes away our authority to regulate international trade. Nothing could be further from the truth.

When a labor union negotiates an agreement with management, they don't bring every single worker to the bargaining table. A small group from the union leadership goes for the best agreement they can get, and then they bring it back to their membership for an up-or-down vote. Individual union members do not get to offer amendments to the contract, but the negotiators know that an unsatisfactory agreement will be rejected by the membership.

Several committees of this House have already held hearings on the proposed free-trade agreement with Mexico. The fast-track procedure will require negotiators to consult with Congress throughout the negotiating process. When previous trade agreements have been in the drafting stages, they have been submitted to congressional committees for review. Mock markup sessions resulted in revisions which our negotiators then incorporated into the U.S. position at the bargaining table. Finally, any trade agreement that is reached is subject to congressional approval.

Opposition to the extension of fast-track all boils down to apprehension about the potential effect of a free-trade agreement with Mexico on employment here in the United States. This has been my primary concern and it is something I have looked into extensively. I realize that we are in a recession. I've seen the closed factories in my district. I've heard the pain of people who have worked hard all of their lives and now cannot find a decent job. If I thought that refusing to negotiate a trade agreement with Mexico would improve the situation, I would strongly oppose the administration's plan.

The fact of the matter is, however, that any company that wants to move to Mexico can go there tomorrow. There is nothing standing in their way. For that matter, they are also free to move their operations to the Pacific rim countries of the Far East, as many plants have already done.

Then why extend fast-track negotiating authority? First of all, we need to continue the GATT negotiations that have been going on since 1986, particularly with regard to better international protection of intellectual property rights. The pharmaceutical and computer firms of New Jersey, which employ a large portion of our work force, have suffered major losses in marketing new products abroad, due to lax enforcement of patents, copyrights, and other protections against industrial piracy.

With regard to Mexico, we need a trade agreement to lock in the progress Mexico has already made in reducing its barriers to our exports, and we need to push for even more opportunities for American companies to sell their goods in Mexico. On the whole, I think that workers in our country may have more to gain than to lose if an effective trade agreement is concluded with Mexico.

Our tariffs on goods coming in from Mexico are already very low, averaging about 4 percent. By contrast, Mexican tariffs on United States goods average about 10 percent. Mexico has local content requirements for many products that require certain percentages of their components to be made in Mexico. Mexico also requires foreign companies that want to sell certain goods there to make comparable investments in the Mexican economy. These requirements are one of the primary reasons some United States firms have opened plants in Mexico, simply to be able to do business there. If we can eliminate these trade barriers, companies such as AT&T and Caterpillar expect to be able to sell larger quantities of goods manufactured in this country to Mexico.

If, on the other hand, we refuse to negotiate with Mexico, it is conceivable that they will slam the door that has started to open. Our present trade with Mexico has a positive impact on jobs in my home State of New Jersey, as well as in other parts of the United States. Since the Mexican Government began to liberalize its trade policies in 1985, exports from the United States to Mexico have risen by 129 percent. In 1986, the United States had a nonoil trade deficit of $1.5 billion with Mexico. By 1990, we had an nonoil trade surplus of $2.7 billion. Between 1987 and 1990, New Jersey's exports to Mexico rose by 120.6 percent, to $417 million. These exports included chemicals, industrial machinery and computer equipment, electrical equipment, food products, and photographic equipment. Hundreds of jobs were involved in manfacturing and shipping these products, and these jobs could well be lost if efforts to strengthen our economic ties to Mexico fall through.

One important advantage of a trade agreement would be the potential expansion of markets for goods that are made in this country. Without an agreement, jobs here will still be lost as plants relocate to Mexico or the Pacific rim, but we will also lose the chance for offsetting employment gains in industries that make products for export.

We are voting here today on a resolution that sets out Congress's objectives for any trade agreement the administration negotiates with Mexico. It has to have sufficient transition periods for U.S. industries that would lose trade protection to adjust to increased competition. It has to provide complete protection against third countries, such as Japan, that might try to pass their goods through Mexico to the United States duty free. It must absolutely enable the United States to maintain strict health and safety standards for food imports into this country.

We have no way of knowing whether the proposed trade agreement with Mexico will be good or bad. After all, it has not been negotiated yet. What I do know, and what I emphatically promise both to the administration and to the workers of my district is that I will do everything I can to defeat any trade pact that does not comply with the conditions set out in the Gephardt resolution.

□ 1330

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the Dorgan resolution and support the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution. I will support, therefore, allowing trade negotiations to continue on GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade] and to begin on a North America Free-Trade Agreement which includes Mexico.

I support the extension of negotiation authority because I believe it is consistent with the tremendous economic potential of our country and will help secure our economic future. I am impressed with the long list of businesses in my State who are poised to enter the International marketplace and who argue strongly that these

agreements will make it more feasible for them to do so. This includes longtime North Carolina industries like furniture, hosiery, tobacco and food products, and timber. It includes agricultural commodities like soybeans, pork, grains, and poultry. And it includes high-technology industries such as computers and electronics, pharmaceuticals, telecommunications, and chemicals. These firms, and many more like them—if they are given a chance to sell their goods without barriers or obstacles—can dramatically increase both exports abroad and the creation of good jobs here at home.

I also support the extension of authority because these negotiations offer our best hope for removing the unfair burdens and barriers our businesses face, and the unfair advantages we have too often conceded to our competitors. We look hopefully to a worldwide opening of markets, but we must remind ourselves that free-trade is not necessarily fair trade—and it is fair trade, above all, that our negotiators must seek. I say that as one who worked for the passage of the omnibus trade act in 1988 and has backed its strong enforcement. We will never solve our problems by refusing to negotiate. Indeed, the abuses which cry out for remedy—dumping, predatory pricing, violations of copyright, exorbitant national subsidies, stubborn tariff and nontariff barriers, restricted marketing and distribution systems—all are damaging our country's interests daily, and can be addressed only through tough and persistent negotiation.

The Congress must be a full partner in this enterprise. Some have suggested that fast-track authority gives the President the ability to bypass Congress in negotiating trade agreements, but this reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the process. Congress, in fact, constructed the fast-track procedure in 1974 precisely to assert itself as fully as possible in trade negotiations. The House in particular has a stake in asserting its revenue—that is, tariff—powers under the Constitution and not ceding to the Senate, under that body's right to approve treaties, all power over trade agreements. The fast-track procedures create a mechanism for both Houses to be deeply and continually involved in the negotiation process and to shape the agreement at every juncture.

The negotiating process carries risk as well as promise, and most of us have had threatened industries remind us of that. In our State certain elements of the textile and apparel industry are particularly concerned about the unfair competition a trade agreement might bring. Some are hopeful about exporting to Canada and Mexico, but the real concern is GATT. One need only attend the meetings our congressional textile caucus has had with our trade negotiators to understand why. We can and we must do better, and if fast-track authority is granted today, we must take full advantage of the opportunity it offers to find better solutions for textiles and similarly situated industries in the talks to follow.

The agreements under negotiation promise substantial benefits to consumers—greater choice and lower prices. Every American consumer will eventually feel the benefit of freer trade in his or her pocketbook. We owe this potential benefit to hard-working Americans struggling to make ends meet.

However, these agreements cannot ignore basic environmental and health concerns. That is why the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution is so critical. It outlines what the final agreements must contain to protect American workers, ensure a sound environment, and protect the health of our Nation's citizens. The administration should attend to this resolution carefully in its negotiations, for its conditions will be critical to congressional acceptance of the final agreements. Trade agreements must promote, not compromise, effective health, safety, and environmental standards. These negotiations, properly conducted, will let us extend these critical standards rather than sacrifice American jobs to countries without comparable standards.

We must also be aware of the international implications of our decisions here today. Europe is poised for a new era of economic cooperation and strength. Mexico has made remarkable strides toward privatizing its economy, reducing its debt, addressing labor and environmental abuses, and lowering barriers to international cooperation. The enormous consequences of a negative verdict here today—of derailing the intricate GATT discussions at this critical stage, or rebuffing the Mexicans, with the message that would carry for others aspiring to democracy and free enterprise in Latin America—should weigh heavily on each of us.

North Carolina, I'm proud to say, ranks 17th out of the 50 States in exports to Mexico, exporting $190 million worth of products to Mexico in 1989, according to the United States Commerce Department. From 1987–89 we more than tripled our textile mill product exports, doubled computer and industrial machinery exports, and more than tripled electronic and electronic equipment exports to Mexico. And we know we can do more, in Mexico and around the world.

We have in North Carolina a strong and increasingly diversified economy, low unemployment, and an enviable quality of life. But there are no grounds for complacency. To secure our economic future we must invest in the health and security of our people and train a work force equal to the challenge of the factories and laboratories and offices of tomorrow. And we must increasingly see the world as our marketplace. These trade agreements can offer us both the opportunities we need and the protections we require, and we must see to it that they do just that. We take only a step here today, but it is a critical step, and I urge my colleagues to grant a continuation of negotiating authority.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] a hard-working member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 101 and in support of fast-track.

We all know the State of Florida agriculture has much at stake in the negotiations for free-trade with Mexico. A bad agreement could cost us jobs, environmental protection and the survival of our agriculture industries. But a good agreement offers tremendous opportunities to our State and the entire Nation. Make no mistake, we will not sell out Florida's best interests and we have made our legitimate concerns clear to the administration. I urge a vote to support fast-track as a vote to continue the process—of course there is no commitment to support the eventual agreement unless it is an agreement worthy of support.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this body how many of them are wearing an American wrist watch, own an American-made camera, own an American-made stereo, an American-made fax machine? They were invented here. One cannot buy one. An American made VCR? They were invented here, but one cannot buy one.

In my lifetime this Nation has gone from the world's greatest maritime power to a nation that has not built a merchant ship in the past 3 years. The great nations of the world have been great maritime powers and they have been great manufacturing powers. We have already given away our maritime industries.

What is the rush to fast-track, the demise of American industry? A house full of cheap foreign appliances will not mean diddley if one does not have a job good enough to send your child to college or if they do not have an opportunity once they graduate. If the Mexicans are charging us 10 percent to have access to their markets, and we are only charging them 4, then I say a level playing field is to charge them 10. If we are willing to tax Americans, then let us tax those people who want access to our markets.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dorgan resolution. Why does the administration not want the fresh air of American scrutiny, the American people's scrutiny to be sub-

ject to these so-called trade deals that they want to make? Why do they just want a handful of people in the room? I will tell my colleagues why, because they do not want the American people to know that our industrial base is going to erode if this so-called fast-track, without the checks and balance of this Congress, our industrial base will erode.

We have lost 75,000 auto workers' jobs to Mexico. We have lost thousands of electrical workers' jobs to Mexico. We are told by the Economic Policy Institute that we will lose 550,000 more manufacturing jobs if this passes.

I say let us take care of our people and let us take care of the Mexican people. This is unfair to the Mexican workers. It sure is unfair to the American workers. I hope and pray we support the Dorgan amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on this issue the administration says, "Trust us." But what is the track record of this administration on questions of economic trust? This President said, "Trust me. I will steward the economy and protect your job." But the fastest track in this country is the track to the unemployment line. This President said, "Trust me. Read my lips. No new taxes." But that promise took the fast-track to oblivion.

I would ask my colleagues, which side are they on today? Are they participants or are they spectators? I say no blank check, no blank check to this administration. I say we say we take back our authority. We support the Dorgan resolution and we say no to fast-track.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dorgan resolution.

We have been asked to withhold judgment, set aside our doubts, listen to the administration, give the President flexibility in these negotiations. Actions speak louder than words, and I can only respond to what I have seen as a result of negotiations already affecting the Pacific Northwest.

Our magnificent forest resource, the very best of our trees, year after year have been sent overseas to Japan as raw logs rather than as processed wood because our administration didn't negotiate tough enough. Just recently, in our negotiations with drift-netting nations, we not only acquiesced to fewer observers to monitor the ships which are scooping up our salmon and steelhead with 30- to 40-mile nets, we suggested the lower number. Sixty percent of the shellfish consumed in our country are imported, yet foreign products are held to much less scrutiny than domestic products.

The President has promised in his trade negotiations to provide resources for our workers who are displaced. He's promised to protect the environment. I've heard promises over and over again, as we work on the issues facing the timber industry in the Pacific Northwest, but I haven't seen him put his words into actions that realistically protect either our workers or our ecosystem. We simply cannot trust the administration to stand up for our resources or our jobs in trade negotiations. Support our resources, support our workers, support America first—support the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 1 minute we can hardly debunk some of the statements that have already been made up here. Some of the so-called facts that are being cited in reality are not facts at all. I just need to say that in opening remarks of the author of this resolution, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], he suggested that those who want the status quo should look elsewhere. That is what they want to do, is the status quo. I say to my friend and colleague, the status quo is we are doing what we are doing. We will increase maquiladoras. We will continue to have problems on the border. The environment will continue to be a problem.

There are a lot of us that live along that border who believe that change is necessary. I for one am willing to run the risk that future employment in my district can increase from its static 10, 12, 14, and 16-percent unemployment rates. I, for one, think we can clean up the environment in cooperation between Mexico and the United States if the United States will do its part.

Do you know what the real challenge is here? If we pass this agreement, the United States is going to have to improve its educational system. We are going to have to improve our technology and our competence in bringing about innovative goods and services.

I would like to conclude my remarks from the perspective of trying to set a few facts before the House. The U.S. Council of the U.S. Business Committee has reported how far ahead of the United States are some of Mexico's labor laws.

EXCERPT FROM THE U.S. COUNCIL REPORT

SOCIAL SECURITY

The Mexican social security system provides more benefits to Mexican workers than the U.S. social security system provides to U.S. workers.

The Mexican system provides medical and maternity care, medicines, hospitalization, surgery, old age pensions, payment for temporary and permanent disability from work injury, and permanent disability pensions.

The Mexican Social Insurance Institute (IMSS) covers all employees in private industry, their spouses, and their unemployed children under age 18. The Security and Social Services Institute of State Workers (ISSSTE) covers employees in the public sector.

The contribution of the employee and employer to the social security fund depends on the employee salary level; those that receive the minimum wage have no payroll deductions for social security—the employer contributes the full amount (17.1 percent).

OTHER BENEFITS

90 days' severance pay is provided after 30 days on the job.

Profit sharing of 10 percent of annual pretax profits is required by law. Companies pay 1 percent of the employee's wage for nursery care.

Pregnancy leave of 12 weeks is provided (and paid by Social Security) with a guarantee of return to a like job.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

Mexican legislation on occupational health and safety is relatively advanced and provides substantial protection. (U.S. Dept. of Labor, "Labor Standards in Export Assembly Operations in Mexico and the Caribbean", June 1990.)

Mexico has ratified 67 ILO conventions addressing worker health and safety standards.

Firms employing more than 300 workers are required by law to set up their own health clinics at company expense, to supplement the social security health care system.

Federal law requires most enterprises to set up plant-level health and worker safety monitoring bodies (which include a trade union representative whenever a union has a collective bargaining agreement) that report monthly to the Secretariat of Labor and Social Welfare.

Health and safety standards are better enforced in large firms. There appears to be a higher incidence of industrial accidents in smaller firms and on construction sites, a reflection of a lack of sufficient inspection personnel to adequately monitor health and safety regulations.

In 1989, 2,218 judgments were handed down relating to industrial accidents and dangerous conditions which resulted in illness and injury. (U.S. Embassy in Mexico, "Reply to Congressional Request for Mexican Labor Standard Information", Feb. 1991.)

It is time that we, in the United States, wake up to the fact that our views on worker benefits are not up to many other country's standards.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

□ 1340

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote for the Dorgan resolution, House Resolution 101. There will be no great loss if fast-track is rejected now. We can always come back and authorize it again, if it is truly needed, and the matter can be addressed then in an appropriate fashion.

This whole issue has been surrounded in a veritable cocoon of promises from the administration, about what they would do about the problems of labor,

the environment, agriculture, food safety, and consumer protection.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell Members this: I have supported fast-track in times past. The result of my support has been that I have walked out with a sheath of promises which were good on their face, but none of which were honored. I am now collecting the promises I received last time when I voted in favor of the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement, but the promises made this time will be honored in the same way they were last time.

The administration makes these promises to get you to vote for these proposals, but after that matter is done and that vote is taken, they go into a closed room, refuse to honor the commitments, and none of the things that they have said would be done for and on behalf of the United States, its workers, and its industries, are ever done.

Mr. Speaker, what should be done is let us send them a message. Reject fast-track. Say to them, come up with some way of giving us assurances that you will, in fact, honor what it is you say you will do.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you stories about what happened with regard to Canada, and none of the promises were kept. I urge Members, reject fast-track, vote for Dorgan, and let us then begin to address this matter in a more calm and deliberate fashion, with a better set of promises from the administration.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is not as if we have not been here before. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] and I were just recalling that in 1965 we got the Canadian-American auto pact, and in 1965 we created the maquiladoras. We know what is going to happen when you extend the boundaries of that zone, because we have had 25 years of experience with it. As a result of that 25 years, there are 30 General Motors plants, 12 Ford plants, and 12 Chrysler plants in the maquiladora, employing 76,000 hourly workers. Every one of those jobs was in America someplace 25 years ago.

Now, if Members feel comfortable with the idea that we are generating new employment that pays as well as those auto jobs did to replace the jobs that we are going to be giving away with this great North American free-trade arrangement, then you should vote against Dorgan. I am not confident that we are doing a fraction of what has to be done to create those jobs. I would like to have Members just look north to Canada and see how many industrial jobs we have sent to Canada, where the wage standard and the standard of living is almost identical with America.

Mr. Speaker, this is an unmitigated invitation for greedy American investors to exploit slave labor in Mexico. They are not going to go down there to raise the standard of living for Mexico, they are going down there to exploit Mexican cheap labor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dorgan resolution and in strong opposition to the fast-track procedure for considering trade agreements.

It is bad policy for Congress to give up our right to amend an agreement we have never seen.

It is foolish for Congress simply to assume that the agreements our trade negotiators will reach will be not only in the best interest of American workers and consumers, but so good that they cannot be improved. Have the agreements negotiated with Japan, China, Korea, or any other country inspired that kind of confidence in our trade negotiators?

After a long decade of seeing our industries hammered by unfair trade practices, the people of southeastern Michigan don't trust our trade negotiators, and I don't either. We have seen a flood of imports. We have seen tens of thousands of jobs destroyed.

What we have not seen are the benefits of so-called free-trade. It hasn't helped matters to see so many of our trade negotiators subsequently employed by the foreign nations with whom they had previously negotiated.

I particularly oppose the extension of fast-track authority for a trade agreement with Mexico. I am convinced that the agreement the administration intends to negotiate will be an economic disaster for my part of the country. It should be open to full debate and the normal legislative process, not railroaded through on a fast-track, with no opportunity to amend or improve it.

The people of Michigan have everything to fear from a trade agreement negotiated by the Bush administration with Mexico. Their interest in good jobs that pay a living wage is directly threatened by what Mr. Bush and his trade negotiators are seeking to accomplish.

The administration's goal is a treaty that will make it safe and profitable for American corporations to invest in Mexico in order to exploit the cheap wages and unregulated working conditions that prevail there.

Their goal is to lock in commercial agreements that will boost investor confidence and make Mexico's huge, underemployed workforce available to American manufacturers. The inevitable consequence of that investment is the abandonment of better paid U.S. workers who are doing those jobs today.

There are many reasons why U.S investors doubt the safety of investing in Mexico, including political instability, unpredictable currency fluctuations, and the history of Mexico's nationalization of industries and expropriation of private property. These factors are reflected in the high rates of return on capital in Mexico and in the activities of the United States Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which has been active in insuring United States investments in Mexico against the threat of nationalization or other political risks.

If we assume that the treaty will achieve its purpose of boosting investor confidence in Mexico, it is reasonable to expect that more than half a million good manufacturing jobs will be lost in the United States and transferred to Mexico.

The Economic Policy Institute estimates that an annual investment of $4.4 billion transferred from the United States to Mexico would cost 550,000 United States jobs over a decade. Mexican officials have said they hope for a $6 billion annual investment shift.

In addition to fears about the security of investments, other major obstacles to increased United States investment in Mexico today include laws limiting the proportion of foreign ownership of most Mexican businesses to 40 percent—except in the maquiladoras—and the lack of protection for intellectual property such as patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

Mexican manufacturing workers earn only one-seventh to one-fourteenth the wages of United States workers. Once the barriers to United States investment in Mexico are removed, the lure of such cheap wages will be irresistible to American employers.

The future under a United States-Mexico Free-trade Agreement can be predicted from the history of the maquiladoras, the assembly plants scattered along the United States-Mexico border in special export processing free-trade zones. The maquiladoras have been a disaster for American workers, a disaster for Mexican workers, and a blight on the environment.

The Maquiladora Program had two purposes at its inception in 1965: To employ some of the hundreds of thousands of Mexicans in the northern provinces who were left unemployed when the Bracero Program ended; and to give U.S. manufacturing firms access to cheap labor. The program allows foreign multinationals to import raw materials and components duty-free into certain regions for assembly, processing or finishing. U.S. law permits U.S. components to be exported back to the United States duty-free.

The maquiladora pays duty only on the value added by the Mexican labor. A special exception to Mexico's strict foreign investment law allows maquiladora enterprises to be 100 percent foreign owned.

This Mini-Free-trade Program has led to an investment boom on the Mexican side of the border. 2,000 plants, employing 500,000 people, have been built there. Almost all of them are American companies that once employed Americans in the same operations.

The auto industry is one of the biggest maquiladora operators. GM has 30 maquiladora plants; Ford has 12; and Chrysler has 12. Together, they employ 76,000 hourly workers.

Michigan's 30,000 unemployed GM workers are bitter that their jobs were exported to Mexico. But what about the Mexican workers? Doesn't this investment shift mean a brighter future for them? Isn't this free-trade in jobs the key to improving their standard of living?

Sadly, even the Mexican workers have been hurt by the Maquiladora Program. Wage levels are lower in the maquiladoras than they are in the rest of Mexico. GM and the other U.S. multinationals have driven wages down, suppressed unionization, and turned the local environment into a toxic waste dump.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, manufacturing wages and benefits in Mexico

average $2.32 an hour. In the maquiladoras, compensation is only half as much—$1.15 an hour. Assemblers at GM's Delnosa plant are paid 68 cents an hour. Their workweek is 48 hours.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, 90 percent of Mexico's work force is unionized. Yet, only 10 to 20 percent of the maquiladora workers are unionized. The American companies have not just undermined Mexican wages levels, they have undermined their rights to be represented and to bargain collectively.

Environmental groups that have inspected GM's maquiladora operations report the highest levels of water pollution they have ever recorded. The groundwater on both sides of the border at Nogales has been contaminated with high levels of cadmium, chronium, arsenic, and other highly toxic chemicals. Mexico's EPA has a paltry $3.1 million budget; the maquiladoras know they do not have to worry about environmental enforcement.

The free-trade the United States already practices with Mexico has been a disaster for American workers, for Mexican workers, and for the environment. An expansion of free-trade will only expand the harm.

It would be a grave mistake to give the administration a blank check in negotiating a United States-Mexico Free-trade Agreement. I oppose the fast-track procedure and urge my colleagues to approve the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dorgan resolution to disapprove extension of the fast-track procedure.

I believe in opening markets and expanding trade to enhance economic growth. I do not believe that we must sacrifice the textile industry and farm programs to do so.

Under the Uruguay round agreement, over the next 10 years textile and apparel imports will be permitted to rise 130 percent causing the loss of 1.4 million American jobs. Under the fast-track procedure Congress can do little more than stress our disapproval to the administration.

American farmers and farm families have endured severe economic hardships and uncertainties in recent years. Many have relied on Federal price stabilization programs to stay in business and maintain their farms.

While farmers will benefit from increased market access under new trade agreements, many will not be able to survive the loss of price supports. Under the fast-track procedure, it is likely that Congress will be unable to help them.

The fast-track procedure is based on the assumption that Congress will accept some damaging provisions of a trade agreement in order to receive the benefits of the favorable portions. Statistics may often prove that such a tradeoff is worth the sacrifice.

But farmers and textile workers are more than statistics. We owe it to them to represent their interests fully in our trade agreements. Fast-track, however, will sacrifice them in favor of a theoretical economic advantage. The cost of this alleged advantage is too high.

I also have concerns about the failure of the administration to address environmental concerns fully. For example, the administration's May 1 statement on the proposed North American Free-trade Agreement does not address the basic process by which domestic environmental standards could be weakened—namely, by challenging them as non-tariff barriers to trade.

We have made great progress in protecting the environment in recent years. We must not take a large step backward for the sake of concluding a trade agreement.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 101.

I have studied this question extensively, and I am personally convinced that allowing negotiations on a North American free-trade agreement to proceed on a fast-track is in the best interest of the United States for reasons of foreign, economic, and immigration policy.

Realistically, absent fast-track, these negotiations are not likely to move forward any time soon. In my judgment, we need to make expeditious progress toward a free-trade agreement.

It is past time that we move toward an equal partnership with Mexico. For too long, our relationship with our neighbor has ranged from one of total domination to mutual hostility. This is not sound foreign policy. North American free-trade agreement bears the promise of moving us toward an appropriate relationship for the 21st century.

My experience on the Subcommittee on Immigration also suggests to me that we must proceed on free-trade talks. Economic development in Mexico is the only effective means of stopping the flow of illegal immigration into the United States from Mexico.

We currently have in place a system of employer sanctions which is causing discrimination and which is not stopping the flow. So long as poor Mexican parents see little hope of supporting their families in Mexico compared with opportunities in the United States, no laws, no fences, or ditches, are going to protect United States jobs from undocumented workers.

American labor has a clear stake in stemming the job losses and downward pressure on wages and working conditions in the United States created by illegal immigration resulting from Mexican underdevelopment.

As it is, there are entire sectors in the U.S. economy where our labor laws are not enforced, and where employers deliberately recruit undocumented workers whose rights they can more easily abuse. American workers are losing jobs right here and now in the United States to Mexican workers with lower wage expectations. Ask American farmworkers who have to send their children to work in the fields in order to afford school clothes, or American garment workers competing with undocumented workers willing, out of desperation, to work for low wages in dangerous sweatshops, about the disparity in labor law enforcement between the United States and Mexico. I bet they'll tell you it's overstated.

Economic development in Mexico is a means to end these illicit and intolerable labor practices in the United States.

I want to make one point in particular with regard to agricultural labor. I have communicated to the President that I am unalterably opposed to the creation of any new guestworker programs or the expansion of any existing program. I have sought unequivocal assurance that this matter will not be on the table during the North American Free-Trade Agreement negotiations or in any ancillary discussions, either as an initiative on the part of the parties or at the prompting of U.S. agricultural employers.

I have been given a clear written commitment from U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills, reaffirmed at a meeting with President Bush, that this issue is absolutely off the table. They know that my vote today was conditioned on that commitment.

Grave concern has been raised about whether a free-trade agreement with Mexico will prompt a greater flight to Mexico of United States companies. But American manufacturers are not going to base decisions to move their operations offshore on the elimination of tariffs which now are only 3 to 4 percent. What is more, I believe that a free-trade agreement has the potential for extracting concessions from the Mexican Government that could diminish the incentives that now exist for that flight.

If the negotiations proceed, when the administration brings an agreement back to Congress, I intend to examine it closely to determine whether the black and white letter of the agreement fulfills the potential I have envisioned. Nobody should take for granted my vote on approval of the implementing legislation. All I am saying in approving fast-track is that the prospects make it worth proceeding.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to extending fast-track authority to President Bush for the proposed United States free-trade agreement with Mexico.

Today, we have heard arguments over the economic consequences of such an agreement; and whether you believe the arguments for or against it, the question of fast-track really comes down to one issue—and that is trust.

Trust in the Bush administration to negotiate a free-trade agreement with Mexico that will benefit all Americans.

Let me tell you something about trust in this administration.

Two years ago, the United States Customs Service insisted that Japanese minivans and sports utility vehicles were trucks and should therefore pay the higher 25 percent United States import fee for trucks, instead of the 2.5-percent tariff assessed on cars.

Acting on the request of Japanese truck producers, United States Treasury Secretary Nicholas Brady overruled our Customs Service, allowing the Japanese trucks to come into the United States at the lower 2.5-percent car tariff—even though these same vehicles are not required to meet the stringent fuel economy and auto emissions requirements we have for cars.

By law they are still trucks: By Brady's ruling they are cars.

If this is any indication of how this administration can be trusted to negotiate a free-trade agreement in the interests of America—I have lost my trust.

I do not believe that, without close scrutiny from Congress, the administration has either the will or the interest in negotiating an agreement that will benefit my own constituents.

And that makes fast-track dangerous—and, to me, unacceptable.

I urge all of you to reject the fast-track extension.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAY].

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to extending fast-track negotiating authority to President Bush.

Congressman DORGAN has introduced House Resolution 101 which would remove the fast-track procedure from trade agreements entered into after May 31, 1991. I am a cosponsor of this bill along with over 100 other Members of Congress.

We are from many different States, and represent a wide variety of interests, industries, and individuals. We are united in our desire to make certain that the people and businesses we represent are not hurt by trade negotiations. Quite frankly, I am concerned about the direction that our President has chosen, and I am concerned that the priorities which our President has set will benefit some industries at a cost to others.

There are several things that I want all Members of this Chamber to think long and hard about before they cast their votes on Mr. DORGAN's resolution. I will sum them up in one acronym—"W.A.I.T." The letters in this word stand for some of the most contentious issues in today's trade agreements.

The "W" WAIT stands for wages. Every Member of this body should stop and think about the implications of entering into trade negotiations with Mexico, a country whose average hourly wage rate has declined from $1.26 in 1980 to just $0.59 in 1990 relative to the dollar. Every Member should stop and think about the enticement low wages are for labor intensive industries. And every Member should think about whether we are prepared to move America away from industries which employ thousands and thousands of workers, and into an era of service industries and high-technology industries. Because make no mistake about it, American industry is moving south of the border and putting American workers left behind out of business.

Then there is "A" for agriculture. Members of this body should keep in mind the months of work that were put into crafting a farm bill last year. Members should also stop and think about those 2 percent of Americans who are out there farming and feeding your families. These men and women are producing the finest produce in the world. American farmers comply with the toughest safety standards and guarantee you high quality at reasonable prices. We crafted a farm bill that gives farmers a little bit of the security that they give us. We make sure that they are able to feed us.

I want to draw attention to a response from Ambassador Carla Hills to a question posed by my good friend and colleague from Texas, Mr. STENHOLM. The question asked about one section 22 commodity that has been in the papers recently, and that is peanuts. Ambassador Hills writes, and I quote, "must the United States agree to modify all section 22 quotas in order to reach a GATT agreement? The answer is Yes. . . ." Ambassador Hills goes on to write, "concern has been expressed about surges of imported peanuts from China if section 22 quotas were modified . . . if the President decides that emergency action is necessary, he may impose import relief immediately pending completion of a USITC investigation."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't speak for every Member who represents a peanut farmer or a dairy farmer or anyone else who falls under section 22, but this is not the kind of response that I think speaks of an administration concerned about the fate of this industry. A peanut farmer whose livelihood is threatened by imports cannot wait for the ITC to investigate. In fact just recently some members of the ITC recommended increasing the amount of peanuts imported into this country. We can all imagine the kind of speedy recommendation the ITC would give the President. Just the threat, Mr. Speaker, not the importation, but the suggestion that an unspecified number of peanuts could come into the country under the recent ITC recommendation brought our carefully crafted peanut program to a halt. Planting and contracting stopped completely, and our farmers have been left wondering whether they should even be in the business.

"I" is for interior issues. As Americans we are waging a war against pollution. We are fighting to clean up our air, our water, and our soil so that our children and our children's children can live in the same bright world we have enjoyed. America still has a long way to go. As chairman of the Environmental Restoration Panel for the House Armed Services Committee, I understand both the progress and the limitations of our work. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we cannot turn our backs on the environmental concerns which we, as Americans, have taken to heart, and which our trading partners may not hold as dear.

Not only do Americans benefit from protecting our environment under our current standards, but we have incorporated the cost of environmental protection into the production of our goods. Any country which does not adhere to standards as stringent as America's places the American manufacturer at a competitive disadvantage.

Finally, the end of WAIT. The last letter, "T," stands for textiles. I choose this commodity to represent those industries which have been targeted as losers in foreign trade agreements.

Textile imports have tripled over the last 10 years. If the current round of negotiations succeeds in phasing out the multifiber agreement, the U.S. textile industry could be devastated. Studies suggest that job losses of more than 40 percent in key industries could result from the current negotiations. The hardest hit will be textiles, automobile parts, shoes and steel. What the administration seems to be saying in its negotiations is that every country should produce only those products in which it is internationally competitive.

Mr. Speaker, we know Americans are competitive. We know our products are in demand all over the world. But we also know that we in Congress and the President have enacted production standards, wage standards, anti-discrimination laws, child labor laws, and environmental laws which effect the price of our goods. What a consumer gets when he buys an American product is more than just the product. It is a commitment to a high standard and commitment to a better environment.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage every Member to stop, think, and WAIT. The administration has written to each of us expressing its view that fast-track negotiating authority is necessary for the successful completion of any multilateral or bilateral trade agreement. Mr. Speaker, the United States has negotiated trade agreements for 100 years without fast-track. Individuals in this Chamber must understand that when the President's agreement comes before us under fast-track, we will be under tremendous pressure to pass the agreement. The deal will have been struck. That is not the time to begin our negotiations. Now is the time to exercise our constitutional power. Now is the time to give substance to our concerns. Now is the time to realize our responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "Yes" vote on House Resolution 101 to disapprove fast-track authority.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN].

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I have long supported free-trade. I voted for the Canada Free-trade Agreement. I voted against the textile bill. But after watching the administration stumble around without a coherent trade policy, I'm not willing to give the administration a blank check. And my constituents aren't either.

In response to congressional concerns about a Mexico Free-trade Agreement, the administration has offered only a list of empty promises. It provides no new information on the economic impact of a free-trade agreement with Mexico. It makes no commitment on adjustment programs for workers adversely affected by trade, and it rejects the inclusion of labor standards, worker health and safety,

worker rights, and environmental protection. As many of my colleagues found out, trade negotiators will promise the moon and the stars to get congressional approval, but give blank stares when asked to follow through after the agreement is signed.

If this were a vote only on fast-track on GATT, I would vote for it. Those multilateral negotiations are critically important to Oregon manufacturers and agricultural producers.

But this bill does not deal simply with GATT—the Mexican Free-trade fast-track is linked with it.

I am voting, therefore, against the bill. Should it be defeated, I know full well that a free-standing GATT bill will be brought to the floor for a vote.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the vote we are about to cast is vital. It will affect the jobs of thousands of Americans who want and deserve decent jobs. It will determine our ability to influence U.S. trade with all other nations. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 101, the Dorgan resolution to stop fast-track.

The truth is that fast-track cuts Congress out of the trade negotiating process. It will keep us from protecting those who need our help the most, and gives the power to the administration. It limits Congress to a "yes" or "no" vote just 60 days after we receive a completed trade agreement from the President—no amendments, no nothing.

I regretfully conclude that we simply cannot trust this administration to protect U.S. workers, industry, and consumers. The people of Detroit sent me to Washington to defend them. I am not going to let them down.

Just yesterday, U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills told the Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security, which I have the privilege to chair, that she was more interested in watching than in acting. She could only identify one nation in the world—Norway—that discriminates against the United States in trade. Amazing as its seems, this was actually an improvement, last year she identified none.

In fact, the administration is required by law—title VII of the Buy American Act of 1988—to identify those countries that practice unfair trade. Yet, what we heard yesterday was the same thing we heard last year—a refusal to stand up to our international competitors.

Imagine, seven major markets—the European Community, Germany, France, Italy, Greece, Japan, and Australia—with a $44 billion trade deficit fueled by discrimination admitted by the administration, and they formally pick out the tiny market of Norway—our 42d ranking export market—as the one nation that discriminates against us.

Last year, the administration told the committee that it preferred to address discrimination through renegotiation of the multilateral code on government procurement, then underway with the Uruguay round of the GATT. This year, renegotiations have not concluded, procurement discrimination still exists, and the administration still refuses to use the powers Congress has given it.

As Yogi Berra said, "it's like deja vu all over again."

For the GATT talks and the Mexican trade talks, the President has said, "trust me." But can we? If we cannot depend on the administration to enforce current law, how can we trust them in secret trade negotiations, removed from the public's view and congressional corrective action?

The latest GATT draft treaty would expose nearly every U.S. Federal, State, and local environmental, health, and safety law to challenge as a technical barrier. Cancer-causing asbestos, pesticides on imported food, and environmental violations could all become allowable under an agreement that would be the law of our land. This kind of an agreement is simply unacceptable. Only Congress can ensure that these trade agreements—and any others that the U.S. negotiates in coming years—do not compromise our national interests.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 101, disapproving the extension of fast-track authority. I spent the first several months of my term listening, discussing, and learning about GATT and the proposed Mexico Free-trade Agreement and have become convinced that we cannot trust the administration to represent the interests of American farmers and workers. Put simply, the administration's trade proposals would cut the throats of our farmers and workers.

Look at the historical record. In 1947, a 3 ton truck—the standard farm vehicle—cost about $2,400, or 986 bushels of wheat. In 1991, the same truck now costs $27,000. Yes, I know we've experienced inflation in the years between 1947 and 1991. But in terms of wheat, it would take 10,000 bushels to pay for that truck in 1991. It would take 11 times the amount of any commodity to pay for that manufactured good.

Folks will argue that the American farmer has become a lot more efficient, but so has the automobile industry. Other sectors of this economy, outside of agriculture, have all become more efficient but the prices simply haven't come down. Why agriculture should be singled out and forced to compete at the world price is beyond me, but that is what this administration will negotiate if we extend the fast-track authority.

If we fail in this attempt to derail fast-track authority, I think I have a solution for the problems our farmers are facing. If they are going to have to compete in a world market, then the services they pay for with the profits from the world price of commodities should also be priced competitively.

Let me give you an example. Most grain farmers, if forced to take the world price for their commodities are going to have to hire lawyers to handle their loan negotiations with Farmers Home or their bankruptcy filing. The average small firm lawyer in my region makes about $98,000, far below the partner in a large Washington firm who makes around $300,000. A Brazilian lawyer, on the other hand, makes between $22,000 to $27,000. I don't think my grain farmers should have to pay more than their competition in Brazil, so we should probably strive to get to the world price for lawyers in our GATT negotiations.

Look instead at a sugar beet farmer. Say the price for sugar falls to the world price. Isn't it fair that the sugar beet farmer should get the same competitive price for legal services. Since Cuba has probably the lowest sugar price in this hemisphere, let's use what they pay their lawyers as the world price. A call to their Embassy indicated that the annual salary for a Cuban lawyer is $6,000. Now we're talking. At those kind of rates, my sugar beet farmer can go bankrupt and have something left even after his attorney is paid.

It is also well documented that we have a surplus of lawyers in this country, something like 10 times as many per person as the Japanese. This has the potential to be a big export market for the United States. Imagine, if we exported enough lawyers to achieve numerical equality worldwide, we might screw up the economies of our international competitors enough that we would really open up some foreign markets.

We should also look at the pay chief executive officers receive in the United States versus the world price. I have received uncounted letters on nice embossed stationary from CEO's of all sorts of American companies who want fast-track extended. A recent Wall Street Journal article indicated that these GEO's are payed as much as 40 percent higher than their foreign competitors. Eighty percent have stock options, while the comparable figure worldwide is 30 percent. If we are going to shrink our farm incomes and hourly wages to match the world market, these executive salaries absolutely have to be part of the negotiations. I think the company planes, chauffeurs, country club memberships, and all the other perks have to be on the table. I hope the administration's trade representative is taking notes.

A recent Washington Post article indicated that American CEO's had their wages jump an astonishing 20 percent between 1988 and 1989—the most recent year for which data was available. I know my dairy farmers are seeing their incomes decline 30 percent this year and the USDA indicates that GATT will cost them another $1 billion. Imagine what prices our consumers could get if CEO salaries saw a comparable reduction.

Or let's take the ratio of CEO earnings to the average manufacturing employee. The same Post article indicated that the average CEO of a large American company earns, excuse me, makes 35 times the average U.S. manufacturing employee. The ratio for Japanese CEO's to employees is 15 to 1, and in Europe it's 20 to 1. This should definitely be the subject of GATT negotiations.

Another service the farmers and workers of my district all have to pay for is medical care. Now, we don't have enough doctors in rural areas, so we can't afford to export them. But, we could bring the salaries down to the world market price. My farmers compete in the world marketplace with Australia and the average doctor there earns $43,581.20. The Australian Embassy has excellent data. The American

Medical Association figures for U.S. doctors show a mean salary of $155,800 and a median salary of $125,000. There is obviously something to negotiate here. If my farmers could just pay the world price for medical care they would be a whole lot better off. Don't argue that American medical standards are higher; our farmers are also the best in the world. What we're talking about here is price—wages, commodity prices, service fees—not about the nationality of the provider.

Many of you probably think I'm being humorous, and on one level I am. But overall I'm dead serious. What the administration is proposing to do in negotiations under the fast-track extension we are considering today is eliminate international price differentials for farm commodities and hourly wages. It is extremely unlikely that world prices will rise to U.S. levels; it is much more likely that our prices will fall significantly and the world price will rise slightly.

If the farmers and workers in my district are forced to compete in the international marketplace, then so should our executives. Don't tell me that it takes more skill to run a company than run a dairy. American dairy men and women get a higher yield per cow than anyone else in the world. Our sugar beet farmers are the most productive in the world. American workers are also pretty competitive on a per hour production basis. If we are putting their incomes on the line, then everyone else's should be on the line too. Let's break down the licensing barriers that protect our doctors and lawyers from competition. Let's break down the cultural barriers that let our CEO's make more than anyone else in the world. When my workers and farmers can shop a world market for services, and when the wage ratio of U.S. manufacturing workers with CEO's is comparable with other countries is the same as other countries, then I'll support the fast-track extension because it can lead to free-trade that is fair. In fact, if the administration was willing to add these issues to the GATT and free-trade talks, I'd vote for the extension right now. But they won't. They'll trade away American jobs and American farm income for reduced trade barriers for goods that won't be manufactured here anymore and for farm commodities that won't be grown here anymore.

I ask you to support House Resolution 101 and deny the fast-track extension.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for opening up the border between the United States and Mexico. The time is long overdue for us to remove barriers to trade that prevent us from cooperating fully with a nation whose history and culture are inextricably linked with ours. I also rise in opposition to extension of fast-track authority.

It is important to point out that fast-track is not synonymous with free-trade, and certainly not with fair trade. Many of the arguments against extension of fast-track authority are weak. Some are blatantly protectionist. Some fast-track opponents have exploited people's irrational fears of increased immigration from Mexico in order to gain support. I have other reasons for opposing extension of fast-track authority.

This is the people's House. We have been sent here to represent all the people of the United States. We should not abdicate our responsibility by surrendering to the executive branch the duties and responsibilities of the legislative branch of government. Just as the President is responsible for negotiating trade agreements, so Congress has a responsibility to see that the concerns of our constituents are addressed in those agreements.

The economic problems facing New York City at this time are complex. Free-trade with Mexico could be the best thing for New York City's economy, but only if the agreement is balanced. The nationwide recession began in the Northeast, and New York has been hit hard. We have been losing manufacturing jobs at an alarming rate, as businesses close down and relocate. One path to economic recovery for New York City is the development of export markets. But development of the Mexican export market will not lead our city to recovery, if it causes thousands of workers to lose their jobs.

Mexico and its people have much to offer the United States on both sides of the border: more, I suspect, than some proponents of fast-track imagine. It is important that we do everything we can to help President Salinas and the Mexican people to strengthen their economy. Our neighbors to the south deserve the same consideration and support as our neighbors to the north and our allies in Europe. As we send aid to the Kurdish refugees in Iraq, and send our most highly skilled professionals to rebuild the infrastructure of Kuwait, it is time that we do more to help Mexico in her struggle to reform the economy and the government.

Fast-track is not the best way to help Mexico. As we work toward a trade agreement, we can help Mexico to develop its economy by crafting a comprehensive debt relief program, expanding foreign aid, and sharing our extensive experience in the areas of environmental and labor law. We recently focused the resources and priorities of this Nation on the mission to liberate Kuwait from a tyrannical Iraqi occupation. We utilized our most precious resources, hundreds of thousands of our people, in the service of a small, faraway nation, in order to restore its political and economic autonomy. If we can expend our money and resources in the Middle East, certainly we can take steps to support our closest neighbor, Mexico.

A fair free-trade agreement would open up the Mexican market to United States exports and stimulate the Mexican economy. By promoting economic recovery in Mexico through a free-trade agreement, we will strengthen our own position in the global economy through our partnership with Mexico and Canada. I am not convinced that it is in the public interest to hand over the future of trade with Mexico to this administration without retaining considerable congressional control over any final agreement. Trade talks with Mexico could well be the most important negotiations undertaken by our Government, with far-reaching effects for the economic future of the United States and North America. Let's make sure to get it right.

American workers are understandably anxious about the possible effects of expanded trade with Mexico. It is likely that many of their fears are justified, while some may be unfounded. Many conflicting projections have been made over the last several weeks regarding the job losses, job gains, reemployment opportunities, and unemployment increases that may result from a free-trade agreement with Mexico. It is the role of Congress to examine these competing claims. The livelihoods of workers and business people are at stake, and we must allay their fears by reassuring the American people that Congress is prepared to hear and act upon their concerns. The administration's push for fast-track extension has driven a wedge between big business and organized labor, just at the time when we should be striving to bring all these interests together to work out an acceptable trade agreement.

Congress has worked hard to enact many pieces of legislation that would be directly threatened by fast-track extension. Fast-track would allow the administration to set trade policies that bypass many of the current laws and regulations that protect American workers and consumers. Once a trade agreement is ratified, our hard won environmental, health, safety, and labor standards are open to challenge by our trading partners as technical barriers to trade. By extending fast-track authority we would effectively give up our ability to see that our own legislation is implemented according to Congressional intent.

We should not paint ourselves into a corner. If we extend fast-track, we in Congress who care about the environment, and care about fair health, labor, and safety standards, will find ourselves powerless to safeguard workers here and in Mexico. I believe that by extending fast-track we will put ourselves in the position of having to choose between an unsatisfactory trade agreement with Mexico, or no trade agreement at all. We must retain our ability to continue in the democratic process of exploring and responding to the needs and concerns of all the American people, so that one day we will have the opportunity to rise on this floor and enact legislation to remove barriers to trade and expand markets and production in the United States and Mexico.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 101, the only bill offered that allows us to retain the authority and responsibility placed with us by the American people to implement a trade agreement that is in the public interest of the United States and Mexico.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment that is being brought before us. I am very much opposed to the business of ending without our people having a job. Poverty is rising, and I want it already understood that my statement is in support of the position for not continuing to do what we are doing here today. I hope that we understand that we have got to protect those people who have already been thrown out of work, and see what we can do in support of the

Dorgan resolution. I think that is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Dorgan resolution. The reason I support the resolution is here in my hands—42 pages of companies which have set up shop in the maquiladora region. This list includes their parent companies in the United States. I urge my colleagues to listen:

Ford Motor has four plants producing auto trim.

General Motors and Chrysler have plants producing auto trim and parts.

TRW produces seat belts.

Zenith makes its TV cabinets in Mexico.

Du Pont makes chemical fluorides.

IBM makes its computer components there.

Eastman Kodak, Honeywell, and ITT have moved there.

Defense industries such as McDonnell Douglas and Rockwell International joined the parade to Mexico.

The list goes on and on; 42 pages single-spaced. Everything from automotive parts to velcro; from baseball caps to "O" rings for American fighter planes—all these items which American companies used to produce, are now produced by these same companies in Mexico.

In 1980, there were 120 maquiladora plants. Now there are 1,800 plants with 500,000 workers.

Recently, some workers at a Chrysler plant in Detroit handed me an ad from a consultant. This consultant is advising his clients to stop any plans to build or expand in the United States. He says: Wait until the free-trade agreement is signed, so you can take advantage of the labor market in Mexico. He knows that 13-year-old girls have been found in maquiladora sweat shops. He knows that the Rio Grande River is turning into a sewage drain, filed with toxic chemicals. He knows that enforcement of Mexico's environmental laws is almost nonexistent.

Free-trade does not help Mexican workers, and is not fair to this country.

I urge my colleagues to support the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Dorgan amendment and support fast-track. It is good for America, it is good for jobs. I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of President Bush's request for a 2-year extension to the fast-track authority for negotiating trade agreements and also in support of the principle of a North American Free-trade Agreement.

Because of the close physical proximity of my congressional district to Mexico, I am intimately aware of the high degree of economic, cultural, and social interchange between the two countries. My experiences as the U.S. Representative for this region have reinforced my opinion that our nations need to address this interdependence to our mutual advantage. I believe that strengthening these bonds can only have a beneficial effect upon the economic prosperity of both the United States and Mexico.

A free-trade agreement is an essential part of this process. The United States must continue to work to improve its economic stability and growth, and as recent experience bears out, increasing U.S. exports is vital to this end. Since 1986, exports have accounted for more than 40 percent of U.S. GNP growth, with 88 percent of GNP growth in 1990 accounted for by exports. It is estimated that each $1 billion in exports creates over 22,000 U.S. jobs. United States exports to Mexico alone have doubled over the last 4 years and our trade deficit with Mexico has been cut by two-thirds. It has been estimated that this increase in exports to Mexico has alone created 264,000 export-related jobs here in the United States. It is clear that the future growth of our economy and the future success of our Nation hinges upon the expansion of our exports, and in particular the broadening of our trade relations with Mexico.

A free-trade agreement will allow the United States to expand this vital export growth by allowing U.S. manufacturers to more thoroughly globalize their operations, increasing competitiveness and cost-effectiveness. To remain competitive, we must take advantage of the fact that the United States and Mexico complement one another economically, in much the same ways that the nations of Southeast Asia and the Pacific rim, and the members of the European Community, have used and will continue to use their individual competitive strengths to their collective advantage. The United States must recognize the viability and strength of these emerging trading blocs and respond accordingly. A North American Free-trade Agreement is this necessary response.

With a free-trade agreement, Mexico will become an even larger market for United States businesses. Of each dollar Mexico currently spends on imports, 70 cents is spent on United States goods. For each dollar of GNP growth, 15 cents is spent on U.S. goods. By helping to expand the Mexican economy and raise Mexican wage rates, a free-trade agreement will increase an already demonstrated demand for United States goods.

I fully recognize that a free-trade agreement such as the one that is currently being negotiated is a complex issue and I am carefully examining all the potential effects that its implementation could have on our two nations as a whole. I have watched and admired the actions that President Salinas has taken toward opening up the Mexican economy to foreign competition and investment. He has moved quickly to lower tariffs, privatize industry, eliminate protectionist policies, crack down on corruption, and strengthen Mexico's environmental protection laws. However, significant nontariff barriers remain, including import licenses and investment restrictions that effect both investment and trade. A free-trade agreement will bring down these barriers.

Furthermore, there are still concerns over the level of compliance with the Mexican environmental laws and the state of worker health and safety regulations in Mexico. These are issues that must be addressed, but the way to ensure this is not to turn our backs to our neighbors, but to work with them. A stronger and economically thriving Mexico will be better able to address the environmental and labor safety concerns which we all share. These are issues that we need to work on together.

President Bush has recently come out with an action plan which will do exactly this. The President has declared that we will maintain our right to exclude any product that does not meet our health and safety requirements, and that we will maintain our right to impose stringent pesticide, energy conservation, toxic waste, and health and safety standards. In addition, he has pledged the willingness of our Government to work with Mexico to enhance health and safety standards and their enforcement. The EPA and SEDUE have already begun working together to design and implement an integrated border environmental plan to address matters such as pollution, hazardous waste, pesticide use, and methods of proper regulatory enforcement, including expanded cooperative enforcement activities and programs of technical cooperation and training.

I applaud the prompt and continued attention that the administration has given to these issues as they work towards achieving a free trade agreement. Similarly, we here in Congress must continue to explore avenues for expanding congressional dialog on this issue in order to ensure that our perceptions are fully aired. Ambassador Hills and President Bush have given the Congress every assurance that all relevant issues will be addressed, and I intend to hold them to that promise.

The opinions and views of the U.S. Congress and the American people must be properly adhered to. However, the denial of fast track is not an effective way of assuring this. The only thing that a disapproval of fast track will do is derail negotiations between our two nations, preclude any possibility of a free trade agreement, and force our Nation to forgo the important economic benefits that such an agreement will reap. The approval of fast track does not improperly abdicate Congress of its powers. It does allow our Nation to take advantage of this most golden of opportunities at a crucial juncture in its economic fortunes.

I am greatly encouraged by the progress that has been made by both the United States and Mexican Governments on the subject of trade relations, and I will continue to be monitoring negotiations on a North American Free Trade Agreement with every expectation that such an agreement will be an important and positive step for both our nations. I request your support for the extension of the fast-track authority so that negotiations may commence, and I ask my colleagues to join with me in voting against the Dorgan resolution of disapproval.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. OLIN].

□ 1350

Mr. OLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 101 and in support of extending the fast-track authority. Prior to my career in Congress, I spent most of my life involved with exports and trade while in business. I have found that where we had good trade relations our exports flourished. Many of the products we produced in Roanoke were exported to 60 countries around

the world. Today the opportunity to export for my business in Roanoke and for other business around the country is greater than ever.

However, in order for our country to be successful exporters we need to successfully complete the Uruguay round of General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] negotiations. Also, if we expect to wrap up the GATT talks we need the fast-track authority. If we disallow the fast-track authority the GATT negotiations will fail, and these negotiations are crucial to the success of our exports.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I have followed the GATT negotiations closely for the past 4 years. I do not agree with those who say our negotiators are insensitive to U.S. workers. I found the negotiators to be knowledgeable, honest, and hard bargainers. They are also extremely careful to keep Congress advised of their negotiations. I do not fear using fast track to complete GATT negotiations or to open up trade with Mexico.

With regard to Mexico, I do not share the gloom and doom opinion shared by some of my colleagues. I believe that anything we can do to encourage trade will help both countries. Our negotiators will work toward a fair free-trade agreement, but that does not mean that we will get there any time soon. Many changes will first be needed before we are on a free-trade basis. In many segments of the economy transtitions to free trade with Mexico are going to take up to 10 to 20 years. It seems obvious to me that if we want to bring about a level playing field for American products we will be able to do this faster and with more leverage with a strong trade agreement than without one.

Of course it is going to be important for Congress to follow negotiations closely. This will assure that segments of our economy are protected from being unnecessarily damaged. But I have full confidence in our negotiators to handle these important trade agreements in a responsible manner.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the Dorgan resolution and support extending the fast-track authority.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the fast-track legislation.

But really, this is not the issue before us today. We are not talking about the actual end product. We are talking about the means to achieve this trade agreement.

The means are neutral. They can produce an end which is good or bad, and we will have an opportunity to vote on that end later.

Make no mistake, I will vote no on the end product if I feel it hurts our economy today. However, I am going to vote in support of the fast track. I am voting to give America the opportunity to secure trade agreements which create jobs and growth.

Derailing fast track guarantees that there will be no means to achieve an end to any trade negotiations. Let us vote for the means to get positive trade agreements.

America's strength is found in each and every American. It is the capacity of each individual to achieve their utmost, unrestricted by oppressive government, which has made the United States the greatest Nation in the history of mankind. It was the genius of the founding fathers in recognizing that a free man given the proper tools can achieve the utmost to the benefit of all Americans.

Over 200 years have passed since the establishment of our Republic. During this time the American people have weathered many challenges and triumphed. The strength of a free people and the confidence which freedom generates has overwhelmed all foes. As we approach the millennium, America stands triumphant. American military might is unchallenged, communism is collapsing in the face of a popular democratic will of oppressed peoples throughout the world. The greatest challenges now confronting Americans are economic—maintaining our economic supremacy and standard of living.

I believe in America and the American people's ability to rise to any challenge and feel that a fairer international marketplace is in our national interest and will bring a rising standard of living. I further believe that protectionism would bring economic stagnancy; placing limits on the potential achievements of individual Americans and the entire Nation.

The issue of fast-track authority forms the divide between these two views of America's future. Fast track is the essential vehicle for conducting any trade negotiations. It provides clear lines of authority between the legislative and executive branches. The Congress bears the ultimate responsibility of approving or rejecting any agreement while the executive branch acts as the single representative of American interests in trade negotiations. Moreover, our negotiators will have to consult the Congress throughout the negotiations because they know that any agreement must be acceptable to Congress. They recognize that I will not hesitate to vote against any future trade agreement which is against our national interest and will urge my congressional colleagues to do likewise.

This division of responsibility helps ensure that the best interests of the American people are promoted. It reflects several key realities: the Congress with 535 Members is institutionally incapable of conducting negotiations with foreign nations—as it speaks with many voices. Only the executive branch can provide our trading partners with a single negotiator. However, the very diversity of Congress ensures that the interests of the entire Nation must be considered if the agreement is to ultimately pass Congress.

The opponents of fast track seek to reverse the nearly sixty-year legacy of divided responsibility between executive and legislative branches on trade matters. The protectionists recognize that no trade agreement, not the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], not the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA], can be achieved without fast-track authority. Simply put, no foreign country will concede trade concessions to U.S. negotiators if they know that these concessions will merely be the starting points of new negotiations with the Congress. Those who believe that any trade agreement is against our national interest, those who believe we cannot compete on a level playing field, should oppose fast track to preclude the possibility of an agreement being reached. Those who believe that the executive branch is not adequately promoting American interests in negotiations—that they are only opening the American market to foreign competition without securing United States access to foreign markets—should oppose fast track. After all, competition is only positive if there is a level playing field.

I reserved my judgment on fast track until I was confident that the administration was listening to the concerns of American farmers, industry, and workers. The House Agriculture Committee, on which I serve, has held numerous hearings on trade issues. In addition, I have met with U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills and Secretary of Agriculture Ed Madigan, and have been assured that Congress and industry will have many opportunities to input throughout the negotiations.

The proposed free-trade agreement with Mexico, also known as NAFTA, presents tremendous potential for Texas and the rest of the United States. Over the last 5 years Mexican tariffs have dropped from an average of 30 percent to a current average of 10 percent. This opening of the Mexican market has brought a tremendous expansion of U.S. exports to Mexico. From 1987 to 1989, Texas' exports increased by 70 percent to over $11 billion. The free-trade agreement protects American exporters from a Mexican return to its historical protectionist policies. The free-trade agreement helps insure that 15 percent of every dollar in Mexican growth continues to be spent on imports from the United States and that 70 percent of Mexican imports continue to come from the United States. To Mexico, the free-trade agreement offers the promise of economic growth and the ability to provide jobs for a population which will exceed 100 million within a decade. Without jobs these millions will be forced to look north for work—dramatically increasing illegal immigration to our State and Nation.

GATT is the framework under which world trade is conducted. Freer world trade produces economic growth. In fact, 40 percent of U.S. economic growth the last 4 years and 90 percent of U.S. economic growth in 1990 was directly attributable to exports. A future GATT agreement, which provides protection for intellectual property rights and opens up protected service sectors, could dramatically increase American exports and increase the American standard of living. I have had concerns that U.S. negotiators were not sufficiently addressing the potential impact on certain segments of American agriculture: commodities with section 22 import protection—peanuts, cotton, dairy, sugar. I raised these concerns with the administration and the U.S. Trade Representative.

Prior to these meetings, I joined many of my colleagues in expressing extreme concern surrounding the attitudes and previous comments made by some administrative officials; which have lead many in the agriculture industry to question the value of any agreement. These officials have incorrectly indicated that an agreement would somehow eliminate our right to determine domestic agriculture policy. This understandably puts fear in the hearts of those who conjure up images of massive import surges that will drive our domestic producers out of business. If these types of surges occur, section 406 of the Trade Act of 1974 provides authority to restrict imports solely on products from a Communist country or countries from which such imports have caused or threatened to cause market disruption.

Our commodity loan program for peanuts, for example, exists to assist the orderly marketing of peanuts during the entire year. Peanut producers are protected from short-term price fluctuations, particularly at harvest time. I have written assurance from our negotiators who

> . . . expect this program to continue even under substantial reform in a GATT agreement. In addition, newly created tariffs and transitional arrangements for import surges would provide protection for the peanut industry.

That's not to say that some of our more protectionist programs may not have to make some adjustments—for example, some negotiated imports—in exchange for some export opportunities and fairer trade—assuming an agreement is reached. But without fast-track authority, the United States is not even a player at the negotiating table and we will lose the opportunity to judge the merits of any final agreement that could emerge. This would put our agricultural sector, and our Nation, at a serious disadvantage. By not opposing this procedure, we have the clear understanding that every effort will be made to ensure that the concerns of U.S. agriculture are fully addressed.

I have strongly expressed many problem areas to our negotiators, among which include their talk of completely eliminating section 22 protection for peanuts, cotton, dairy, and sugar—leaving these industries vulnerable to unnecessary imports. The U.S. Trade Representative's office has come a long way in addressing these concerns. I am including their written response to my questions at the end of my statement.

Our farmers are facing considerable adjustments in internal farm subsidies as a result of the 1985 and 1990 Farm Acts and budget legislation. As a producer, I have to look toward the international marketplace as an opportunity to enhance farm income in the future. Without a successful GATT agreement this opportunity doesn't exist. A "successful" agreement means that our competitors could no longer stimulate their production with sky-high price supports (sometimes double our levels), close their borders to imports, use unjustified health regulations to keep out the competition, pile up surpluses and then dump it on world markets with big export subsidies, et cetera. Much of the cost of our farm programs is simply to offset the heavy farm support and unfair practices of other countries.

The purpose of these talks, which have been taking place in one form or another since the 1930's, is to expand market opportunities and work toward fairer trade. Destroying, or even adversely affecting, those programs that have consistently provided this country with the best quantity, the best quality and the safest food supply at the lowest relative cost of any other country in the world certainly not be a part of this endeavor.

It is my sincere hope that our negotiators are able to achieve success in the GATT and NAFTA negotiations. I firmly believe that a freer and fairer world trading environment with our neighbors and major trading partners will mean economic growth and jobs for Americans. The capabilities of America and the American people are limitless. Fast track offers no guarantees for achieving a good agreement, it is merely a means, not an end. I have confidence that the Congress, as a voice of the American people, would reject any trade agreement which proved contrary to our national economic well being. Without fast track, trade negotiations will halt and this possibility of enhancing economic growth and opportunity will not be realized.

To reiterate, we've heard convincing remarks against any potential trade agreement. We have heard evidence regarding potential threats trade agreements might pose to American jobs and industry. I share my colleagues concerns and have additional concern for section 22 agricultural commodities.

However, this is not the issue before us. We are not voting on an end product, a trade agreement. We are not voting on the merits of a Uruguay round GATT accord or a free trade agreement with Mexico. We are voting on the means to achieve a trade agreement, fast track. The means are neutral. They can produce an end which is good or bad and we will have an opportunity to vote on that end. Make no mistake, I will vote no on that end product if I feel it hurts our economy.

Today, however, I am voting in support of fast track. I am voting to give America the opportunity to secure trade agreements which create jobs and growth. Derailing fast track guarantees there will be no means to achieve an end to any trade negotiation. Let us vote for the means to get positive trade agreements through passage of fast track and let us pledge to reject the end product of any trade negotiation which is not in America's best interest. Do not confuse the means with the end. Vote for the possibility of economic growth and jobs. Vote for fast track.

THE U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
*Washington, DC 20506, May, 2, 1991.*

Hon. CHARLES W. STENHOLM,
*U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STENHOLM: Attached are the questions you submitted to me on dairy, cotton, and peanuts. I hope the answers help to clarify our position on these issues. I appreciate your ongoing interest in the Uruguay Round negotiations on agriculture and look forward to continuing our discussion on this and other trade issues.

Sincerely,

CARLA A. HILLS.

QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO THE TREATMENT OF DAIRY

Question 1. Reform of the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP) may be consistent with reducing EC international supports, export subsidies, and a general lowering of the levels of the EC variable import levies. But strong discipline on the variable level, such as bound over-quota tariffs, I viewed in the EC as inconsistent with CAP budgetary discipline because it would mean loss of control over agricultural imports into the EC. For this reason, is it not doubtful that the EC will be willing to agree to "clean tariffication" (*i.e.*, bound tariffs without "fixed" and "variable" components, exchange rate adjusters, etc.)? How can the U.S. justify its willingness to surrender its basic program for controlling market access, Section 22, without assurances that the EC will be able or willing to fundamentally change its variable levy?

Answer. This interpretation of the U.S. position is incorrect. We have repeatedly stated that we are prepared to modify our agricultural support and protection system, but we will *not* make those changes unless other countries make similar commitments. We would *not* give up Section 22 unless other countries, including the EC, agreed to make similar changes to their non-tariff barriers in the context of a multilateral agreement.

From the beginning of the negotiations, we have recognized that improving market access will be a huge challenge. Many participants rejected the idea of tariffication when we first proposed it in 1987. Now, the concept appears to be acceptable to countries, including the EC. The issue has come down how to implement the concept, *i.e.*, "clean" or otherwise. The EC's proposed modification of the variable levy will not improve market access. The experience in Brussels sent a strong message to the EC, Japan and others that *real* reform of market access barriers, export subsidies and trade-distorting internal supports will be an essential element of any final agreement. Hence, we expect to have a legitimate method for tariffication in the final agreement.

Question 2. Is the U.S. prepared to agree to a fixed and variable component system and/or exchange rate correction factor in order to achieve tariffication, if the EC insists upon them?

Answer. It should be noted that tariffication, in itself, is not an objective of the U.S. All participants have agreed upon substantial progressive reductions in support and protection. The U.S. proposed the concept of tariffication as a mechanism for achieving a reduction in protection on a multilateral basis. As indicated above, the EC's proposal to modify its variable levy would not produce increased market access. It is, therefore, inconsistent with the agreed-upon objectives and unacceptable to the U.S. and other participants.

The EC's corrective factor system would allow for complete offsetting of all exchange rate movements, partial offsetting of non-monetary price movements up to a threshold, and complete offsetting of non-monetary price movements beyond the threshold. The EC wants their corrective factor system to be a permanent "overlay" to fixed tariff equivalents. In many aspects, the EC's system is just like their current variable levies. We do recognize that temporary import relief measures may be useful during the implementation period. We have proposed that a tariff snapback mechanism be permitted during the implementation period. Under our proposal, if either an import volume or an

import price trigger is exceeded, a country would be permitted to automatically raise tariffs to moderate a surge in imports, i.e., no injury investigation would be required. Our proposal differs significantly from the EC's corrective factor system both in its design—no automatic exchange rate adjustor, for example—and in its temporary (vs permanent) nature.

Question 3. Are we prepared to agree to a strengthened and/or clarified Article XI if Canada, the EC and Japan insists upon it?

Answer. No, we have proposed the elimination of Article XI:2(c), a provision which sanctions the use of import quotas for agricultural products under certain conditions. Under our proposal, all import quotas currently maintained under Article XI:2(c) would be subject to tariffication. From our perspective, the changes proposed by Canada, the EC and Japan would weaken, not strengthen, Article XI and make it easier for countries to restrict agricultural imports.

Question 4. Won't the U.S. dairy industry suffer under "clean" tariffication because its current "protection levels" are so much lower than those of the EC, the Nordics, Canada, and Japan?

Answer. While it is true that initial tariff equivalents for dairy products in EC, the Nordic countries, Canada, and Japan are likely to exceed those for the U.S., our initial levels will nonetheless provide significant protection and exceed 100 percent on an ad valorem basis for most products. During the implementation period, the tariff snapback mechanisms described above will also be available to protect our dairy producers from import surges.

Section 22 quotas help protect U.S. dairy producers from a very distorted world dairy market. However, every empirical study we've seen indicates that world prices for dairy products will rise as the sources of distortions—policy-induced supplies, export subsidies and market access barriers—are reduced. Much of the improvement will come from a reduction in EC export subsidies. Our analysis indicates that five years after implementing a U.S.-type proposal, world dairy prices would rise by 40-45 percent. U.S. dairy production would be up about 4 percent and producer revenues would be about at 1990/91 levels. As world prices continue to rise, the U.S. is likely to become a competitive exporter of many dairy products.

How will others fare? EC and Nordic producers must adjust to reductions in export subsidies for their dairy products as well as commitments on internal supports and market access. The fact that Canada and Japan are strongly advocating changes to Article XI, in part to protect their dairy industries, indicates that they do not believe their dairy sectors can be competitive in a more liberalized agricultural trading system.

Question 5. Does the Administration support an agreement on agricultural market access under which products continuing to receive export subsidies would not be eligible for expanded importation under liberalized market access? An agreement of this type might, for example, prohibit additional imports of European cheese that received any export assistance in the form of EC export restitution or in other forms.

Answer. Our October 1990 proposal does not contain such a general prohibition, although we did address this issue in the context of our proposed tariff snapback mechanisms. Other countries have raised this issue, and we are looking at its implications for imports into the United States and for our products receiving export subsidies. It's also important to point out that we have laws providing for countervailing and antidumping duties to protect U.S. products from unfairly priced imports.

Question 6. Regarding the question of "political will' in the EC on agricultural issues, EC President Jacques Delors has shown a substantial willingness to back the French on a number of sensitive issues, especially agriculture. He's backed Mitterand on the issues of keeping all plenary sessions of the EC Parliament in Strasbourg, he was silent during the Brussels Ministerial when the French insisted that the European Commission had no mandate to negotiate separate disciplines in the three areas of market access, export subsidies and internal support, and he is known to sympathize strongly with the social policy implicit in the CAP with respect to maintaining large numbers of small farmers on the land. With Delors playing such a critical role in any eventual Uruguay Round agreement, how is the political will going to be summoned in the EC to agree to concessions that will be violently attacked by the EC's 10 million small farmers, especially French farmers?

Answer. A successful conclusion to the Uruguay Round negotiations will require substantial "political will" on the part of all participants, including the European Commission that negotiates on behalf of member states. President Bush, along with his counterparts from the G-7, which includes President Delors have personally committed to remain involved in the Uruguay Round. Summoning the needed "political will" has not been an easy task in the negotiations, given the very difficult issues on the negotiating table. Nonetheless, we believe that the EC, like other major trading partners, is prepared to have the Uruguay Round succeed. Opportunities for trade expansion, increased market access and a strengthening of GATT rules, including in the new areas of services, investment and intellectual property protection are key to Europe, as they are to the United States. The experience at Brussels dramatically proved that in order to achieve a comprehensive result in the negotiation agricultural reform would have to be addressed in a meaningful way by all participants.

In late February, GATT Director General Dunkel reported that as a result of his consultations participants agreed to "conduct negotiations to achieve specific binding commitments on each of the following areas: domestic support; market access; export competition; and to reach an agreement on sanitary and phytosanitary issues;. . ." This was not disputed by any participant to the negotiations. Director General Dunkel is holding very detailed technical discussions on the issues. We are satisfied with the seriousness with which the EC is participating in this process.

At the same time, we are encouraged by the debate within Europe on CAP reform and its potential to influence favorably the outcome of the Uruguay Round. While still early in the process, the initial reform paper has a number of positive elements, particularly the shift from price-based support to direct payments (although the payments may retain a link to production).

Question 7. If the U.S. does agree to terminate the Section 22 waiver, would it be effective immediately? What would be your anticipated termination date?

Answer. Initial tariff equivalent levels for non-tariff import access barriers will be part of the bound schedules of concessions for all Uruguay Round participants. Other participants would need to include non-tariff import barriers that exist under grandfather clauses, protocols of accession to the GATT, etc. Tariff equivalents for our Section 22 products would be included in our schedule. The final Uruguay Round agreement would indicate when these schedules would become operative.

Question 8. In connection with a potential "minimum access" agreement, what measure of present access are you planning to argue for adopting? Some in the U.S. dairy industry have argued that current access to U.S. dairy product markets for imported products should be measured on the basis of milk components for internationally traded products, and that imports of products not subject to quotas, such as non-quota cheeses and casein, should be included in the measurements. Does this coincide with your views?

Answer. As part of our tariffication concept for non-tariff barriers, we proposed that tariff quotas be established at low duty levels to maintain existing access opportunities. In the case of products where imports amount to less than 3 percent of domestic consumption, we want to establish the tariff quotas at minimum access levels of 3 percent of domestic consumption.

We are examining technical and operational issues involved in setting and administering minimum access commitments. A good case can be made to use milk components, rather than specific products, for at least some dairy products. Imports of manufactured products during our proposed based period (1986-88) were approximately 3 percent of domestic consumption on a milk equivalent basis. As tariffication applies only to products subject to non-tariff import barriers, products receiving only tariff protection should not, in principal, be used to establish minimum access commitments for tariff quotas.

Question 9. What types of inventory management programs for the U.S. dairy industry do you consider to be consistent with the reduction commitments on internal support to agriculture you are seeking in the Uruguay Round?

Answer. We propose using an aggregate measure of support (AMS) to target policy-specific commitments for internal support reduction commitments. To meet an AMS target, participants could either reduce policy prices or reduce quantities of production receiving support prices. Hence, any effective inventory management program (*i.e.*, one that actually restrained production or restricts the quantity of production benefitting from support) could be used by any participant, including the United States, as one of the means to meet the AMS target.

QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO THE TREATMENT OF COTTON

Question 1. How do we prevent losing cotton export markets to countries where GATT rules on domestic and export programs don't apply (*i.e.*, centrally planned economies like the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union)?

Answer. New GATT rules and disciplines would only apply to contracting parities of the GATT. Both China and the Soviet Union have expressed an interest in joining the GATT, and if that happens, they would assume the obligations flowing from a Uruguay Round agreement. It would be erroneous, however, to jump to the conclusion that, because China and the Soviet Union are not GATT members, our cotton exporters would be just as well off with or without a Uruguay Round agreement.

Under a continuation of current policies, USDA analysts project upland cotton exports at 7.5 million bales in 1996. A Uruguay Round agreement would likely increase our cotton export by 5-6 percent by 1996. A Uruguay Round agreement will widen the gap between foreign cotton consumption and production for several reasons. First, foreign cotton consumption will rise due to economic growth induced by the overall results of the Round. Second, world grain prices are expected to rise relative to cotton prices, shifting foreign cotton area to grains, and widening the foreign cotton consumption-production gap. Finally, EC cotton production is likely to slow or even decline due to reductions in internal support resulting from the agricultural negotiations and EC imports of U.S. cotton could rise.

Question 2. Are there any concessions anticipated that would compensate the U.S. cotton industry for the potential disruption as a result of surrendering Section 22? Since imports of cotton products account for a significant share of U.S. domestic consumption, how will the minimum market access provisions apply to cotton?

Answer. Our Section 22 import quotas for raw cotton have not been filled in recent years, and we do not expect the current import situation to change much, if at all, under a minimum market access provision. Domestic mills pay world market prices for our raw cotton, so there is little economic advantage for the mills to use imported cotton. A Uruguay Round agreement will not affect this situation. If import surges did occur, temporary import relief measures would be available to our domestic cotton producers during the implementation period (see next question).

Question 3. What tariff rate do you anticipate adequately protecting U.S. producers from import surges?

Answer. We have proposed that a tariff snapback mechanism be permitted during the implementation period. Under our proposal, if either an import volume or an import price trigger is exceeded, a country would be permitted to automatically raise tariffs to prevent an unexpected increase in imports, *i.e.*, no injury investigation would be required. For example, under the import price trigger a surcharge equal to 50 percent of the difference between the trigger level and actual duty-paid import price could be levied.

Question 4. The negotiations on internal subsidies could be based on the concept of an aggregate measure of support (AMS). How many countries have submitted the data for their AMS's and how consistent is the data supplied thus far?

Answer. Last July, GATT participants agreed to provide data sets in the areas of internal support, border protection and export competition. At this time, all recognized that flexibility should apply to developing countries as to how detailed and comprehensive these lists might be. Country lists from 38 participants have been submitted, with the EC submitting one list for all member states (12 countries). All OECD countries have submitted lists. The methodology for the AMS has not been explicitly defined. Hence, there are differences in the method, product coverage and policy coverage in the lists.

Question 5. AMS's are based on standard concepts to ensure no contracting party is placed at a competitive disadvantage. What ability do we have to verify that all countries are using the same standards to develop AMS values and to verify their compliance with any future agreement?

Answer. A Uruguay Round agreement will set out the methodology for computing AMS's. The approach to the AMS is one of the subjects of the technical consultations now underway in Geneva. All countries will be required to submit AMS data following the agreed-upon approach.

Existence of a standard methodology will facilitate the verification process. Also, a considerable portion of the data required is available in public documents (budgets, financial reports, etc.). Nonetheless, we will need to devote considerable resources to review and verification of the data. We will be calling on USDA analysts in the Economic Research Service (ERS) and the Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) as well as information provided from our embassies to assist in this process. ERS analysts have considerable experience collecting and evaluating data sets for support measures, and for the last fews years have published estimates of support for many developed and developing countries. FAS agricultural attaches collect information on agricultural programs in other countries as part of their normal reporting activities. Also, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has an extensive database that will assist in our reviews for OECD countries.

Question 6. How would you anticipate rules being developed for Less Developed Countries (LDC's) that are exporters of one commodity (*i.e.*, cotton) but not all commodities, or are exporters on an inconsistent basis? How would you anticipate LDC's that produce cotton and export textile and apparel products be treated?

Answer. Developing countries should be subject to the same rules and commitments as developed countries, but we would be willing to examine a longer phase-in period based on the individual economic and agricultural development. Under our proposal, all LDC's would abide by the general commitments on export subsidies (*i.e.*, no special rules for LDC's). Likewise, LDC's that are net exporters of a commodity would undertake developed country obligations on any market access barriers and domestic price support policies.

Quotas on developing countries' exports of textiles and apparel will be maintained into the next century under the Uruguay Round. In addition, exports that are presently not covered by quotas will be subject to a special textile safeguard mechanism for at least ten years. Finally, U.S. tariffs on cotton textile imports will remain after the transition to strengthened GATT rules, and an important cotton sector, broadwoven fabrics, has been excluded from tariff cuts under the U.S. proposal.

We have proposed that the textile transition mechanism should be in place for ten years so as to facilitate an orderly integration of the textile and apparel sectors into the GATT. Exports of textiles and apparel from developing countries that are not presently under MFA quota restrictions could be subject to quotas under the terms of the special safeguard in the textile transition if they cause serious damage to U.S. producers.

The MFA provides that "exports of cotton textiles from cotton producing exporting countries should be given special consideration . . . in terms of quotas, growth rates, and flexibility" vis-a-vis other foreign suppliers. This type of reference to "special consideration" for cotton-producing textile exporters will likely be maintained in the textile transition mechanism in some form; however, we will be able to maintain quotas on imports of cotton textile products from developing countries to protect the domestic industry from disruption under the Uruguay Round transition agreement.

Question 7. Some analyses on raw cotton have concluded that there will be net increases of 200,000-400,000 bales of annual offtake primarily accounted for by increased exports). In reaching this conclusion, what assumptions have been made concerning textile and apparel import levels, foreign acreage shifts between cotton and grain, and the ability to determine compliance with the agreement?

Answer. USDA analysis indicates that reform of textile and apparel trade is not likely to significantly reduce expected U.S. domestic mill use because U.S. yarn and textile manufacturing is generally considered to be quite efficient. A GATT textile agreement is expected to adjust existing quotas and tariffs over time. Countries that are not GATT members would not have unrestricted access to U.S. markets. With or without a Uruguay Round agreement, both our imports and exports of cotton textiles are likely to grow. However, it's important to remember that more imports of cotton textiles do not necessarily mean lower U.S. mill use of domestic cotton. During the early 1980's when imports of cotton textiles increased rapidly, U.S. mill use of domestic cotton *rose* by a third. More recently, imports of cotton textiles have stabilized, while exports have increased.

Increased raw cotton exports would result from a wider gap between foreign cotton consumption and production. Several factors could lead to an increase in cotton exports of 300,000 to 500,000 bales.

By 1996, foreign cotton consumption could rise by 350,000-400,000 bales annually for a 1 percentage point increase in real world-wide economic growth induced, in part, by the Uruguay Round results. This factor alone could raise annual U.S. cotton exports by 100,000-150,000 bales.

World grain prices are expected to rise relative to cotton prices under trade reform. USDA analysts show wheat prices up by over 20 percent by 1996 under a U.S.-style agreement. Even marginal shifts for foreign cotton areas from cotton to grains would widen the foreign cotton consumption-production gap by another 300,000 to 400,000 bales annually. This could mean another 100,000 to 125,000 bales for U.S. exporters.

Reductions in EC internal supports for cotton would reduce the rate of growth of EC cotton production and, coupled with EC market access commitments, could open a market of up to 200,000 bales for U.S. exporters by 1996.

Uruguay Round commitments on internal supports, export subsidies and market access barriers would be specified in bound country schedules, much like our current tariff schedules. Participants would be required to report compliance with the schedules, and a surveillance process will need to be established.

Question 8. What changes would need to occur in our domestic policy in order to comply with an anticipated agreement?

Answer. Under a GATT agreement similar to the U.S. proposal, our commitment to reduce internal support for raw cotton over the next 5 years could probably be met without additional policy actions. Policy changes in the 1985 and 1990 Farm Bills and budget legislation have reduced support, *e.g.*, cotton target prices and payment acres have been substantially reduced since 1986. Price rises as a result of such an agreement are projected by USDA to reduce program participation and the quantity of cotton receiving payments.

QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO THE TREATMENT OF PEANUTS

Question 1. The peanut industry has become convinced that Section 22 is gone with any GATT agreement. Clayton Yeutter has made public that peanuts will be the big loser through GATT. Some trade officials have gone so far as to say that ". . . peanut farmers make too much money anyway". For peanuts, the threat is China—a non-market, non-GATT member. Needing hard currency, they can make a political decision and move to export peanuts quickly—and in the past, they have landed peanuts here at prices 10 cents below our cost of production. U.S. growers have watched China double their cotton production since 1980 and become a major exporter—based on political decisions for hard currency, not necessarily the cost of production. The same can happen in peanuts.

In many areas, we are not talking about the economic impact on a few individual producers, but rather, on hundreds of rural communities that rely on the producers for their economic base—communities that may not recover from economic loss of losing their markets to China.

Responses like, "China will join GATT" and "we can preserve our laws on dumping" have not been acceptable to the peanut industry. Growers must sell at harvest due to the nature of the crop. If the loss of Section 22 allows the importation of Chinese peanuts during that harvest time, U.S. producers lost an entire year's profit, and cannot wait two to three years for our government to stop the import action.

What does the peanut industry gain by supporting the removal of Section 22—a program that has worked for them and one they believe does not have to be given away in order to reach an agreement? It wasn't removed in the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement and is not an option (at this point) in the Mexican Free-Trade discussions. In fact, how much pressure, if any, are we getting from the EC to eliminate Section 22? Are there other acceptable alternatives?

Answer. Concern has been expressed about surges of imported peanuts from China if Section 22 quotas were modified. Since China is not a GATT member, China would not be bound by GATT rules and obligations. Conversely, however, the U.S. would not be bound by GATT rules and obligations in responding to increased imports from China. In fact, there is a special provision in U.S. trade law for dealing with injurious surges of imports from Communist countries.

Section 406 of the Trade Act of 1974 gives the President authority to restrict imports solely on products from a Communist country or countries where the U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC) determines such imports have caused or threatened to cause market disruption. Moreover, if the President decides emergency action is necessary, he may import relief immediately pending completion of a USITC investigation. In any event, the USITC must conduct a Section 406 investigation and report to the President no later than three months after a petition is filed or a request for investigation is made. This provision was used in 1987 and resulted in limitations on imports of tungsten products from China.

Our commodity loan program for peanuts exists to assist the orderly marketing of peanuts during the entire year. Peanut producers are protected from short-term price fluctuations, particularly at harvest time. We expect this program to continue even under substantial reform in a GATT agreement. In addition, newly created tariffs and transitional arrangements for import surges would provide protection for the peanut industry.

Another issue raised concerns the fact that neither our Section 22 quotas nor Canadian import restrictions on dairy, poultry and egg products were not addressed in the U.S.-Canada Free-Trade Agreement. Both countries recognized the need to maintain such arrangements until reform of all sources of distortion in world markets for these products—*i.e.*, reform of internal supports, export subsidies and market access barriers—could be achieved on a multilateral basis. The FTA was finalized after the Uruguay Round had begun, and both sides agreed that reform of market access barriers was best addressed in the context of the Round.

Must the U.S. agree to modify *all* Section 22 quotas in order to reach a GATT agreement? The answer is yes if we want to reform similar barriers in other countries, such as the European Community's variable levy system, Japan and Korea's prohibitions on rice imports, and Canada's import system for dairy, poultry and egg products. Whenever we raise the issue of reforming non-tariff barriers in other countries in the GATT discussions, the immediate rejoinder relates to the U.S. willingness to undertake similar actions on our Section 22 import quotas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. [Mr. McNULTY]. The Chair would advise Members that the closing will be in the following order: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

The Chair will further advise Members of the time they have remaining.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] has 2½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 4 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has 5 minutes remaining; the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] has 4 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] has 3½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] has 3 minutes remaining.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in the order of closure, does the Speaker tell Members that the sponsor of the resolution is not entitled to close under this procedure?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee who called up the resolution has the right to close, and the closings will be reverse order of recognition under the rule. The Ways and Means members will go last. Preceding them will be members of the Rules Committee, preceded by Members who were given control of time by unanimous consent.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. As a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, that is not the usual order with respect to a bill brought to the floor; is it not the usual practice that the sponsor will close debate on a bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. What the Chair has suggested is the regular order under the precedents.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Despite my respect for my friend from North Dakota, I stand in opposition to his resolution. I have two very brief points to make.

If we were giving carte blanche today to Ambassador Hills and her people to just go and negotiate an agreement with Mexico without anything further, I would probably be in favor of the gentleman's resolution. But we are not. There will be consultations during the interim. We will have many opportunities to call the various negotiators before our panels to ask questions before a final trade agreement is reached.

Second, and the last point, I think the best opportunity we have to control to some extent, and maybe even eliminate, illegal entry into the country of immigrants from Mexico would be by improving the conditions in their home country, giving them an opportunity to live decent lives where they live now that I think is at least a possibility under a good treaty agreement with the nation of Mexico.

So for the reason that we will have opportunity to look this trade pact over, and also because it might help us with our immigration problem, I believe the gentleman's resolution should be defeated.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of being one of the Congressmen who represents the Port of Baltimore. Too many shops come into the Port of Baltimore with imported products that are unloaded and leave without any products to send overseas. There is one way we can solve it: by closing the ports. I do not think that is the way to do it.

We want to see balanced trade and fair trade in this country. Those of us who support fast track are not satisfied with the status quo. We want to see an improvement. We are not satisfied with the jobs that we have lost to Mexico and other countries. But the only way that we can improve that is to sit down and negotiate.

Those of us who support fast track are going to wait and see what products we come up with as to whether we will support the final agreement. By voting for fast track we are not voting for the trade agreement.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Dorgan amendment so that we can negotiate and reach a better agreement.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of fast track and in opposition to House Resolution 101.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of fast-track negotiating authority, in support of a North American Free-Trade Agreement, and in opposition to House Resolution 101.

Mr. Speaker, free trade is a win-win proposition for all countries, especially the United States. We currently run a $2.7 billion annual non-oil trade surplus with Mexico. The only sector of our economy performing well during the current recession is exports. Opening markets like Mexico for our goods promotes the strongest sector of our economy, encouraging American competitiveness and growth.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from southern California, not only do I have a special interest in increasing California's $3 billion in exports to Mexico, I also sincerely hope that lowering trade barriers with Mexico will solve the longstanding problem of illegal immigration. The Border Patrol estimates that as many as 3 million people cross the American border illegally every year—almost half of them enter San Diego County.

Increasing economic growth in Mexico will increase opportunities and wages there, reducing incentives to immigrate to the United States illegally. President Salinas has said he wants to export goods to the United States, not people. Free trade is the most compassionate and constructive way to address the unfortunate causes and ill effects of illegal immigration.

Some opponents of fast track say they support free trade, but oppose leaving negotiations to the President. Mr. Speaker, if there is no fast track, there will be no Uruguay round negotiations and no North American Free-Trade Agreement. Without fast track, our trading partners will expect Congress to rewrite any deal the President reaches, or at least amend the agreement to death. However, fast track also gives Congress 90 days to voice its objections about specific provisions of proposed agreements. As a last resort, every member of the House has the right to vote a proposed agreement down.

Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons, I urge the rejection of House Resolution 101.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the revered Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. My colleagues, the issue before us today is basically one of procedures, but in this case the procedures mean everything.

Will our country lead the growing movement toward openness and economic freedom sweeping the world, or will we become victims of the four horsemen of protectionism: stagnation, isolationism, fear, and xenophobia?

When we look to the Far East, Asia's economic tigers grow in confidence. Look to Europe, an economically united Europe waits to be born. Look to the north, and we have the United States-Canadian Free-Trade Agreement. And now, long overdue, we finally look to the south and we see an export market so potentially powerful that it staggers the imagination.

That market can be part of our future and we can be part of Mexico's future, but only if we support the job-building, trade-enhancing commitment to fast track.

The President, in his response to Congress's concerns over fast track, has set forth negotiating objectives. He has made a commitment to consult with Members of Congress as well as with other groups during the negotiating process. The sense-of-the-House resolution that we will be considering immediately hereafter gives greater formality to those commitments and objectives.

Congress should and must play a vital role in trade agreements. It has the ultimate power, the power to say yes or no. Only the executive branch, however, can carry out the kind of negotiations workers and business need. I think we all know that. The only way that an effective agreement can be achieved is if the nations know the agreement will stand or fall in its entirety and not suffer the slow, agonizing death of a thousand congressional reviews or revisions.

Good trade agreements mean jobs in the United States and jobs in other nations. In a free-trade agreement with Mexico, my home State will benefit greatly, for example, and additional jobs gained will exceed those lost by a 6-to-1 ratio, and that can be proved. Illinois has already been benefiting from expanded trade with Mexico.

Some may say so what, your State is one thing; my State is another. What good does it do me?

The answer is that benefits of free trade are universal. We grow through trade. There is no other way to grow. If we stay on the fast track we move ahead, but if we take the side track of protectionism, we will inexorably backtrack to economic oblivion.

And when it comes to trade, Americans should have just one rule: Just say "grow." Remember, 8 percent of our own growth last year resulted from exports, foreign purchases of American-made products.

Congress should be partners in shaping an American future, and it can be a future of growth through trade, jobs through trade, and business opportunities through trade.

Fast track enables us to be a trade negotiating partner with the ultimate power to say yes or no. Fast track, in my opinion, is the way to go. Certainly I hope we will be successful in our effort today.

□ 1400

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JONTZ].

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today the United Technologies plant in Wabash, IN, closed its doors, and now 555 jobs, American jobs, are on their way to Mexico.

We are now told by the proponents of fast track for a Mexican free-trade agreement that we do not have to worry about that kind of plant closing, because we are going to create more jobs than we are going to close. I suggest to the Members today that we have no such assurance that that will be true, and we should not begin negotiating until we have much better assurance.

The whole idea that more jobs will be created here is dependent on the idea that the standard of living in Mexico will improve. I suggest to the Members that the experience over the last decade shows that the opposite is true.

Forty percent of export earnings from Mexico go to satisfy debt requirements. There is no question in my mind that the big money-center banks will do very well under a free-trade agreement. The rich will get richer. There is no question about that.

But will our country get stronger? This is the question I think that is really before us today. I think the answer to that is that we have no assurance.

We should turn down fast track. We should support the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this body authorized fast track in 1974. Let us look at the last 17 years of history. In 1974 we were the greatest creditor nation in the world, huge positive balance of trade.

We are now the greatest debtor nation, and we have more than $100 billion a year in trade deficits, 17 years of secretly negotiated fast-track trade agreements that are not worth the paper they are written on.

Yes, we have followed the rules, we have followed the trade agreements, but our trade competitors did not follow our examples. We opened our borders. They opened their borders to our jobs and our manufacturing interests.

I have had friends say, "Actually there is nothing left to lose." Well, there is a lot left to lose. It is not just tariffs on the table anymore, friends. Now, GATT targets our laws against unfair foreign trade practices, our environmental law, our Buy America Program, food safety. Even the recent restrictions on drift-netting by the Japanese will be targeted in the GATT agreements.

Many of the values held dear by this body and by our constitutents will go out the window with fast track.

Keep the authority under discretion that was invested by you when you were elected to Congress. Do not cede your judgment, your constitutional authority, to faceless bureaucrats.

Vote for Dorgan.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of fast track and against the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the President's request for an extension of fast-track procedures and urge my colleagues to vote against the Dorgan resolution disapproving the authority.

Extension of fast-track authority is a vote for open markets. Extension of fast-track authority is a vote for future economic prosperity.

On the other hand, a vote to disapprove fast track is a vote of no confidence in American workers and industry.

Fast track is vitally important for this Nation's economic future.

During 1990, nearly 90 percent of U.S. economic growth was attributable to exports. According to the Commerce Department, exports have accounted for over one-third of U.S. economic growth in the last 5 years.

Organized labor may not want to admit it, but a vital export market means U.S. jobs. The facts are clear. We export over $390 billion of goods annually, with nearly 7 million jobs being export-related. One in six U.S manufacturing jobs is tied in some way to exports.

It is important to our future economic well-being that we move ahead with current trade negotiations and that can't be done without fast-track procedures in place.

I also want to address one of the great misconceptions about fast-track procedures. Labor seems to be telling its people that a vote for fast track will allow the President to cram a trade agreement down our throats.

That is a bold statement, but it does not tell the whole story. The real story is that the Congress will have input into the negotiations, and we will have the final say on any agreement that is negotiated. Fast track just simply gets us to the table.

I have read the President's action plan carefully and it shows that the President is personally committed to protecting American workers. I believe that with Carla Hills as his negotiator at the table, he will attain these goals.

I urge the rejection of House Resolution 101.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I think we have had a very good debate today, but for all its length, not enough time to deal with much deep analysis as to the issues before us.

But, quite frankly, as was alluded to by my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JONTZ], a few minutes ago, the real reality is jobs leaving places like the Midwest, particularly Indiana.

The maquiladora program will continue where, for example, in Evansville, IN, 1,400 workers are out of work. If they are lucky, right now, Mr. Speaker, if they are lucky they have $6-an-hour jobs to raise kids through high school for year upon ongoing year, and by the administration's own best technical reviews, this is a mediocre possibility at best and surely nothing to rush into.

Mr. Speaker, for example, the U.S. International Free Trade Commission report to the Committee on Ways and Means states that the benefits relative to the size of the U.S. economy are likely to be small in the near to medium term, and, furthermore, it states in effect that 73 percent of the workers in the United States, and particularly and exclusively those at the bottom, are going to be negatively impacted. That is what we need to do is kick the people at the bottom making $6 an hour.

Vote for Dorgan.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as an American nationalist and a populist in opposition to the multinational corporation's and economic elitist greed. I oppose this effort to lower the standard of living of the average American.

I support the Dorgan amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to fast track and in support of the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this is the week we consider, among other things, the administration's request for a 2-year extension of the fast-track trade negotiating authority. And, we consider extending this authority to a President who has a vision of a new world order, a "world of open borders" as he expostulated in his speech last year before the U.N. General Assembly. But what exactly is an open border? An open border is not a flexible border, nor is it a permeable border: An open border is really no border at all. Moreover, when we imagine a nation with open borders we imagine a nation without any means of defining itself or the territory it contains. In fact a nation without borders, or euphemistically, with "open borders," is really not a nation at all.

Mr. Speaker, while we in Congress have a nation to defend, to represent, to build: while we in Congress have citizens of that nation appealing to us to fight for their jobs, their lives, and their future: in short, Mr. Speaker, while we have a country that is very unique and well defined in our eyes we must defy a President who dreams of an undifferentiated nation with no right to make claims for itself.

Currently, this no-more-borders-no-more-nations dream is being very aggressively pursued. Through a regrettable sequence of speedy maneuvers the extension of fast-track authority has become bound up with consideration of expanding fair trade with Mexico. Most of us welcome the opportunity to begin to consider how increased cooperation between all of the North American nations may improve the quality of life for all of our citizens. But to guide such consideration according to a vision of nations without borders, without cultural integrity, would be to displace the American dream with the dream of a single American President and this we in Congress cannot do.

No one disputes that a loss of American jobs will occur when American or multinational corporations can safely take their investment capital to Mexico—a virtually inevitable scenario with Mexican wages hovering between 50 cents and $1 dollar. No one doubts that if we give Mexicans enough American jobs they will buy American goods. And it is true, the optimists expect that eventually the demand for higher level workers will grow. But eventually is not good enough for the American workers who will lose their jobs, especially as that eventuality is not for them. Nor is eventually good enough for the American workers who have been displaced across these last 20 years. Through them the Bureau of Labor Statistics has learned that a displaced American worker is an obsolete American worker. Displacement short circuits each productive American life.

The administration claims that failure to extend fast track will result in a loss to the credible negotiating stature of the United States as a trading partner. But the truth is that our credibility derives from our actions once the trade agreements are signed, not from the questions we address in the process of coming to an agreement. Our ability to insist that even minority points of view are heard in open debate is the very essence of the kind of democracy we champion. But the President would have us forfeit this so that he can dictate our trade agreements with the same authority some of his neogtiating partners enjoy. His wish is understandable: To grant it would be unwise. In the end, of course, an expansion of trade within North America will occur. Now, however, I trust it will occur with American citizens alert to the implications: Of trade agreements and of imperialistic visions.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 101, the Dorgan resolution. Mr. Speaker, today each Member of the House will vote on what role Congress will have in the negotiation and implementation of a free-trade agreement with Mexico.

Let me say at the outset that I am convinced that it is in our long term interests to improve our trade relationships with Mexico. Today we find ourselves in a globally competitive society. The European Community is attempting to join its economic forces, as are many of the Asian rim countries.

But the issue for this continent is not quite that simple. Until recent years, trade negotiations dealt primarily with the elimination of tariff and quota barriers. Today, they deal increasingly with structural changes in U.S. employment and with the technical stand-

ards which form the foundation of our national health, food safety, environmental and workplace safety policies.

Unfortunately, the administration has not done a good job of convincing Congress that it has a strong commitment to handling these issues.

Jumping into a free-trade agreement is sure to have an impact on both economies, but it is not necessarily good. According to a study by the International Trade Commission, and let me quote it, "real income for unskilled workers in the United States is likely to decline slightly."

I later found out that the Commission's definition of unskilled workers includes 70 percent of the entire American work force. It would certainly be hard for me to explain to my constituents—many of whom are already on the low end of the income scale, that they should not worry if their incomes are reduced, or even worse, their jobs are lost because the Mexican agreement is "good in the long run."

This brings me to the issue of fast track. It is not free trade with Mexico that gives me my greatest concern about extending fast track. Rather I am concerned about the administration's lack of commitment to meeting America's essential interests while negotiating that agreement.

For example in my own area of Chicago, a number of large firms have already made the move to Mexico leaving behind large numbers of workers without jobs, and unable to support their families as they had before. These are people who have worked every day of their lives. People who have saved their money to buy a home, and to put their children through school.

When a plant shuts down and moves to Mexico, it leaves in its wake not just unemployment, but shattered lives and lost opportunities. Homes may be lost; children may be forced to drop out of school; health care is often unavailable and the physical well-being of our people falls.

This is exactly the situation in Chicago. My city, like many others in the Northeast and Midwest is facing just such a spiral of declining services, with a smaller and smaller working population base to fund these needed services. In the end, that makes cities such as Chicago less competitive, forcing even more companies and individuals out of our city and moving to areas where the work force is increasing.

As just one example, the Rheem manufacturing plant in Chicago closed last year. The Rheem plant made hot water heaters which were among the best on the market. The company was profitable and highly productive. But Rheem sold out to a Japanese firm, and the new Japanese owners moved the plant to Mexico in pursuit of low-wage, low-fringe benefit employees.

Eight hundred employees worked in Rheem's Chicago plant and were put out of work when the plant closed. Workers were left with no way to support their families. Not only did the State, local and Federal governments suffer a loss in tax payments, but these unemployed workers had to be paid unemployment insurance, and they needed job training and other public services—much of which they have yet to receive.

In the last few years, an estimated 20,000 Illinois workers have lost their jobs because of plants closing and moving to Mexico. And, these are big firms too. Let me identify just a few firms from the Chicago area and my district that have moved to Mexico:

Quaker Oats Co. moved its Fisher-Price Division to Matamoros and Tijuana, Mexico;

Zenith has moved to Chihuahua, Reynosa and Matamoros;

American Hospital Supply moved to Juarez;

North American Philips moved to Juarez;

Lamkin Leather & Rubber Co. moved to Tijuana;

Gould Electric Products moved to Juarez;

R.R. Donnelly & Sons moved to Reynosa;

Cooper Lighting moved to Juarez;

Brunswick Corp. moved to Juarez;

Eureka Manufacturing moved to Juarez; and

Outboard Marine Corp. moved to Juarez.

And, why are these firms leaving? The answer is: First, cheap labor; and second, no environmental regulation. And what about our own unemployed workers here in the United States?

The President's action plan makes some vague commitment to providing trade adjustment assistance to workers who lose their jobs as a result of moves to Mexico. But, at the same time, the administration's own budget for next year contains no money whatsoever for trade adjustment assistance or for the Job Training Partnership Act which has never been funded.

In addition, many consumer and environmental safeguards may be affected by trade agreements. For example, a United States Government meat inspector testified at our hearing that the administration's free-trade policies with Canada have left a "food safety disaster in its wake." By virtually eliminating inspection of Canadian meat in the name of free trade, the administration is allowing Canadian meat packers to dump contaminated and infected meat here in the United States; meat that they would not be allowed to sell in Canada.

My colleagues should not dismiss the concerns being expressed by environmentalists and others as alarmism. There is good reason for concern.

Like most of you, I have heard firms say they do not go to Mexico to escape environmental regulation in the United States. Well, let me tell you, it just is not so. At our hearings, the General Accounting Office [GAO] provided the first documentation that manufacturers do, in fact, relocate to avoid environmental regulation.

So, what are the pitfalls a free-trade agreement with Mexico poses for the United States? Some say it is jobs; others say the environment; and still others say food safety. Does this mean that we should not be negotiating a free-trade agreement with Mexico? The answer to that queston is, no.

The problem is not free trade with Mexico; the problem is the fast-track process itself. Why must we leave such an important decision to a single up-or-down vote? Why must it be fast track or no track?

For this reason, it is my intention to vote for House Resolution 101 which would disapprove the extension of fast track, and I urge my colleagues to vote in the same way.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, in a burst of comity, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], who has been most gracious on this side.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, in a burst of comity, I would like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], my friend from San Diego, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago this month I attended my first meeting of the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference. At that meeting, Jose Lopez Portillo began nationalizing the banking system and many other industries in Mexico. Beginning in 1986, after an amazing economic collapse, President de la Madrid initiated a reversal of these socialist policies, recognizing that Mexico's future success depended on the revival of the free market.

This year, President Salinas has heralded the success of these tremendous economic reforms which we need to reward by opening the border. If we do otherwise, I am convinced that these reforms will grind to a halt, United States imports will plummet, the Mexican economy will stagnate, and illegal immigration over the border into Texas, and Arizona, and New Mexico, and California will skyrocket.

Approving Dorgan would be a direct repudiation of President Salinas and his courageous reforms. As a result, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is tough to be over here facing my 166 Republican colleagues who were the heroes of the world's legislatures during the gulf war when they had the guts to take on Saddam Hussein in a politically risky vote and a President who has done a tremendous job with respect to foreign policy.

But I think that right now we are moving down a track that is not going to accrue to the economic benefit of this country, and it is important to speak out against it.

I just want to ask my conservative friends to reflect on the late 1970's and the early 1980's when we used to look across the aisle, and our colleagues, some of the more liberal colleagues, would say, "You know, we cannot be involved in an arms race," and our answer to them, which was correct, was, "There is already an arms race going on, and the problem is we are not in it."

Well, my conservative colleagues, there is a trade war going on right now, and we are not in it. And there is nothing you can do about the unilateral attacks or the predatory trade tactics of other countries. Right now Mexico could, in fact, play a role in fighting this trade war and in bringing about some balance to international trade, if we did it right.

But all the signs are not toward that. All the signs show that we are going to be building a window to that one group that continues to pull the train with respect to the American economy, and that is the American consumer. We are building a window for the American consumer, and we are exposing American workers. There is no doubt about it.

The old days when that master machinist in the United States could make 12 bucks an hour, and he could still beat the guy on the other side of the world making a buck an hour, because he was literally 20 times as productive, are gone.

If you are IBM or General Motors, which incidentally achieves 80 percent of the productivity of a Detroit worker with its workers in Mexico City, you can move in a user-friendly, laser-guided assembly line, and within a few weeks you can bring up that worker in Mexico or other parts of the world to 50, 60, 70, 80 percent of the productivity of an American worker for one-tenth the wages.

Ladies and gentlemen, there will be movement to Mexico with American production lines, and American business has an interest in maintaining Americans who make 12, 14, 16 bucks an hour so they can continue to buy homes that have 1,500 square feet, so they can continue to educate their children, so they can go see the mother-in-law in the summertime with the mobile home, so they can do all the things and have the lifestyle that other people in the world are willing to forgo.

Now, what is the real issue here? The real issue is freedom. Mexico needs political freedom, and if they have political freedom, they will have prosperity.

□ 1410

We cannot give political freedom to Mexico. I am talking about internal political freedom. A freedom of a small businessman to buy or not buy, to sell or not sell, hire or not hire, to be able to count the votes on his election day without having to know somebody powerful.

It is a lesson of every Socialist from Gorbachev and Castro and hundreds of others. Political prosperity cannot precede political freedom. That is what we want to export to Mexico with no tariffs and no charge.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM]

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Dorgan amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Resolution 101, a resolution disapproving the extension of fast-track procedures. Like my colleagues who have come before the Chamber today, I have heard from many of my constituents on the issue of extending fast track. I have been advised of the merits of granting the extension and on the pitfalls of a potential North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] and have met with both national and Pittsburgh area trade representatives.

Generally, I believe in the promotion of free trade, and I am encouraged by the economic opportunities that freer trade yields the United States. The United States has historically benefited from free-trade agreements, and I look favorably upon future trade agreements that may come before this body for consideration. Today though, Mr. Speaker, the issue for me is not so much a debate over a negotiated NAFTA or Uruguay round trade agreement as it is an issue over granting this country's international trade negotiators the authority to negotiate. Before the Chamber today is not a question of a trade agreement with Mexico. This body has not been presented and is not being asked to vote on a Mexico trade document. At issue is a resolution to disapprove of procedures to bills to implement trade agreements, including the Mexico and GATT talks, under a guaranteed timetable for congressional committee and floor consideration. We are being asked to grant the authority for the commencement or continuation of trade talks with the understanding that the Congress will be a full and effective partner in any trade negotiations.

Implicit in granting the 2-year fast-track extension is an understanding of Congress' role in the trade process during this time period. As stated in the Committee on Ways and Means report on House Resolution 101, the President must, by law, consult with the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee and must notify the Congress, at least 90 days in advance, of his intention to enter into a multilateral or bilateral trade agreement. The purpose of the 90-day notice is to provide the congressional committees of jurisdiction an opportunity to review the proposed agreement before it is signed. The committees may advise U.S. negotiators on whether the content of the agreement is likely to be acceptable or requires revision in order to obtain congressional approval. The Congress has in the past worked with the Administration to develop the draft text of an acceptable implementing bill. In all three trade agreements previously negotiated under fast track procedures, the President has submitted to the Congress an implementing bill identical to the provisions drafted in the Congress.

It is difficult to discuss the fast-track extension request without touching on a potential NAFTA agreement. Many of my constituents have advanced their concerns over entering into trade agreement with Mexico. While I am sensitive to the environmental and labor concerns associated with a Mexico agreement, I am equally encouraged by the economic opportunities that a Mexico agreement presents not only our Nation but the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Currently, Mexico is our third largest trading partner and enjoys a 10-percent tariff rate as compared to our 4 percent. Pennsylvania exports alone to Mexico have grown by 162 percent from 1987 through 1989. Although our negotiators have yet to produce a NAFTA agreement for consideration before the Congress, I enter the debate today with these competing interests in mind and with the confidence that the Congress will continue to be an active adviser and consultant throughout all trade negotiations over the next 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that we should extend our trade negotiators the authority to negotiate the best trade agreements possible for our country. I am convinced that granting the fast-track extension request effectively advances this objective while maintaining the rights of the Congress, and I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing the resolution.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE].

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Dorgan amendment and against fast track.

Mr. Speaker, the issue before us is not whether or not we should approve a North American Free-Trade Agreement, or whether the Uruguay round of GATT should continue. A properly framed free-trade agreement may well serve the long-term economic interests of the United States, and an integrated North American market could certainly become an important counterweight to European Community and Pacific Rim economic competition. Rather, the issue before us is whether or not Congress should surrender its negotiating authority to the administration under fast track, a procedure which seriously limits both public and congressional involvement in discussions with Mexico. That is what the fast-track debate is all about.

Proponents of fast track speak of the many benefits that will accrue for the U.S. economy in the long run. However, to acknowledge long-term potential benefits that might conceivably flow from a North American free-trade agreement does not mean that any agreement would serve American interests, or that a free-trade agreement would be without significant transitional costs. Most certainly it does not mean that the Congress should acquiesce in the fast-track procedure that exists solely to strengthen the hand of the administration and

to reduce congressional leverage in the negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, American workers have good reason to be nervous about granting fast-track authority to the administration. At the heart of the fast-track issue is a question of trust. Should Congress surrender its negotiating authority and trust an administration that has a long track record of failing to protect American workers and American interests?

I remind you that this is the same administration that has demonstrated very little concern for those American workers who have already been displaced by a declining defense budget, the recession, and foreign competition. In fact, the President's budget request for fiscal year 1992 proposes the elimination of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act [TAA], a program which provides training for workers dislocated by foreign competition.

Moreover, none of the $200 million in defense conversion assistance that was passed by Congress and signed by the President last fall has yet been dispersed, a full 6 months into the fiscal year. Even Vice President QUAYLE's crowning legislative achievement, the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA], is slated for sharp reductions. According to the Department of Labor, if the President's fiscal year 1992 budget request were to be approved by Congress, 224,000 fewer Americans would benefit from JTPA employment and training programs next year.

This is the same administration that only days ago opposed amendments to the defense authorization bill that would begin to require that our allies pay their fair share of our mutual defense costs. These were amendments which merely required the administration to begin negotiations on cost-sharing agreements with countries on whose defense we already spend billions of American taxpayer dollars. If this administration will not confront our allies, how can we have confidence that it will stand up to our toughest trading partners to protect American economic interests? How can we be certain that American workers will not be left footing the bill?

Mr. Speaker, if in fact we are negotiating a North American free-trade agreement for its overall long-term benefit to our economy, then our entire society should bear the burden of the transitional costs. Studies have indicated that the economic impact of a free-trade agreement with Mexico would fall heavily on workers employed in such areas of our economy as the automobile industry, the textile industry, and the glassware industry. I am unwilling to allow these vulnerable American workers to hang in the wind, anchored only by flimsy and half-hearted promises from the administration. There must be concrete and definitive transition mechanisms in place to assist those who might be displaced as a result of a new set of trading rules.

A free-trade agreement requires a full and open debate to identify its effect on economic growth, wages, income distribution, the environment, and quality of life in both countries. Such a debate cannot occur under the fast-track process. The administration is essentially asking Congress for a blank check to negotiate a free-trade agreement with Mexico, an agreement that has been acknowledged as being unprecedented in our history. Without question, the economic and social upheaval that is envisaged by such a pact deserves more consideration, examination, and debate in the Congress and the Nation than the fast-track process would allow.

I strongly urge passage of the Dorgan resolution of disapproval for fast-track trade authority.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Dorgan amendment.

Mr. Speaker, today, I will vote against the administration's request for extension of fast-track authority to negotiations for the United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement and the Uruguay round of GATT. While I applaud the objectives of the United States-Mexico negotiations—a North American free-trade zone including Mexico, Canada, and the United States with 360 million people and combined output of $6 trillion—and those of the GATT negotiations—reducing international barriers to free trade—fast track is the wrong track to achieve these goals.

The issue before us is not only free trade. A vote for fast track is a vote against American interests, because it will lock Congress out of U.S. trade policy, it will result in thousands of American job losses, and it will accelerate environmental degradation. For these reasons, as a proud free trader, I am voting against fast track.

Fast track would limit full debate on the critical issues raised in the negotiations. By giving Congress only two options: A "yes" or "no" vote, fast track would unfairly restrict the say of Congress in discussions about our Nation's economic future. Our founding fathers would shudder at the thought of an agreement with so great an impact on American lives not subject to the consideration of elected representatives. If the President has his way, only appointed officials will determine what is best for our Nation in trade negotiations.

We have received no assurance from the President that his negotiators will protect American jobs. Thus, fast track would mean workers from my district in Wisconsin, and every other district in the United States, will lose their jobs to Mexico's exploited and underpaid work force. A half-million American jobs have migrated south to the Maquiladora region since 1980 without a free-trade agreement. Without congressional debate, I can only guess how many more jobs will leave our districts for Mexico, where some workers still earn less than $1 an hour, compared to around $14 an hour in this country. Times are tough enough in our country for working people. The last thing we need in a recession is to send our jobs to Mexico, which is what the President and his negotiators would do if they get their way.

We have received no assurance from the President that his negotiators will protect the environment. Thus, fast track would worsen and export the environmental disaster in the Maquiladora region to the United States. The Mexican Government's unwillingness and inability to enforce acceptable standards for water pollution and toxic waste has resulted in a near-epidemic of hepatitis in the border region. Under fast track, the number of unregulated companies operating in the Maquiladoras would increase substantially at the expense of health and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, by voting against fast track today, I am voting for American interests. I am voting for congressional input in American trade policy, for saving America's jobs, and for protecting America's environment. I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating fast-track and putting trade policy on the right track.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. HORN].

Ms. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dorgan amendment and in opposition to fast track.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote against extending the administration's fast-track authority. If this position should prevail, I will vote to extend fast track for the continuation of the GATT talks. If the Dorgan resolution to disapprove fast-track authority should not prevail, I will vote for the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution.

I support the goals of a North American free-trade agreement. I strongly believe that we exist in a global market and that we must work to eliminate tariff and nontariff barriers to fair trade among all nations. I will work toward that end.

How do I, then, reconcile my vote against the fast track and my support for a NAFTA?

Fast track defines a process. It sets limits on the ability of Members of Congress—on behalf of their constituents—to participate fully in the negotiations with Mexico. The administration needs the streamlined advantage of this process for GATT. But, Mexico is one country—and it is a country that will benefit greatly from the new investment and trade resulting from a NAFTA. Mexico has enormous incentives to come to the table with the United States and Canada—with or without fast track.

President Salinas has shown a refreshing willingness to start addressing some of the severe problems in his country. He faces huge debt, high unemployment, a rapidly growing population, significant illiteracy, and strong political opposition from those in his own country who do not share his goals.

Mexico desperately needs an infusion of international investment to grow economically. However, investors are concerned about a history of political instability and the continued threat of nationalization in Mexico. President Salinas urges an agreement because Mexico needs to increase the confidence level of foreign investors in the Mexican economy. He knows the United States, under a North American trade agreement, will in effect guarantee these investments.

As the world becomes a global marketplace, businesses here continue to pursue a low-wage strategy in an attempt to stay competitive—rather than increasing productivity. In forming the European Community, a high-wage strategy has been the norm for its members. There was significantly less of a disparity in wages and living standards among the EC members when they began to negotiate 30 years ago than there is today between the United States and Canada and our southern

neighbor, Mexico. The EC achieved agreement with the goals of higher wages and a better life for all intact.

But, almost 30 million Mexicans wait to accept wages one-seventh of United States wages. We've already lost hundreds of thousands of jobs to the Maquiladoras on the Mexican border. Is it enough to promise our American workers that new jobs in high-technology manufactuirng and high-value industries will develop to fill the gaps? As we stand here today, Mr. Speaker, this is a policy of rhetoric because the transition track is just not in place.

We do not have a comprehensive approach for identifying the industries and jobs of the future, or for assisting businesses and workers in retraining or job development today. The administration has promised in the past to support and utilize programs for retraining displaced workers. There is no track record for that promise, and little reason to believe things will change.

Congress has continually authorized and appropriated funds for retraining and economic assistance to businesses and workers displaced by trade or economic decline—only to have them ignored or delayed by the agency ordered to implement them. For example, in the St. Louis area, nearly 10,000 jobs at McDonnell Douglas, 1,500 at TWA, and thousands in the auto industry were lost in the past year. These numbers recognize only the largest employers—not the layoffs at the suppliers and service providers caught in the domino effects of the recession and these cuts.

Yet, money for local retraining and economic assistance programs, authorized in the DOD, was held up until Congress prepared to question the delays in committee hearings last week. This aid was supposed to be for workers laid off nearly a year ago—workers whose unemployment compensation ran out months ago. Funds received from the Department of Labor, although more timely, have also run dry. When do we plan to put jobs into place for the workers out of work today? How can we risk further massive moves of our businesses to the low-wage promise of Mexico while we lack the policies and the political will to identify where the high-wage jobs of the future are for this country's workers?

We badly need ongoing, operative Federal programs for technology transfer and commercialization now. We are already in a global economy where lower skilled jobs are moving offshore. We owe hard-working Americans more than a promise that their skills will be used for the new specialized and high-technology manufacturing jobs that will remain here.

For these reasons, I do not believe the fast-track process is either necessary or in our best interest as we negotiate with Mexico. We need, instead a fast track for U.S. economic development policies to support our workers and businesses. In the meantime, I will continue to work for a mutually beneficial free-trade agreement for all of North America.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the blue-collar working men and women of this country and in support of the Dorgan amendment. I oppose fast track.

Mr. Speaker, in considering which way to vote on this critical issue, I had to confront two sides of an argument that were both extraordinarily convincing. The merits of fair trade are well-recognized, and the concerns of the working men and women of this country are of paramount importance to me.

My decision hinged on the simple moral necessity of representing my constituents, who have reminded me in extraordinary numbers that I am here in Congress to speak for them, especially on issues that affect their economic survival. Since it was the working men and women of Indiana's Third District who are responsible for my ability to serve here today, I will not fail them by giving away their voice.

Mr. Speaker, we must vote for the Dorgan resolution, and defeat the fast-track proposal.

There is no more important element in our current international trade agenda than the GATT treaty. GATT is critical to our survival in international trade. We need GATT to protect our intellectual property rights, open and maintain markets for our financial institutions, insurance companies, and other service industries, maintain a competitive edge for United States goods, fight unfair subsidies that hurt our farmers, and ensure that countries like Japan play fair on the international trading field.

But Mexico must be addressed as a separate entity in our trade picture. An agreement with Mexico is going to have a profound impact on this country, and without careful consideration, will have a devastating impact on the working people of Indiana and the entire Midwest.

The competition of the future is not only strong trading states like Japan and Germany, but trade unions such as the European Community and the Pacific rim.

The larger picture mandates that we not just start a local trade pact with our neighbors Mexico and Canada. We must proceed slowly, diligently, using our time and resources to create an agreement with both Canada and Mexico that will form our own collective trading community capable of competing with other regional trade powers. We can and must work inside and outside North America. Congress has an obligation to oversee the careful construction of a local trade zone equally capable of competing as others.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting the Dorgan resolution, we are speaking out for the rights of people who have all but been ignored in the legislative process: our people who work in manufacturing and blue-collar jobs. I am sick and tired of government paying lipservice to the people who build this country into a world industrial power. They ask for no special treatment, they ask for no favors, they do not want a free ride. All they want, Mr. Speaker, all that they want is to keep their jobs so that they can support themselves and take care of their families. And yet they are being ignored.

How is it that the backbone of our country has lost its right to work? The folks in my district lose their jobs when the old factories close, and, if they can find work, it is in other old factories, never in new factories, never in new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tragic symbol of where our priorities are going, and how we are shepherding our own futures. Government, business, and labor all have a social responsibility to our working people. We must restore our commitment to our working class and to innovation in our manufacturing sector. Without our backbone, how long can this country stand erect and proud?

I want to thank the many people, Mr. Speaker, workers, farmers, and business people who took the time and trouble to contact me on this issue before us today. Both sides articulated their arguments effectively and intelligently.

But the overwhelming majority of them are the working people of my district, who simply want the ability to support themselves and raise their families. To them, I owe my support, and I must speak with their voice. The Indiana Farmers Union, the Family Farm Coalition, the Midwest Dairy Farmers, the environmental groups, and, most importantly, the working men and women of Indiana. They find no reassurance in a free trade agreement with Mexico, and their fears need to be given voice. They are worried about losing their jobs, and I am here to protect those jobs. In order to do that, I must vote no on fast track as long as GATT and Mexico are intertwined.

Mr. Speaker, the voice of America is clear, and it is saying no to fast track. For us to respond in any other way is an abrogation of our responsibilities to our primary constituency, the working people of the United States. A vote for fast track is a vote to make our primary export American jobs. This is wrong, and I urge my colleagues to pass Dorgan and stop fast track in its tracks.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Dorgan resolution. I do so because of my opposition to the application of fast-track procedures to the United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement.

I had hoped that the issue of fast track for the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs [GATT] would be split from fast track for the Mexico Free-Trade Agreement.

I believe strongly that GATT could be considered under fast-track procedures because it is a multinational agreement involving more than 107 countries. And we have more than four decades of negotiating background to utilize in solving disputes.

With the Mexico Free-Trade Agreement a different situation is presented. This is an agreement between just two countries and it is our first major agreement. In such a situation, especially in light of the disparity between our two economies, I do not believe that the President should be given free rein to write a document of first impression and present it to the Congress on a take it or leave it basis, with no room for amendment.

The Constitution invests in Congress the duty and obligation to establish and regulate trade. Clearly Congress cannot carry out its constitutional duty under fast-track procedures,

and therefore fast track should have been rejected for any agreement with Mexico.

But the vote I face today is not on just GATT or just Mexico, but on both. Because of my strong feeling about the place of Congress in the Constitution, I cannot suport fast track for both. Therefore, I support the Dorgan amendment. However, since I support fast track for GATT, I will address my comments only to the Mexico portion of this resolution.

The Dorgan resolution addresses the fundamental question of who will set the agenda in this Nation's trade negotiations with Mexico. The trade agenda can be set by the administration or by Congress.

When our Forefathers wrote our present Constitution, the country had just come through 10 years of governance under the poorly considered Articles of Confederation. To clarify the roles of the different branches of Government, they designated specific areas of influence. Command of the military and the conduct of war were entrusted to the President. But the determination of when and against whom to wage war were entrusted to the democratic processes of the Congress. Similarly, command of the executive agencies of Customs and Commerce which enforce this Nation's domestic and international trade policies were given to the President. But, the determination of those policies and what constitutes our trade agenda was entrusted to the legislative mechanisms of Congress.

The Dorgan resolution returns the legislative and executive branches to their proper roles of policymaking and policy implementation for the United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement. It allows Congress, with the advice of the administration, to set the agenda and goals for negotiations and charges the administration with carrying out and implementing that agenda by negotiating an agreement which meets Congress' goals.

Such an outcome is impossible if the fast-track procedure is applied to the Mexican agreement. The fast-track procedure allows the administration to undermine the intent of the Constitution by letting the President, rather than the Congress, formulate the goals and direction of this country's trade policy, implement those goals through trade negotiations, and submit those proposals to Congress for a yes or no vote. Without the ability to amend an agreement, Congress is placed in an essentially reactive position. We simply cannot fulfill our constitutional responsibility to formulate trade policy if our only options are yes or no.

For years there was consensus between Congress and the administration on the tenor and aim of trade policy. However, with the Mexico trade agreement, it has become increasingly clear from the statements of my colleagues and the administration that these views have begun to diverge and that we are essentially being presented with two agendas. The battle over fast track for the Mexican agreement will determine which of these agendas prevail.

The administration is pursuing a narrow agenda. It wants a United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement that includes tariff and nontariff barriers, investment restrictions, rules of origin, dispute settlement, and intellectual property protections. This agenda is aimed at creating a hospitable climate for investment in Mexico. Our economy already has low tariffs, few nontariff barriers, minimal restrictions on foreign investment, and strong intellectual property protections. These items are on the agenda because they are problematic for businesses operating in Mexico. In return for these concessions, Mexico would be guaranteed access to the American market.

The narrow agenda of the administration ignores conditions in Mexico which are exacerbated by United States companies operating there. Recent articles in the Wall Street Journal and U.S. News & World Report vividly illustrate these problems. Toxic wastes and raw sewage flow through open canals and into the public water supply. Workers and their unborn children are harmed by working conditions which expose them to toxic substances and dangerous machinery with little or no protection. On paper, Mexican labor and environmental protection laws are as stringent as our own. In practice, however, these laws are seldom strictly enforced. This practice of not enforcing laws to attract foreign investment constitutes nothing less than a regulatory subsidy.

Businesses operating in the United States spend more than $95 billion annually to protect workers and the environment, a cost demanded and borne by all U.S. citizens. Mexican companies spend almost nothing and the Government allows it.

Lax enforcement is a hidden subsidy which entices businesses seeking to raise profit margins and lower operating costs to move to Mexico, while laying off workers and undermining the economy of this country. The administration is choosing to ignore this issue, and will continue to do that unless we—the Congress—intervene.

Americans have fought for, and come to expect, safe working conditions on the job and a healthy environment in which to live. Congress should insist on a comprehensive free-trade agreement which includes remedies and protections to ensure that environmental and workplace protections are given Mexican workers. And certainly, Congress should retain its prerogative to amend an agreement which does not contain adequate environmental and worker safety protections.

The Dorgan resolution does just that. It forces the agreement to undergo the normal procedures for legislative consideration in the House. In this way, we can produce a United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement between our two countries which is cognizant of and builds upon the common interests we share. I urge my colleagues to support the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALLON].

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dorgan amendment and opposed to fast track.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support for House Resolution 101, which would disapprove the President's request to extend fast-track trade negotiation procedures. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] and the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA] will have a profound affect on every sector of the U.S. economy. I believe that the Congress has a solemn obligation to ensure that the substance of these trade agreements is consistent with the long-term health of U.S. industry. Delegating this duty to a small group of trade negotiators would needlessly strip Congress of the authority it should keep in guiding the GATT and NAFTA treaties to a conclusion that is in this Nation's best interests.

There are those who argue that Congress would still retain the fundamental power to shape the agreements in the process of negotiation with the administration to come up with treaties that will muster sufficient support for approval. This is not convincing. We all know that the fast-track procedure is designed to make it extremely difficult to defeat the administration's trade treaty proposals. Plain and simple, fast track weakens this Congress' power, and weakens it so that Congress will be out of the loop on economic questions that we have no business delegating to others. I did not come here to give away my responsibility to make difficult decisions on this Nation's economic future.

I could spend a long time here explaining the specifics of why I don't think the administration's trade positions, which will be reflected in the GATT and NAFTA treaties, are in the long-term interest of the United States. For example, in textiles alone, we're prepared to give away 1.4 million textile jobs by the year 2001 and nearly two-thirds of the industry's production. In addition, we only have vague, unenforceable assurances that important worker health and safety and environmental concerns will be addressed.

I do not wish to address the substance of these concerns today, however, I only wish to emphasize that today we may be giving away our right, and indeed our duty, to fully examine and act on these many concerns. Our power lies in the ability to freely debate. Let's not constrain ourselves today and give that away.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield my remaining 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], and ask that he be given control of the 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If no Member has no more than one speaker remaining, we will entertain closing statements. The first closing statement will be the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is now recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the generosity of my friend from California [Mr. HUNTER].

There is an old saying: the United States has never lost a war, but never won a conference. When I hear that, I am reminded somewhat of our trade policy in this country. We are told somehow that trade is too important

and too confusing for the ordinary folks to get involved. We just need the experts to go do all this. This is just too murky an area for the rest of the citizens to understand.

So we are told we should just have elected officials go into a room someplace, behind closed doors, make a deal, then bring it back and tell Congress, "Take it or leave it, but don't change it."

Well, Mr. Speaker, all Members in this room ought to understand that country is off track. Things are not working well. We have lost our economic edge, and part of the economic problem we face in this country is our trade policy. In my judgment, it is a failure. We need a new direction, and we need a little nerve—to begin insisting on fair trade. We need a little nerve to insist that, finally, our negotiators stand up for the interests of our workers and our producers.

Yes, we need expanded trade. Yes, we need expanded opportunity. Yes, we need free trade. No one debates that. Yes, we also need to insist on fair trade agreements.

I am tired of seeing agreements with other countries that are unfair to our producers and our workers. It is time to exhibit the nerve to stand up. No, it is not xenophobic, as the minority leader suggests. No, it is not protectionist. No, it is not isolationist. It is our job as public officials to stand up for the economic interests of this country. Who else is going to do it? The Mexicans? The Japanese? The Germans? The Swedes? Of course not, that is our job. It is our country. It is in our interest to take the first sensible step in demanding fair treatment around the world.

We have been very generous with open market, and I do not propose to change that. I want our markets open to foreign foods, but I expect and demand that their markets will be open to our goods, as well, for that is the only way we can compete around the world. I expect and demand those who negotiate trade agreements will finally begin standing up for this country's interests, and insisting on those open markets. Only then will this country regain its competitive edge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] is recognized for a total of 3½ minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the 3½ minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, nearly 5 months ago this House voted to authorize the President of the United States to use force to fulfill our commitments to our allies in the Mideast and to enforce the resolutions of the United Nations. None of us, that evening, could have doubted either the consequences or the significance of the vote.

It was not only a vote which committed American forces to a deadly conflict. It was no less a reaffirmation of the principles and values this country has cherished for two centuries. It was a statement that the United States is not prepared to leave the world stage. It was a reassertion of our political leadership.

The vote we cast today is no less important. With this vote the United States will determine its economic future. We will decide if we are prepared to lead economically, as well as politically. We will cast a vote as to whether we have confidence in American workers and American management to compete in what is undeniably an increasingly tough global economy.

Some have argued that denying fast track is not a rejection of free trade with Mexico and Canada, but simply a reassertion of congressional perogatives in trade. Don't be fooled by that argument.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution vests authority to regulate foreign commerce with the Congress. But article II gives the President exclusive power to negotiate international agreements. Fast track is nothing more than a realistic merging of these conflicting powers in complex trade negotiations that could not have been envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

Fast track has worked. It has worked with GATT negotiations, with free trade negotiations with Israel and Canada. Its absence in the Caribbean Basin Initiative was painfully obvious as this Congress dashed the hopes and dreams of our Caribbean neighbors and gutted more than 90 percent of the agreement.

Then there are the substantive arguments about trade with Mexico. It is said by some that we can't compete because of lower wages in Mexico. That argument denies reality. Even as Mexican tariffs have come down, they remain twice our own. Yet, in 3 years we have more than doubled our exports to Mexico and gone from a $5 billion nonoil trade deficit to a surplus.

As any economist and any business person knows—and as Members of Congress should know—there is much more to the decision about locating a plant than simply wage rates. If wages were the sole criteria, then Haiti, with some of the lowest wages in the world, would be the manufacturing capital of the Western Hemisphere.

Others have argued that environmental standards are insufficient. While such statements reflect an ignorance of recent environmental legislation in Mexico and of the dramatic efforts to improve enforcement, no one would argue that major problems do not exist, or that enforcement is still lacking. I represent a border district where we struggle to cope with these problems every day.

I would ask the opponents this question: How do you expect environmental enforcement to be improved if the country does not have more wealth and thus more resources to tackle the problems? How do we achieve better cooperation on border environmental problems if we turn our back on improved trade ties? Do we tell Mexico they must solve their environmental problems to our satisfaction before they can be allowed to lift themselves from poverty?

The economic benefits for both countries are clear. The political benefits are equally obvious. I understand that no Member of Congress can cast their vote on trade because of political implications in another country or another region. We must vote for what is right for our district, for the United States.

But we cannot be unaware of the political consequences of this vote, either. It is not just about Mexico. It is about all of Latin America. For years we have preached to Latin American countries the benefits of our market economy. We have urged them to privatize their inefficient state-owned industries. We have prodded them to lift the stultifying hand of government regulation. We have waxed eloquently about democratic reforms.

No country has responded more openly, more fully, more dramatically than Mexico. Are we now to tell them it is not enough? Are we going to say the reward for reform is the back of our hand?

But, in the final analysis, this vote is about ourselves—how we view ourselves as a people and how we view our future as a nation. As President Salinas said in a meeting recently with a group of Congressmen: How could it be that country that was willing to confront the political challenge of Saddam Hussein, a country prepared to commit its military might to wrest the fruits of aggression from a tyrant, how could it be that such a country would shrink from talking to its small neighbor to the South about improved trade, about increasing the economic benefits for the citizens of both countries?

President Salinas, President Bush, we will give you that answer today. Our answer will be the United States does not fear its future. We do not shirk from our economic responsibilities. We will vote for embarking on this path toward a better life for the citizens of Mexico, Canada, and the United States.

I was urge a "no" vote on H.R. 101.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say as we close this historic debate, no one deserves more credit than the gentleman in the well, the gentleman

from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON], to whom I yield the rest of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] to close the debate.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Without the gentleman's help and without the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, this would not be possible.

Mr. Speaker, I come to this well as a Democrat with a 95-percent career AFL/CIO record, with a 90-percent environmental record.

I say that this issue is not partisan. It is bipartisan. A sizable number of Democrats will be supporting this initiative. I also say that a sizable number of Hispanics around this country want this agreement and a majority of the Hispanic Caucus today will be supporting it also.

This has been a good debate. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE] have made good arguments and it has been a positive debate; but as I look around, I say to myself and I hear the words of my colleagues, why are we so afraid of Mexico? Its economy is 130th as big as ours. One-half of our Latin American trade is from Mexico. Seventy cents of every dollar that Mexico exports is spent in the United States, 70 cents. In the last 4 years, our exports have doubled to Mexico, $12.4 billion in 1986 to $29.4 billion right now; 264,000 American jobs have been created.

My colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] talked about border States. We have had bad economies with the peso devaluation. This is a big boost for us in the border, with all due respect for our colleagues from the Midwest who are concerned; but the issue here is who do we trust? There are three entities, the Congress, the administration, and the Mexicans.

With the Congress, the Gephardt-Rostenkowski provisions that deal with worker rights, that deal with environmental protection, that deal with rules of origin, give us assurances that for the first time we will have a free-trade agreement where the Congress will have maximum input, and if necessary the rules will be changed to amend the treaty.

The Bush administration I think has shown good faith. They have made an effort to deal with worker rights. They said we are ready to have worker retraining and adjustment assistance. They said we are ready to have environmentalists on the negotiating team. They have said that we are ready to have a border development plan for the environment. Major environmental organizations have endorsed this fast track, the Audubon Society, the National Resources Defense Council, the National Wildlife Federation.

The Mexicans. I have heard some of my colleagues who think we are talking about a country that is not friendly. Here is a Mexican President who has privatized, that pays his debts to the United States, who is trying to root out corruption, who is trying to improve the lot of his people, and we are going to send a message to him that no, we do not want to have free trade with you?

I say this is a critical vote. I say to all my colleagues in the Congress, let us not isolate ourselves as a country. Let us not be protectionist. Let us vote for fast track.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In letters to the President from Chairmen BENTSEN and ROSTENKOWSKI, and from Majority Leader GEPHARDT, the Administration has been asked to address a variety of economic, labor, and environmental concerns that have been raised about the proposed North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. The Administration's response sets forth detailed action plans for addressing these concerns, as well as views on the economic impact of a NAFTA.

THE POSITIVE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF A NAFTA

From 1986 to 1990, as Mexico reduced import barriers, with barriers our exports more than doubled from $12.4 billion to $28.4 billion, generating 264,000 additional U.S. jobs.

Under a NAFTA, we can do even better. Mexico still has higher trade barriers than the U.S. Mexico's average duty is 10% compared to 4% in the U.S. Significant nontariff barriers remain. We therefore have much to gain from the elimination of these barriers.

All three major economic analyses done to date corroborate that the U.S. will benefit from a NAFTA in exports, output, and employment.

We will benefit from Mexican growth: for each dollar Mexico spends on imports, 70 cents is spent on U.S. goods; for each dollar of GNP growth, 15 cents is spent on U.S. goods.

Further, the resulting economic integration will strengthen the ability of the United States to compete with Japan and the EC.

ADJUSTMENT PROVISIONS WE WILL SEEK IN THE NAFTA

*Transition Measures*

In order to avoid dislocations to industries and workers producing goods that are import-sensitive, tariffs and nontariff barriers on such products should be eliminated in small increments over a time period sufficient to ensure orderly adjustment.

In determining import sensitivity, we will rely heavily on advice of the International Trade Commission, the Congress, and the private sector.

We will be prepared to consider transition periods beyond those in the United States-Canada FTA.

*Effective Safeguard Provisions*

Even where reductions in tariffs and other trade barriers are staged over a lengthy period, there may be isolated cases in which injurious increases in imports could occur. To prevent injury from such increases, we will seek to include in the agreement a procedure allowing temporary reimposition of duties and other restrictions.

This mechanism should be designed to respond quickly, especially in cases of sudden import increases.

Special snap-back provisions should be included to address the unique problems faced by producers of perishable products.

*Strict Rules of Origins*

We will negotiate rules of origin to ensure that the benefits of a NAFTA do not flow to mere pass-through operations exporting third-country products to the U.S. with only minimal assembly in Mexico.

Rules of origin will impose clear, tough, and predictable standards to the benefit of North American products.

We will seek to strengthen the required North American content for assembled automotive products.

We will consult closely with the private sector and the Congress in designing these rules.

DOMESTIC WORKER ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

Since trade barriers on sensitive products should be decreased over a long timeframe, we do not expect immediate or substantial job dislocations.

Nevertheless, beyond including adjustment provisions in the NAFTA itself, there is a need to assist dislocated workers who may have adjustment difficulties.

The Administration is committed to working with Congress to ensure a worker adjustment program that is adequately funded and that provides effective services to workers who may lose their jobs as a result of an agreement with Mexico.

Whether provided through the improvement or expansion of an existing program or through the creation of a new program, worker adjustment measures should be targeted to provide dislocated workers with comprehensive services in a timely fashion.

LABOR ISSUES

*Labor Mobility*

We have agreed with Mexico that labor mobility and our immigration laws are not on the table in NAFTA talks, with the possible exception of a narrow provision facilitating temporary entry of certain professionals and managers.

*Worker Rights and Labor Standards*

Protections afforded by Mexican labor law and practice are stronger than generally known.

Mexico's laws provide comprehensive rights and standards for workers in all sectors, including the maquiladoras.

Mexico has ratified 73 International Labor Organization conventions on worker rights, including those on occupational safety and health.

Mexico has a minimum worker age of 14 and mandates special protections and shorter working hours for those between the ages of 14 and 16.

A substantially higher proportion of the Mexican workforce is unionized than is the U.S. workforce.

While enforcement problems have resulted largely from a lack of resources, a NAFTA would both raise living standards and create resources for enforcing existing laws.

*Future United States Cooperation on Labor Matters*

Memorandum of understanding

The Secretary of Labor and her counterpart from Mexico are prepared to sign a Memorandum of Understanding providing for cooperation and joint action on a number of labor issues which could be implemented in parallel with our FTA negotiations.

These include health and safety measures; work conditions, including labor standards and enforcement; labor conflicts; labor statistics; and other areas of concern to the United States and Mexico.

Specific projects

U.S. and Mexican officials have agreed on joint projects to address specific concerns in the labor sector.

Initial projects include: occupational health and safety; child labor; and labor statistics.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

*Mexico's Commitment to Environmental Protection*

Mexico has no interest in becoming a pollution haven for U.S. companies.

Mexico's comprehensive environmental law of 1988, which is based on U.S. law and experience, is a solid foundation for tackling its environmental problems.

All new investments are being held to these higher legal standards and an environmental impact assessment is required to show how they will comply.

Enforcement has in the past been a key problem, but Mexico's record has been improving dramatically. Since 1989, Mexico has ordered more than 980 temporary and 82 permanent shut-downs of industrial facilities for environmental violations; the budget of SEDUE—Mexico's EPA—has increased almost eightfold.

*Environmental Issues in the NAFTA*

Protection of Health and Safety

We will ensure that our right to safeguard the environment is preserved in the NAFTA.

We will maintain the right to exclude any products that do not meet our health or safety requirements, and we will continue to enforce those requirements.

We will maintain our right to impose stringent pesticide, energy conservation, toxic waste, and health and safety standards.

We will maintain our rights, consistent with other international obligations, to limit trade in products controlled by international treaties (such as treaties on endangered species or protection of the ozone layer).

Enhancement and Enforcement of Standards

We will seek a commitment to work together with Mexico to enhance environmental, health, and safety standards regarding products, and to promote their enforcement.

We will provide for full public and scientific scrutiny of any changes to standards before they are implemented.

We will provide for consultations on enhancing enforcement capability, inspection training, monitoring, and verification.

*Joint Environmental Initiatives*

In parallel to the FTA negotiations, we intend to pursue an ambitious program of cooperation on a wide range of environmental matters.

We will design and implement an integrated border environmental plan to address air and water pollution, hazardous wastes, chemical spills, pesticides, and enforcement.

During the design phase of the border plan, there will be an opportunity for public comment and hearings; during implementation, there will be periodic comprehensive reviews.

We will consult on national environmental standards and regulations, and will provide an opportunity for the public to submit data on alleged noncompliance.

We will discuss expanded cooperative enforcement activities, such as coordinated targeting of environmental violators.

We will establish a program of technical cooperation and training, which will include facilitating sharing of technology for pollution abatement.

*Informed Policymaking and Public Participation*

We will broaden public participation in the formulation and implementation of trade policy to ensure that efforts to liberalize trade are consistent with sound environmental practices.

We will appoint individuals to selected trade policy advisory committees who can contribute both an environmental perspective and substantive expertise.

In consultation with interested members of the public, we will complete a review of United States-Mexico environmental issues, with particular emphasis on possible environmental effects of the NAFTA, to enable U.S. officials to consider the results during FTA negotiations and other bilateral efforts.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO TRADE FACTS

*Exports and the U.S. Economy*

In the last 4 years, U.S. merchandise exports have expanded by $178 billion, accounting for over 40 percent of GNP growth.

In 1990, export expansion accounted for 84 percent of GNP growth.

*Mexico—Our Fastest Growing Export Market*

In joining the GATT in 1986, Mexico bound its top tariff at 50 percent. Since 1986, Mexico has lowered its top applied rate to 20 percent.

The trade-weighted average of Mexican tariffs applied to imports from the U.S. has fallen by more than half, from 25 percent in 1985 to about 10 percent today.

Mexico is now America's fastest growing major export market.

U.S. merchandise exports to Mexico have risen from $12 billion in 1986 to $28 billion in 1990, a gain of nearly 130 percent. This increase is twice as fast as the overall U.S. export growth rate.

Mexico is our third largest trading partner.

The U.S. sells more per capita to Mexicans, $350, than to the far wealthier people of the EC, $266.

U.S. agricultural exports to Mexico, our 4th largest market for agricultural products, totalled $2.5 billion in 1990, a rise of 134 percent since 1986.

Consumer goods' exports from the United States to Mexico have tripled since 1986, rising from $1 billion to $3 billion.

U.S. exports of capital goods to Mexico have grown from $5 billion in 1986 to about $9.5 billion in 1990.

Since 1986, U.S. exports for final consumption in Mexico have been growing nearly 60 percent faster than U.S. exports of components for assembly in maquiladora plants.

In 1989, the latest year currently available, less than one-quarter—24.2 percent—of U.S. exports to Mexico were components for assembly in maquiladora plants.

The Department of Commerce estimates that the expansion of U.S. exports to Mexico over the period 1986 to 1990 has added 264,000 export-related jobs in the United States. In 1990, 538,000 U.S. jobs were related to merchandise exports to Mexico.

Each billion dollars in exports to Mexico adds almost 20,000—$19,600 in 1990—export-related jobs in the United States.

The U.S. bilateral merchandise trade deficit with Mexico has fallen from $4.9 billion in 1986 to $1.8 billion in 1990. Excluding oil, the U.S. trade balance with Mexico has moved from a deficit of $1.5 billion in 1986 to a surplus of $2.7 billion in 1990.

*With NAFTA, There is Great Potential for Additional Export Growth to Mexico*

A NAFTA will create the world's largest free market, with 360 million consumers and a combined GNP of $6 trillion.

Despite recent trade liberalization, Mexico's trade-weighted average tariff—10 percent—remains 2½ times higher than the U.S. tariff average (4 percent).

Import licenses are still required on 40 percent of our agricultural export to Mexico.

Mexican performance requirements hamper U.S. exports especially in the auto sector. Mexico requires 36% local content in autos manufactured in-country, and forces auto companies to export auto products worth 2½ times the assembled vehicles they are allowed to import for sale in Mexico.

Although Mexico's population, at 85 million, is roughly one-third the population of the United States, its output is currently only 4 percent of the U.S. level.

Estimates show that Mexicans spend 15 cents of every additional dollar of income on imports from the United States.

The U.S. supplies 70 percent of Mexico's imports.

*A NAFTA Will Have a Minimal Impact on Investment in the U.S.*

United States direct investment in Mexico was an estimated $1.6 billion last year, representing less than 4 percent of United States direct investment in all foreign countries.

In 1989—latest year available—over 70 percent of United States direct investment in Mexico came from the reinvested earnings of United States subsidiaries in Mexico.

While average Mexican wages are roughly one-seventh United States wage levels, the average output per worker in Mexico is also roughly one-seventh the average output per United States worker.

COMPLETED ECONOMIC STUDIES OF NAFTA

*The ITC Study*

For the United States, an FTA with Mexico would expand exports, lower prices, increase competition and result in savings from larger scale of production.

U.S. real output and the real wages of both higher and lower skilled workers would increase.

*The Clopper Almon Study*

U.S. real GNP, exports and employment (up 64,000 jobs after 10 years) increase moderately due to an FTA. 48,000 additional jobs are created in manufacturing, 12,000 in agriculture.

After 10 years, U.S. exports to Mexico would be increased by $10 billion, U.S. imports from Mexico by $3 billion (at 1990 prices).

*The Peat Marwick Study*

Real income, wages and return on capital in the United States are all improved modestly.

Any decline in the U.S. trade balance with Mexico is more than offset by improvements in the U.S. trade balance with the rest of the world.

If the FTA leads to additional investment in Mexico, U.S. income, wages and return on capital increase even more than in the absence of added investment in Mexico.

*The Hinojosa-Ojeda/Robinson Study*

An FTA together with continued reform of the Mexican economy and added domestic and foreign investment in Mexico would significantly raise the real wages of the must vulnerable segments of the U.S. work force.

Real wages in Mexico would be increased, reducing the rate of immigration to the United States. Lower immigration results in less competition for rural and unskilled urban jobs. As a result, the real wage of these two groups increases by 1.8 percent. This scenario implies no reduction in the wage of union workers and a small (0.2 percent) increase in the wages of white collar workers.

MEXICO'S COMMITMENT TO ANTINARCOTICS EFFORTS

Mexican President Salinas, recognizing that illegal narcotics pose national security and public health threats to Mexico, has committed his government to an aggressive campaign against drugs.

In 1990, Mexico seized 48.5 metric tons of cocaine and increased eradication of marijuana and opium crops. Since Salinas took office in 1988, Mexico has seized 90 tons of cocaine.

Mexico increased its annual drug enforcement spending to nearly $77 million (antinarcotics budget has tripled in past three years).

Under President Salinas, U.S.-Mexican antinarcotics cooperation has reached unprecedented levels.

The Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty, which came into full force on May 3, 1991, provides a mechanism for more effective prosecution of international drug traffickers.

DEA agents work closely with the Mexican police providing information which helps Mexico stop smuggling operations.

Mexico has created a Northern Border Response Force (NBRF) to interdict cocaine-laden aircraft entering Mexico.

The NBRF works closely with U.S. law enforcement agencies and surveillance assets, responding to reports of drug flights with tracker aircraft, helicopters, and police.

The Mexican military is also involved in counter-narcotics operations.

One-quarter of the Mexican army is involved in anti-narcotics operations on a daily basis.

Mexican Army troops eradicated record levels of marijuana and opium in 1990.

Mexico toughened its anti-narcotics legislation in 1990, increasing penalties for trafficking and corruption.

500 Mexican officials dismissed for drug-related corruption; over 18,000 civilian arrests for narcotics offenses in the past year.

Major trafficking figures, previously believed to be above the law, have been arrested, convicted and jailed.

Caro Quintero, implicated in the murder of DEA agent Enrique Camarena, remains imprisoned.

Symbolic of Mexico's strong commitment in this area, ninety Mexican police officers and military have lost their lives during the past two years in the fight against drugs.

ECONOMIC IMPACT: GENERAL

The role of U.S.–Mexican trade to the U.S. economy has gained greater importance since Mexico began liberalizing its trade regulations in 1986. Through a Free Trade Agreement, we can negotiate greater access to the Mexican market for U.S. firms.

The doubling in U.S. exports to Mexico in response to Mexico's trade and economic reforms has already created an estimated 264,000 export-related jobs in the United States. Greater access to the Mexican market will permit increased exports from the United States, and create even more jobs.

Three important econometric studies have been done to estimate the impact of a Free Trade Agreement on the U.S. economy. These studies were done by the International Trade Commission, Dr. Clopper Almon of the University of Maryland under contract by the Labor Department, and KPMG Peat Marwick for the Mexico-U.S. Business Committee. All have shown that the United States would benefit for an agreement.

The Peat Marwick study, in particular, shows that a free trade agreement with Mexico would improve U.S. global competitiveness, including our overall trade balance. In addition, the Peat Marwick study estimates that there will be a net job gain in every state of the union, with at least 61,000 jobs being created in the U.S. as a result of an FTA with Mexico. Clopper Almon's study suggests similar job creation of 64,000 jobs. All of these studies indicate that the United States labor force would benefit from the FTA.

Without a free trade agreement, Mexico is not under obligation to keep its market open to U.S. products. The Peat Marwick study suggests that if Mexico returns to its pre-1986 trade restrictions, the United States will lose in terms of real rates of return, income levels, and competitiveness vis-a-vis the rest of the world.

Support for fast track will allow our negotiators the opportunity to prevent such a step backwards for both of our countries.

Since 1986, U.S. exports to Mexico have more than doubled from $12.4 billion in 1986 to $28.4 billion in 1990. This results from Mexico's reduction of trade barriers.

In 1986, when Mexico became a member of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, it agreed to a top tariff rate of 50 percent. Since then, Mexico has voluntarily reduced its top applied tariff to 20 percent, but is only bound to a 50 percent ceiling.

Additionally, Mexico has made progress in reducing its non-tariff barriers. Import permits have been eliminated on all but 230 products.

Even though Mexico has made considerable progress in reduction of trade barriers, through negotiations for a free trade agreement we can make greater progress. For example, Mexico's average applied tariff is over 10 percent, compared to the U.S. average applied tariff of approximately 4 percent. Additionally, import licenses are still required on about 40% of our agricultural exports to Mexico.

A free trade agreement would ensure that Mexican tariffs are reduced, eventually to zero. In addition, we will negotiate further reductions in non-tariff barriers. Removal of these barriers will create greater opportunities for U.S. firms to better compete in the Mexican market.

One important econometric study done by KPMG Peat Marwick for the Mexico-U.S. Business Committee shows that U.S. exports to Mexico will increase in response to higher Mexican demand caused by an FTA. As a result of the increased demand in Mexico, U.S. Output and the real rate of return on capital in the United States will increase.

Not only will reductions in trade barriers between the United States, Mexico, and Canada permit greater trade between the three countries, it will better enable us to compete with the rest of the world. The Peat Marwick study shows that our balance of trade with the rest of the world will improve by $1.6 billion.

Should we fail to move ahead at this time, the Peat Marwick study suggests if Mexico returns to its pre-1986 trade restrictions, the United States will lose in terms of real rates of return, income levels, and competitiveness vis-a-vis the rest of the world.

Support for fast track will allow our negotiators the opportunity to prevent such a step backwards for both of our countries.

A NAFTA HAS LONG TERM, DYNAMIC EFFECTS ON U.S. AND MEXICAN GROWTH

An FTA will increase U.S. exports as remaining Mexican trade barriers fall. The Clopper Almon study predicts increased U.S. exports by $10 billion a year by the end of ten years.

Mexicans buy American products.

70 percent of what Mexican consumers spend on imports is spent on American goods.

Firms in Mexico are far more likely to buy U.S. capital goods and components than are firms in other countries. Approximately 75% of Mexico's imports of capital goods are from the U.S.

As Mexico becomes more wealthy through increased trade and investment, the United States will benefit from the dynamic gains of trade. Mexican consumers and firms with more resources will demand ever greater quantities and more sophisticated U.S. products.

Dornbusch from MIT has estimated that for every dollar of Mexican GNP growth, 15 cents is spent goods imported from the U.S.

These larger, longer term gains are not reflected in the current studies on the economic effects of an FTA.

FAST TRACK IS JUST AS IMPORTANT FOR BILATERAL AGREEMENTS

There is no justification for less favorable treatment of Mexico negotiations than Uruguay Round negotiations.

Fact track authority is essential for bilateral (or trilateral) trade negotiations, just as it is for larger multilateral negotiations.

The need for fast track arises from the number and complexity of different issues addressed and the number and diversity of domestic interests affected.

For example, a one-product agreement with 100 countries can be considerably easier to negotiate than a comprehensive bilateral agreement.

Any comprehensive trade agreement, bilateral or multilateral, involves widely divergent constituent economic interests. Consequently, they are vulnerable to legislative amendments which, while possibly small in themselves, run the risk of unravelling the entire agreement.

In order to achieve the kind of comprehensive, far-reaching agreement with Mexico and Canada that will truly liberalize trade in all areas of concern to the United States, the U.S. negotiators need to come to the negotiating table with the assurances that only fast track can provide: the agreement reached will be the agreement voted on at home.

---

EMBASSY OF MEXICO,
*Washington, DC April 29, 1991.*

Fast Track is indispensable for free trade negotiations between Mexico and the United States.

We firmly refute any suggestion that Dr. Blanco or any other Mexican official has stated that preservation of fast track is not essential for Mexico to participate in free trade negotiations with the United States.

The article which appeared in the Mexican press misquoted Dr. Blanco on this matter. The Government of Mexico considers fast track essential for its participation in free trade agreement negotiations with the United States.

It is therefore of the utmost importance to dispel any doubts that may have emerged

concerning the position of the Mexican Government on this issue.

---

THAT TREATIES HAVE BEEN APPROVED WITHOUT FAST TRACK DOESN'T MEAN THAT FAST TRACK IS UNNECESSARY FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS

This treaty argument made by Mr. Dorgan and others is fallacious and misleading.

First, the procedure for the negotiation and approval of treaties is set out in the Constitution; the procedure for the negotiation and approval of trade agreement is not. Consequently, some accommodation between the branches is a constitutional necessity if we are to have an effective trade policy.

Second, fast track refers only to the congressional procedures for trade agreement implementing legislation. Of the 25 Treaties and Conventions cited by opponents of fast track, only 5 involved implementing legislation approved by both Houses of Congress. The other 20, while pursuing noble objectives such as arms control, had little if any direct effect on U.S. laws or the pocketbook of U.S. citizens.

Third, in each of these 5 cases, both the treaty and the legislation involved only a specific article (e.g., coffee, mind-altering drugs, endangered species), a single set of laws (copyrights) or established new authorities in one specific area (ship pollution, endangered species).

None involved the broad range of subject matter or implicated widely divergent constituent economic interests as do major trade agreements.

Consequently, none was vulnerable to the type of multiple legislative amendments that can unravel entire agreements.

Finally, under fast track the determination of whether a trade agreement is in the overall interest of the United States is still determined by Congress, and I might point out by both Houses of Congress, not just the Senate as is the case with treaties.

A NAFTA BENEFITS THE AMERICAN CONSUMER

An FTA not only will increase U.S. exports and create U.S. jobs, but will raise the living standard of the American consumer.

An FTA gives American consumer the freedom to buy the highest quality and lowest priced products available.

Protectionism wastes money and is an inefficient use of resources. An FTA transfers these resources back to the private sector—to the American producer and the American consumer.

An FTA extends the American principle of the free market across national boundaries. Free trade is not a zero sum game, it is a win-win proposition.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment my colleague for a very, very fine and comprehensive statement. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Finally, why is this important for the United States? First, more jobs for us, a larger market in Mexico for American products.

Second, a reduction of immigration coming into the United States.

Third, and perhaps the most important, the world is moving into trading blocks. GATT probably is not going to work. I hope it does.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we approve fast track in this vote today.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, after all these fine speeches, I yield back any time that I may have.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, there is a serious confusion clouding the debate over fast track. Fast track is not the same as free trade.

I want to repeat that: Fast track is not synonomous with free trade.

I support free trade. My State of Wisconsin benefits enormously from free trade.

But I cannot support the administration's fast-track proposal for a free-trade agreement [FTA] with Mexico and, in order to support any such authority for the GATT talks, I need reassurances—that I have not yet received—that section 22 will not be traded away.

Regarding the GATT, I have long supported the key goals of the Uruguay round—to expand GATT to include services and investment, to strengthen intellectual property protection for American products sold around the world, and other steps. But I have serious concerns in the area of agriculture. I am concerned that, in our effort to encourage concessions from intransigent negotiating partners, we may be willing to trade away section 22. This is a program that is critical to American dairy producers and more important to the average dairy farmer than a GATT agreement. Having a dairy price support program without section 22 is like having a law without the means to enforce it.

I favor expanding free trade with Mexico. But I strongly oppose delegating complete negotiating authority to the President's team because of the concerns many of us have been raising for several months have not been adequately addressed by the President. His May 1 letter promises to take appropriate steps, to consult, to pursue parallel talks and take other steps. But there is no commitment to specific results in the key areas of concern: First, international worker rights; second, worker safety and health; third, child labor; fourth, the environment; fifth, wage disparity; sixth, rules of origin; seventh, safeguards against targeted export surges; and eighth, U.S. worker adjustment and retraining. The first four items are noteworthy because their fulfillment requires enforcement of laws that are on the books in Mexico but have not been enforced to date

The President also doesn't say how many resources he will commit to U.S. worker adjustment. He doesn't say what rule of origin he will pursue. Most importantly, he doesn't commit himself to defining Mexican violations of agreements in the first four areas as unfair trade practices.

The talks absolutely must spell out specific performance standards for the environment, international workers rights, and health and safety standards. And they must address them within the agreement. If they are on a separate track, that track needs to be completed before we consider a free-trade agreement—not after.

An FTA must also include a very strong rule of origin so that Mexico cannot become a platform for simple transshipment of Asian-produced and other goods to the United States market. But that is exactly the proposal that President Salinas outlined to the Pacific Basin Economic Council when he addressed them last week. President Bush believes that he has found a fellow disciple of free trade in President Salinas when, in fact, he has found an extremely savy pragmatist.

The administration has tried to dismiss opponents of fast track as simple protectionists. But in fact the administration is being economically naive by letting our national trade policy be guided by a dogmatic belief in free trade under any and all conditions. We really have no solid evidence to support the administration's claims that an FTA will yield significant gains.

The administration points to three studies to support its claim that this agreement will be a net winner for our country: the International Trade Commission, Clopper-Almon, and Peat-Marwick studies. But all three of these studies make two flawed assumptions. First, they assume full U.S. employment. This simply defines away the problem of job loss. Second, they assume zero shifts in investment. In other words, they assume that no United States-based facilities will pick up and move to Mexico as a result of much cheaper labor, poorly enforced environmental standards, and weak health and safety laws—all of which substantially lower the costs of production. This is economic naivete at its worst.

In fact, the ITC report itself concludes that "In the long run, and assuming that an FTA does not result in the equalization of wages and health, safety, and environmental standards," guarantees which the administration has refused to give us, "U.S. firms may accelerate the process of producing more finished machinery and equipment in Mexico." In other words, our fears of investment shift and loss of U.S. jobs will probably be confirmed.

To argue, as the administration does, that we need a North American free trade zone to be internationally competitive leaves one assumption unstated: we're paying American workers too much. The administration will never state it that baldly, but the key to their proposal is that free trade with Mexico will make us more competitive by pressuring down labor costs.

I'm convinced that a go slow approach is best for Mexican interests as well as ours. Environmental groups in Mexico insist that the trade agenda be expanded to include the environment but their views are not being heard. Independent labor groups not affiliated with the government oppose the agreement because they fear tremendous dislocations for Mexican agricultural workers and subsistence farmers. Their views are not being heard.

In fact, the majority of Mexicans won't have any voice in shaping the FTA. President Salinas would like to close this deal as soon as possible with relatively little domestic debate. The Chamber of Deputies won't even vote on the measure. The stakes are very high for President Salinas. Naturally he wants this agreement to shore up the waning prestige of the government party, the PRI, that has ruled in Mexico without interruption for 60 years.

If we really want to help Mexico move forward, then let's help them lighten its crushing debt burden, find the resources to provide tar-

geted foreign aid, and help foster a vibrant, multiparty democracy in which all Mexicans can participate. Letting Mexico drain millions of manufacturing jobs out of America will only be another assault on working families in this country who have taken many hits in recent years.

I believe that a go slow approach is the right one for both Mexicans and Americans. Let's make sure that we address the issues that affect the quality of life of both our nations. Let's attempt to minimize the painful and wrenching dislocations that could result from changing investment patterns. Let's listen to the important views that exist within Mexico—both the powerful and the powerless in that country.

The administration claims that Mexican-American relations will suffer if we reject fast-track negotiations. But if we make a mess of this agreement and thousands of United States jobs are lost to Mexican workers who are not paid the full value of their work, the long-term costs to our relationship could be even greater.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 101, a resolution to reject extension of fast-track authority to the President, on the merits of the proper procedure Congress deserves to approve trade treaties.

Extension of fast-track authority—authorized by the 1988 Omnibus Trade Act—requested by the President for trade negotiations is the key to the United States securing any form of bilateral or multilateral trade agreement. If we intend to compete in an international economy and in international markets, concessions and compromises on trade distorting barriers are a must. Without the extension of fast-track, we basically throw away the possibility of achieving the goals of freer and fairer trade.

Fast track simply allows the President the ability to negotiate trade agreements in consultation with Congress and the private sector. Once an agreement is reached, Congress has the right to examine the accord and then accept or reject the final agreement with a "yes" or "no" vote. The President's request would extend this authority through June 1, 1993.

There is no denying that we now live in a global economy and that the future of our continued well-being, in part, hinges on the ability to construct long-term multilateral or bilateral trade agreements. The United States' ability to export its goods has become increasingly important to U.S. economic growth. The positive effect of global trade is clearly witnessed by the agriculture sector.

The opening of markets and removal of unfair trade practices is essential to developing a market-oriented global economy. Fast track authority is crucial to completing trade negotiations because it is a procedure that allows the President and U.S. negotiators to participate in negotiations with the assurance that the agreement reached internationally will be the same agreement voted on at home. I support fast-track because it gives our negotiators the credibility they need to be effective. How do you negotiate a treaty subject to audit by 535 Federal legislators?

At stake is our ability to have the necessary negotiating tool to successfully complete negotiations with trading partners through the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and to execute a North American Free-Trade Agreement. I believe both of these agreements will have wide-ranging, but positive affects for U.S. agriculture by reducing trade distorting barriers that hamper our ability to export agricultural commodities at profitable and undistorted world market prices.

U.S. agriculture exports totaled $40.1 billion in calendar year 1990, exporting over 150 million tons of agricultural products. Some 884,000 U.S. workers were used to produce agricultural exports in 1987. About 40 percent were farm workers and 7 percent were in agricultural services. Workers in food processing represent another 6 percent of the total. Much of the supporting labor demand, however, occurred outside agriculturally related industries. For example, 19 percent worked in the transportation and trade industries, moving agricultural products and the inputs required to produce them through the various stages of production and distribution. Another 28 percent worked in other industries throughout the economy, such as petroleum refining and container manufacturing. Do we need trade? Yes we do.

Representing the largest dairy producing region in the country, I sincerely appreciate the concerns of dairy producers about the prospects for liberalized dairy trading policies. But I am equally optimistic that given a freer and fairer trading environment, our dairy farmers and industry will gain additional market opportunities with improved environment for strengthened prices on the world market and domestic markets.

I only support the multilateral reduction and subsequent elimination of export subsidies so that our efficient U.S. producers can compete in a more market-oriented world economy. There will be a long transition period, yet to be determined, and safeguards so that producers are not put at a disadvantage.

North American Free-Trade Agreement and dairy—the impact of trade negotiations on dairy may be felt more through the North American Free-Trade Agreement with Mexico. Mexico is already the United States' largest customer for United States dairy exports. From 1985 through 1990, the United States averaged a positive dairy trade balance of $102.6 million. This trade represents an average 23 percent of the total U.S. dairy exports. The largest items exported to Mexico has been nonfat dry milk and milk and cream products.

There are good prospects to expand United States dairy product exports to Mexico for cheeses, yogurts, butter, whey, cream and fluid and powdered milk. The restraints to increasing exports revolve around Mexico's lack of sanitary standards, poor transportation infrastructure, lack of pasteurization capabilities, and government restrictions. Mexico retains high tariffs on some dairy products and protects its domestic industry with the use of import licenses.

There is potential for increasing dairy product exports to Mexico. Mexico now cannot meet its current demand for dairy products and as Mexicans prosper, demand will increase for high value products such as dairy products.

Mexico's production is limited by several factors including restrictive land ownership policies, lack of water resources and current milk price controls. Although there is an abundant labor force, it is not competitive with U.S. producers in animal genetics, feed supplies, and technology.

Mexico is Wisconsin's 10th largest trading partner. We have a track record with Mexico that we can build upon. Food products were second in exports to Mexico only to computers and industrial machinery. In 1989, food product exports to Mexico equalled $30 million, a 280-percent increase over 1987.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and dairy—it's difficult at best to determine the outcome of a trade treaty because trade negotiations have yet to be made. In regard to the GATT negotiations, trade liberalization of world dairy export markets should result in a more accurate and more competitive world export market. The current world dairy market is so distorted by the European Community, the United States lacks the ability to compete fairly and profitably on the world market.

Currently, the European Community has 47 percent of the world dairy exports, all of which are subsidized with variable export refunds—direct subsidies—to ensure European Community dairy products are competitive with products in international markets. The European Community has a subsidy three times higher than the United States but then dumps its surplus dairy products on the export market. Total agriculture expenditures—domestic support and export subsidies—for the European Community were $36.25 billion in 1990. This is four times larger than the $8.48 billion committed by the United States. Export subsidies for the European Community alone were $11.53 billion compared to $280 million of U.S. support. This highlights the lack of market orientation in European Community agricultural support programs contrasted with the increasing market orientation of U.S. programs.

The objective of GATT is to convert nontariff trade barriers to tariffs and reduce them over a transition period. The initial U.S. proposal was a 75 percent reduction in barriers over 10 years. The European Community has indicated willingness to make a 30 percent reduction over 5 years. A Uruguay round would place no restrictions on support to producers that does not distort production and trade. Such support could be provided for producers who face lower returns as they adjust to a greater reliance on the market.

During a hearing before the House Agriculture Committee with the U.S. Trade Representative, I laid out these specific concerns relating to GATT negotiations and dairy which I am dedicated to seeing negotiated in a positive manner:

First, section 22 dairy import quotas would not be used as a bargaining tool for concessions outside of agriculture or for other nondairy negotiations.

Second, sanitary and phytosanitary regulations relating to dairy would be established with the confirmation that no country would be required to lower its food safety standards. The ability for countries to set their own standards should be reserved if based on science and which aren't disguised as barriers to trade.

If any trade agreement has the negative impact that some opponents of these negotia-

tions state, then the trade agreement deserves to be rejected by Congress. But the success of our future will be affected by our ability to come to terms on trade barriers. Congress still reserves the right to thoroughly be involved in the trade negotiating process and it reserves the power to direct our trade negotiators toward freer and fairer trade agreements for the benefit of this country. We either prepare for the future or become a victim of the future.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the disapproval resolution. This vote on the extension of fast-track authority is perhaps the most important vote on economic matters we will make in this Congress. The Uruguay round negotiations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] and a North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] hold out the possibility of great economic benefits for America. A vote now for the disapproval resolution is a vote to end these negotiations and to kill any agreements sight unseen. Let's allow our negotiators to bring home the best agreements they can, and then see if they are in our national interest.

Over the last few years, American companies have become increasingly competitive. Our export sector has grown dramatically, and is now one of the strongest sectors of the economy, accounting for over 80 percent of the growth in the economy last year and for over one-third of U.S. economic growth in the last 5 years. We need to continue and encourage this export trend. Disapproving fast track is a step in the wrong direction.

Ohio is one of the leading export States. Over 14 percent of Ohio's manufacturing employment is export related. Last year Ohio exported 16.6 billion dollars' worth of goods and services, an increase of 66 percent since 1987 when Ohio exported only 10 billion dollars' worth of goods and services. Half of Ohio's exports are machinery, transportation equipment, and high technology products and materials, all of which generate high-skilled, high-wage manufacturing jobs.

Mr. Speaker, my State stands to greatly benefit from freer trade, and a vote to disapprove fast track is a vote to preclude the possibility of opening new markets for our goods and to extend GATT rules to services, investment, an intellectual property on a worldwide basis.

Ohio is not unique in this situation. Most, if not all States, will gain from the successful conclusion of this round of GATT talks. U.S. exports have risen from $217 billion in 1986 to $375 billion last year, a 73-percent increase. The Uruguay round should foster even faster export growth and faster economic growth in the rest of the economy.

The United States will also benefit from a North American Free-Trade Agreement with Mexico. Our exports to Mexico have grown from $11.9 to $27.5 billion over the last 5 years while at the same time our trade deficit has shrunk from $5.3 to $2 billion last year. A free-trade agreement with Mexico will further stimulate this trend, just as Spain's, Portugal's, and Greece's accession to the European Economic Community improved the Germany's, Britain's, and France's trade balance vis-a-vis Spain, Portugal, and Greece.

A vote today to deny the extension of fast track is a vote against the backbone of the American economy.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, the decision to grant or deny the President's request for fast-track trade negotiating authority is a difficult one. In both the proposed Uruguay round GATT agreement and the proposed Mexican/North American Free-Trade Agreement there are ample reasons for Congress to fear that the administration will pursue the full range of goals that are important to the American people. In addition, the actions of the Ways and Means and the Rules Committees leave us with a choice between two extremes, neither of which strikes me as a ideal approach.

In general, we have much to gain through reductions in trade barriers. We must keep in mind that American workers, although their lead is slipping, are still the most productive workers in the world. Our tariffs and trade barriers are also the lowest in the world. In the case of Mexico, our average tariff rate on Mexican goods is only 4 percent, much lower than the average Mexican tariff. By reducing both countries' tariffs to zero, American companies see a much greater improvement in their competitive standing than Mexican companies.

We are also facing increased competition from other integrated economies. As the European Community unites and Japan increases its integration with other Asian countries, we need greater cooperation and greater trade opportunities to compete. By working together with Mexico, we can keep jobs in this hemisphere that would have gone to Asia, and we can help Mexico develop its economy and decrease the unemployment problems that force so many Mexicans to cross our border illegally in search of work.

But Mr. Speaker, I will not vote for a bad trade agreement just because I vote for fast track. Outside of these general positive aspects, there are many specific industries and communities that could be hurt. If the President and his negotiators do not address the environmental, wage level, investment, and worker safety concerns that have been raised by Congress, I will work to reject a free-trade agreement.

In addition, many aspects of the implementing legislation for a trade agreement deal with domestic issues or require changes in domestic laws rather than tariffs or other issues negotiated with our trading partners. It would be both within the House rules and the spirit of the fast-track process for the House to change the fast-track rules at a later date to amend the implementing legislation in these areas.

I will vote for fast track, but it will be a reluctant vote. The administration has uniformly opposed or attempted to dilute domestic environmental, worker safety, trade adjustment assistance and minimum wage initiatives, and the fast-track process requires us to trust that they will negotiate a good international agreement in these areas.

I become persuaded by the administration's commitment to congressional involvement in developing the agreement and the implementing legislation. However, the President has shown a blatant disregard for the intent of Congress on trade issues with China, and many of the workers who may be hurt by increased competition from Mexico are already suffering from cheap Chinese imports. If his negotiators show the same disregard in negotiating with Mexico, I and a majority of the House will certainly reject their agreement.

Mr. Speaker, despite these concerns, I cannot ignore that Mexico has made very positive economic reforms in recent years, and they need greater trade to continue on their present path. I also cannot ignore that the barriers Mexico will have to remove are much larger than ours, so we have much to gain.

In addition, air pollution, water pollution, illegal immigration, and drug trafficking are international problems that we can best address through cooperative efforts with Mexico. By increasing our economic cooperation we are laying the groundwork for tackling these difficult problems.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Intellectual Property and Judicial Administration, I have a special obligation to monitor the intellectual property aspect of trade negotiations. I have discussed this issue at length with U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills. I have been impressed by her assurances, and I have faith in her ability and integrity. However, if a final agreement does not live up to those assurances, you can be sure that I will help lead the fight against approval of that agreement.

Having stated these concerns, I recommend that my colleagues approach the fast-track process the same way President Reagan advocated negotiating with the Soviets, "Trust, but verify." The Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution lays out the areas that Democrats expect to see addressed. If a Mexico free-trade agreement is presented, and we cannot verify that those concerns and expectations have been met, I will certainly work to reject it.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the resolution. I believe the administration must be granted the tools necessary to negotiate a North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. The fast-track procedure will strengthen the President's hand in accomplishing the goals of our trade agenda, both in terms of NAFTA and the ongoing Uruguay round of GATT discussions.

In supporting this procedure, Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss three main points. First, is the critical importance of achieving a free-trade agreement with Mexico. Second, and possible more important, is the fact that much of the debate here today fails to recognize the true challenge we face in remaining competitive in a global economy—and here I speak of the importance of education. Third, we must work together to solve the budget deficit.

For many of us in this Chamber today, the explosion in world trade has taken place during our own lifetime. We have been witnesses of the greatest economic expansion in history. World trade now accounts for some $4 trillion in goods and services.

This great increase in international trade has provided tremendous benefits worldwide, as well as here in the United States. International trade has expanded markets for goods and services. It has allowed manufacturers to utilize economies of scale which otherwise might not have been achieved. It has led to reduced prices for consumers. It has

brought about a dramatic increase in the standard of living around the world. And, to a great extent, I believe it has helped make the world a more peaceful place as nations become partners in trade.

It wasn't so many years ago that the nations of Europe were armed and fighting against each other in two horrible World Wars. Today, these same nations have become partners in a plan which calls for the integration of their economic and political systems. The role of international trade cannot be discounted in this accomplishment.

The benefits of international trade are many. I believe we all can recognize that fact. But what has contributed to this tremendous success?

While we can point to a variety of factors, among the most important would be the role of trade agreements. These agreements have facilitated the growth of trade. Agreements have brought down tariff and nontariff barriers. They have provided the means for resolution of differences. They have established the rules and framework for a system of international trade.

Today's discussion of the fast-track procedure really centers on the question whether we truly oppose such an agreement with Mexico. Those who would oppose such an agreement with Mexico fail to recognize the lessons of history. They fail to see the benefits we have reaped from international trade in general, and trade with Mexico in particular.

During the last 4 years, United States exports to Mexico have increased from $12.2 billion in 1986 to $28.4 billion in 1990. It is estimated more than 500,000 United States jobs directly are supported by exports to Mexico.

My home State of Michigan currently sends more than 8 percent of its exports to Mexico. Michigan goods sent to Mexico have grown to total about $2 billion a year—compared to $1 billion just 4 years ago.

The growth of exports to Mexico has been phenomenal. And this has occurred despite the fact Mexico's tariffs average 10 percent—opposed to our own average of 4 percent. A free-trade agreement with Mexico will help bring down tariffs and nontariff barriers in a market where our exports already are growing.

But, as I stated at the onset, much of the debate here today fails to recognize the true challenge we face in remaining competitive.

The answer to the challenge of world trade is not protectionism. The lessons of Smoot-Hawley taught us this much. The North American Free-Trade Agreement is the correct response to the changes taking place in Europe.

Instead, the answer to the challenge of increased competition is a better prepared work force. As more nations of the world industrialize and enter international trade, the United States must gain its edge through education. Our children and workers must be the best trained and educated in the world. This will be our key to remaining competitive. And, unfortunately, this is where we, as a nation, most need to improve.

How many of us have toured manufacturing plants and seen the shift toward quantitative measures of quality? How many of us have had demonstrated the new uses of computers and technology in the workplace?

Competitive workers must have higher levels of skill in today's market. Monitoring quality control charts requires a basic understanding of statistic principles. Operating and programming computerized machinery requires basic mathematical skills, keeping up to date on technological changes requires reading and communcations skills.

The United States cannot remain competitive in this type of environment if our students are not properly prepared.

A couple of years ago Dr. Harold Stevenson of the University of Michigan undertook a study to measure the mathematical achievement of students in the United States, Japan, and China. He measured the achievement of the students from one city in each country in the first and fifth grades.

What Dr. Stevenson found, in a nutshell, is that although the students all started out on a equal basis, by the fifth grade the American students had fallen far behind the Japanese and Chinese students.

Why do our students fall so far behind? They are not less intelligent, the Japanese and Chinese students simply spend more time in school. How can we expect to remain competitive in world trade, if other nations have work forces which are better prepared?

Our challenge in education has been well documented. Studies like Dr. Stevenson's, reports like "A Nation at Risk," and others have verified the problem. They also have shown us that to better educate our children we must look for new and innovative approaches in the classroom. Simply throwing more money at the same old problem will not work.

Later this year this House of Representatives will make some critical decisions with regard to the direction of American education. In my mind, Mr. Speaker, the decisions we face on education certainly will impact trade. In fact, the decisions we face on education will impact more on trade and employment in the United States than our decision today on the fast-track procedure.

To those who are concerned about American jobs, my message today is quite simple. Let's focus on properly preparing our work force through improved education and then, instead of wanting to protect our industries, we will actively seek free and open foreign markets in which to compete.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, let us not be mistaken about the impact of the Federal budget deficit upon our ability to compete in world trade. The need to bring this Nation's fiscal house in order continues to overshadow many of the positive steps we take to make American firms competitive.

Until our Government demonstrates the resolve to bring an end to the practice of spending beyond its means, the inflow of foreign goods and capital will not be brought into balance.

I encourage my fellow Members to vote against the resolution, and to keep in mind the impact of education and the budget deficit on matters of trade.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose fast track and to support the Dorgan resolution. I have been a supporter of the Uruguay round of GATT, because we should lower barriers to United States firms in finance, insurance, construction, and services, and we must get rid of all the quotas and subsidies that impede agricultural trade. Moreover, I recognize the longrun benefits which the Mexican Free-Trade Agreement could bring to America by linking the United States, Canada, and Mexican economies in one common market.

Despite these benefits, I oppose fast track primarily because I am concerned with the effects of the Uruguay round on America's textile and apparel industry. The textile proposal accepted by the administration in Geneva will open up our markets to an unrestrained flow of foreign textiles, produced at subsistence wages. It will abandon any semblance of managed trade in textiles and apparel, and force more and more American textile and apparel firms to shut down or move offshore.

The administration has agreed to a proposal in Geneva at the Uruguay round to phase out the Muti-Fiber Agreement, a major dispensation from GATT that has existed for more than 20 years. It would also lead to significant tariff reductions imposed on imported textiles. Over the past decade, domestic textile manufacturers have lost a large percentage of the American market share to foreign manufacturers and I believe ratification of the Uruguay round would only make this problem worse.

In my judgment, the administration is using the American textile industry as a bargaining chip, trading it away in return for concessions in other sectors. Last year, I, along with other members of the Textile Caucus, met with Carla Hills, the United States Trade Representative, who outlined the administration's position on textiles in the Uruguay round. The USTR told us that she had tabled a proposal for global quotas in textiles and apparel to replace today's country-by-country, product-by-product quotas. When we pressed for details, we were given very few. The USTR could not tell us at what level the global quota would be set, or how much of the global it would actually cover, or at what present it would grow and phase-out over its 10-year life. I wrote the USTR a letter explaining why I would be forced to vote against fast track if the administration did not change its proposal to give better protection to textiles. Since last year, the administration has changed its proposal, but in the opposite manner from what we sought. It has made even greater concessions to the textile-exporting countries, and I am even more convinced now of the damage which the Uruguay round may do to the American textile worker. I cannot agree to carte blanche authority for a negotiation that has already given away so much of the American textile market, and has yet to receive anything adequate in return.

Aside from my concern about textiles, I have concerns about the short-term impact of the Mexican FTA on the United States economy. Unlike Canada, with whom we already have a free-trade agreement, Mexico is at a lower level of economic development compared to the United States. Huge disparities exist between the United States and Mexico in wage levels, health and safety standards, environmental protection, and worker rights. The European Community has found that integrating Greece and Portugal into the common market has been more difficult than they ever expected, because of the disparities in their economies. The disparity between Mexico and

the United States is greater than the disparity between Portugal and Germany, and I think the problems will be significant.

Despite these drawbacks, I believe a North American Free Trade Agreement and revision of GATT will bring some long-term benefits to our Nation, and I would probably vote for fast track if the textile industry's concerns were properly addressed. The Uruguay round will bring agriculture and services under GATT rules for the first time. These changes should benefit the United States because of our competitive advantages in agriculture and services. Along with the Canadian FTA, a Mexican FTA will place the United States in the middle of a market of over 360 million consumers with a combined output of $6 trillion—20 percent larger than the European Community. A Mexican FTA will mean greater access for American businesses to the Mexican market because of the removal of tariffs; it will mean a more open regime of trade in services and investment; and it will mean better protection for intellectual property rights. All of these are advantages for us, and I could vote for a Mexican FTA if it addressed all the problems that I think it should. But I am reluctant to give the USTR what amounts to my proxy when we have so little assurance that the package she brings back will contain all that it should.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of extending the fast-track authority for implementing trade agreements and increasing trade with Mexico as part of a North American Free Trade Agreement. Without fast track, many nations would hesitate to enter into trade agreements with the United States, and as a result, this country would continue to lose its competitive edge to foreign competition. As in the past, the Administration will thoroughly involve Congress in all aspects of trade negotiations to ensure fair and equitable agreements.

Fast track will open the door to increased trade—and increased prosperity—for this country. For instance, 20,000 new American jobs are created for every $1 billion in increased exports from the United States. A new free trade agreement with Mexico could create up to 150,000 new American jobs alone. Mexico has traditionally been a strong economic partner of the United States, ranking as this country's third-largest trading partner after Canada and Japan. In my State of Arizona, over 20,000 jobs currently are associated with Mexican production-sharing industry. As a result of a new free-trade agreement, this figure could jump to nearly 50,000.

A free-trade agreement would also allow Mexico to continue its aggressive efforts to modernize its economy. A growing Mexican economy would allow companies to improve worker safety, protect the environment and bring all the other benefits of economic prosperity to this country. Now is not the time for this country to slip back into the isolationism and protectionism of the past. As EC 92 and other international markets begin to take shape in the coming decade, this country must regain the initiative in international trade. The only way to ensure this is through extending the fast-track authority and negotiating new trade accords such as a North American Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 101, to disapprove the extension of fast-track procedures for the negotiation of trade agreements. I would like to commend the gentleman from North Dakota, Congressman DORGAN, for sponsoring this resolution, and for his hard work in bringing this resolution to the floor for a vote of the full House.

The issue of the free-trade agreement with Mexico is not simply a matter of whether we want to expand trade with our neighbor to the south. In the abstract, a unified North American market of the United States, Mexico, and Canada makes sense. Canada is already our trading partner, and Mexico is our third largest.

The question regarding a free-trade agreement with Mexico is how we go about pursuing negotiations. Do we give President Bush and his trade negotiators the authority to negotiate an agreement which ignores the fundamental concerns of working men and women in America? Or do we insist that the United States Congress, the elected representatives of the people, have the opportunity to provide input and direction to the negotiations, so that the vital interests of every American are represented in an agreement? If we grant the President an extension of fast-track negotiating authority, we would basically be surrendering our oversight role, and removing ourselves from having any meaningful input into the negotiations. I believe that we have a duty to our constituents to reserve the right to amend a free-trade agreement with Mexico, therefore I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 101.

Furthermore, there are serious social, economic, and political consequences that must be addressed in a free-trade agreement. Individual and workers' rights, decent standards of living, and environmentally safe working and living conditions are fundamental to any workable United States-Mexico free-trade agreement.

The essential point is that the creation of a regional free trade zone in North America must be very carefully crafted. The United States and Mexico are very different economies, and we possess vastly different standards of living. Mexico has a gross domestic product only one-twentyfifth as large as that of the United States. Wages in Mexico average less than 10 percent of the United States level, and the average per capita income in Mexico is $1,820 a year.

The single comparative advantage of Mexico for American business is the poverty of its citizens and their willingness to work for subsistence wages. No matter how productive, fast-track procedures workers cannot compete with labor costs of less than $1 an hour.

Not even the Bush administration disputes that a free-trade agreement with Mexico will cost some Americans their jobs. But Carla Hills, the United States Trade Representative, discounts the possibility of wholesale migration of factories and jobs to Mexico. If companies only wanted a low-wage solution to their competitiveness problems, she argues, they would have pulled up stakes for the border before now.

I have news for Carla Hills and the President, the U.S. automotive and electronics industries are already in the process of moving south of the border.

General Motors now has more than 30 maquiladora plants in Mexico, employing over 30,000 workers, making it the largest private employer in the country. Since 1985, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers estimates that 12,000 union members have lost their jobs due to the transfer of work from the United States to maquiladora factories in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, in Cleveland, OH, which I represent, a recent article in the Plain Dealer reports that the unemployment rate is 13.8 percent, according to a soon-to-be-released Bureau of Labor statistics study. Over one-in-five of black people in the city of Cleveland is unemployed, the highest rate in the Nation.

I have read it in newspapers, I have heard it said on television, and I have even heard it said here on the floor of the House, that Members of Congress who oppose fast track for the United States-Mexico free-trade agreement are protectionist. To my accusers, let me just say that if striving to protect American jobs, the jobs of my constituents and your constituents, is protectionism, then I confess myself guilty of being a protectionist.

Mr. Speaker, an unregulated trade agreement along the lines of the administration's proposal would subject an increasing number of American workers to continuous pressure to lower their wages, benefits, and living standards in order to compete with low-wage Mexican labor using high technology machinery and equipment. This is simply an intolerable situation, and I urge my colleagues to stand up for their constituents, and support House Resolution 101.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, today the House will decide on an extension of fast-track authority, which provides the means for the administration to negotiate trade agreements.

Extending the fast-track authority does not mean an endorsement for GATT. In its current form, I oppose the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], and would vote against it if it were under consideration. However, we are not voting on trade agreements or policy, instead, the issue on the floor regards procedure.

Fast-track procedures preserve Congress' role during the negotiation, approval, and implementation of trade agreements. To ensure congressional and private sector input, the fast-track statute contains extensive notification and consultation requirements. At each step along the way, from initiation through implementation, Congress will be an active partner.

The President will be required to notify Congress 90 calendar days before signature under fast track, and once an agreement is reached, the administration must work in close consultation with Congress to formulate the implementing legislation. The process will involve full participation of all committees of jurisdiction. If the agreement and its implementing legislation are still not acceptable, they can be rejected by majority vote of either House.

In the following letter from President Bush, I have been assured that support for continuation of fast track is not an endorsement for any agreement, and the administration will

work with Congress to develop fair trade policies:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, DC, March 1, 1991.*

Hon. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON,
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR BILL: Today I sent to the Congress my request for an extension of the fast track procedures for the implementation of trade agreements, along with my report supporting that request. I am also writing to each Member of Congress to underscore the importance I attach to that request and to urge your support.

Events in the Gulf show how much the world continues to look to the United States for leadership. Continuation of fast track procedures is crucial to U.S. leadership in the global economy.

Our trade policy is to open markets worldwide for U.S. goods and services. Indeed, our economic growth is hinged to the success of these market-opening initiatives. Over the last three years, export expansion accounted for 57 percent of our GNP growth. But without the certainty the fast track guarantees—an up-or-down vote on implementing legislation within a limited time—we cannot complete or even negotiate trade agreements to sustain such growth.

When Congress reenacted the fast track procedures in the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, it anticipated that an extension beyond the upcoming expiration might be needed and important. We do need an extension of these fast track procedures to pursue important initiatives such as the completion of the Uruguay Round negotiations, the negotiation of a North American Free Trade Agreement, and the pursuit of our trade objectives in the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative.

I know that some may have concerns about these initiatives. But your support now for continuation of fast track procedures does not commit you in advance to endorse any particular agreement. Moreover, the fast track procedure is a partnership, and my Administration will do its part to make that partnership work. Fast track procedures call for, and I am committed to, close consultations to ensure that the negotiations are deliberate and that, ultimately, we achieve agreements in which we can all take pride. However, a vote against extending these procedures now deprives us of the prospect of negotiating any agreements.

I am asking for your support for our continued efforts to liberalize trade from open markets. No country stands to gain more from an open global economy than the United States. We are today engaged in trade initiatives that hold unprecedented promise for the advancement of our economic interests. With such important initiatives in the balance, we need more than ever to maintain U.S. leadership and the Legislative-Executive partnership that has endured for years.

Sincerely,

GEORGE BUSH.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I vote today for House Resolution 101.

I regret that we are presented with only two choices.

One is to accept fast track for both GATT and Mexico and a secondary role for Congress.

The other is to stop fast track for both.

From the outset I have searched for a course between two flawed alternatives.

Fast track for GATT should not be tied to negotiations for Mexico. The issues are different.

The negotiation process for United States-Mexico should be shaped to fit the particular circumstances where two economies at very different stages of development would be totally integrated.

I worked actively with many of my colleagues including House leadership to find an approach that would provide a meaningful role for Congress without killing fast track—an approach that would turn Congress from a consultant on trade to an active participant. I worked with guarded optimism. We drafted an amendment to modify fast track for Mexico to clarify our concerns and to strengthen the congressional role through a midcourse review. Because of the shape of the rule, that amendment was not allowed to be offered on the floor of the House.

Without that option, how do I express my deep concern about the need to pay serious attention to what fast track for United States-Mexican negotiations might mean for American jobs and businesses? How do I express my unwillingness to simply trust the Bush administration, with its record of failure and default in so many trade areas—and this on the heels of a Reagan administration that presided over the worst trade deficits in American history and the erosion of many key American industries and jobs?

Unfortunately, the gap is not filled with the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution when the House has been handcuffed in our bid to give it real teeth and a clearer message.

This is why I vote for House Resolution 101. I do so as an expression of my concern for the future of the American economy if today's status quo is tomorrow's practice, if the President remains as docile and the Democratic Party as divided as it is today and if the troubled and troubling performance of the 1980's is repeated in the decade of the 1990's.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, as we consider this proposal to extend the fast-track authority for trade negotiations, I'd like to point out some of the other concerns that Congress has looked at over the past year, and will be looking at later this year.

Our unemployment system is in need of a major overhaul, as more and more Americans lose their jobs.

Last year we passed major revisions to the Clean Air Act, which we hope will make great improvements in the environment.

We continue to look at legislation to enable workers to be in a position to bargain fairly with management at the negotiating table without fearing that they will be permanently replaced.

Again we will attempt to pass legislation to enable workers to take time off from their jobs to experience the joy of the birth of a child, or to care for a seriously ill family member.

I would argue that these issues are among the most important concerns this Congress must consider. Yet today we are debating a measure that could completely ruin any advances we have made, or will make, in the issues I've just mentioned. Because let's face it, this debate is not about being fair in trade negotiations, it's not about the mundane points of international relations, it's not about potential growth in our economy. This debate is about guaranteeing the right of Congress to amend any agreement that the administration might reach with Mexico to protect American workers.

Why do we need this assurance? To be frank, it's because there is a legitimate fear among many Members of Congress that trade negotiations with Mexico will not result in protections for American jobs. And as we debate the fast-track, we've got to keep in mind that if Congress gives up its right to amend a Mexican trade agreement, we may very well be giving up the chance to improve the conditions that the average American faces at work. Because if Congress can't amend a Mexican trade agreement, the United States is going to lose jobs, and unemployed workers won't need the family and medical leave bill, and they won't need the striker replacement bill. They would need a better unemployment system, but we're not going to be able to afford that if we add more Americans to the unemployment rolls. And by allowing Mexican industry, which doesn't operate under a clean air act, to greatly expand along the border, we're gutting our Clean Air Act. Because we already have free trade when it comes to the air we breathe.

I urge you to support the Dorgan resolution, and give Congress a chance to protect American workers when any Mexican trade agreement is up for ratification. It's the only course of action that is fair to the people we represent.

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 101.

Let me say one thing at the outset that should be said: Those of us who oppose fast track are not against free trade; we are not protectionists. We are concerned about our Nation's economic strength and the interests of our working families, and because we believe that fast track would not serve those interests, we support the Dorgan resolution to block fast track.

After the lofty rhetoric and weighty macroeconomic arguments made in support of fast track and the proposed United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement have a chance to settle, the promises and assumptions made in support of the agreement just aren't very realistic.

The idea that a free-trade agreement with Mexico means that Mexican consumers will create jobs in the United States, through their purchase of American goods just isn't a sure thing.

In fact, a great deal of liberalization in trade and job growth in Mexico has occurred during the past decade but Mexican wages have actually fallen. In the 1980's, Mexican wages as a percent of GNP fell from 37.6 percent to 15.8 percent. Mexican workers in the 1,600 maquiladora factories earn an average of 98 cents per hour, with average income of $2,165 a year. What can America sell to workers who earn $27 a week in take-home pay?

Certainly it won't be automobiles. The tiny middle class in Mexico accounts for almost all of the 400,000 automobiles sold annually in Mexico—workers in maquiladora plants have to ride or walk to work.

The promise that things will improve under a free-trade agreement depends on the as-

sumption that remaining trade barriers will be fully and completely dismantled.

But that isn't a sure thing, either.

Again, take a look at the automobile industry, which is heavily protected by the Mexican Government: Not by tariffs which have been all but eliminated over the past 5 years, but by nontariff barriers. Only 15,000 autos can be imported from the United States into Mexico a year. For every $1 in auto parts which a company imports into Mexico, they must export $2.50 of parts. So do we have any assurance that these nontariff trade barriers will be dismantled as part of a free-trade agreement? Not at all.

Our experience with Canada show that some nontariff barriers may take a long time to dissolve, and others may not dissolve at all.

The Canadian Free-Trade Agreement was more a tariff reduction agreement than a free-trade agreement and as a Member of Congress representing an automobile producing area, I want to reserve the right to offer amendments to the agreement if it doesn't adequately address these nontariff barriers. Fast track wouldn't allow me to do that.

Let's also take a look at who would really benefit from a free-trade agreement. Additional economic activity resulting from a free-trade agreement might not end up as additional dollars in the pockets of Mexican consumers. At the present time, 40 percent of Mexico's export revenues are used to service its debt. The staggering size of the Mexican debt, more than $95 billion, will soak up a great deal of whatever additional GNP Mexico realizes from a new trade agreement. To a large extent, it could be United States money center banks as Mexico's creditors who benefit from a new trade agreement rather than the working people of either Nation.

Addressing Mexico's debt crisis before we jump into a free-trade agreement would be a more desirable way to seek mutual prosperity. As long as Mexico's debt remains as debilitating as it is now, the standard of living for Mexican workers will not improve even if exports grow. Coupled with the fact that Mexico will retain its competitive advantage over the United States in many manufacturing sectors because of lower imput costs—effectively, the maquiladora system would be expanded nationwide—the United States job flow to Mexico would grow faster.

If we really want to improve the standard of living for workers in both countries, then we should address debt first.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that U.S. companies must be competitive in an increasingly global market. But instead of encouraging the low-wage solution which moves jobs and capital south of the border or off-shore, we ought to be pursuing a high technology strategy. Encouraging investment in U.S. factories, increasing our productivity by applying technology, and investing in our human resources through education and job training are all better long-range approaches to competitiveness than encouraging investment in low-wage countries.

If Congress is truly focused on the long term instead of the expedient, we will resist the rush to a free-trade agreement and instead take the conservative approach by insisting that problems be addressed before giving the administration fast-track authority.

I urge my colleagues to support the Dorgan resolution which will ensure we can negotiate a good agreement. We should open markets and increase trade with Mexico, but our exports should be products from American farms and factories—not American jobs.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I doubt there is any Member of this Chamber who is entirely comfortable with the concept of fast-track approval of trade negotiations.

Fast track, by definition, is designed to limit Congress's authority to revise or improve a trade agreement once negotiated by the President. While such restrictions might be reasonable in the case of a broad-based, multilateral agreement such as the Uruguay Round of the GATT, I remain unconvinced that fast track is called for in the proposed North American Free Trade Agreement, in which only three nations are involved.

I have very serious reservations about the President's intentions to negotiate a North American Free Trade Agreement that will be in the best interests of American working people, American farmers, and American consumers.

The administration has responded with little more than vague rhetoric to the many concerns of the Congress regarding the loss of American manufacturing jobs, the need for trade adjustment assistance, and the need for stringent environmental safeguards written into the agreement to protect American consumers and their environment.

We have not received any realistic answers to how United States negotiators will insure that Mexico does not become one vast maquiladora of the worst sort, with widespread violations of child labor laws, and nonexistent health, safety, and environmental standards. The administration says that Mexico already has good laws on the books regarding these issues, but anyone who has spent even an hour in the border region can tell you how ineffective those laws really are.

Free trade will be a disaster for the American economy if the administration does not make a monumental effort to correct the deplorable standards and lax enforcement of existing standards in Mexico. Mr. Chairman, based on what we have seen thus far from the administration of this issue, I do not have a great deal of faith in the administration's commitment to these goals.

Unless the resulting agreement contains enforceable environmental protections and provides meaningful protections for the American workers who will be replaced by the agreement—including trade adjustment and re-training assistance, workers' rights, rules of origin, and a suitable lengthy transition period, I will not support a North American Free Trade Agreement if it is submitted to the Congress.

Nevertheless, we are not voting today on the North American Free Trade Agreement. We are voting on a procedural issue that will first and foremost determine whether this GATT round will live or die. Rejection of fast track may be a diplomatic insult to President Salinas of Mexico and may temporarily slow the momentum for the start of negotiations, but it will not ultimately stop trade liberalization with Mexico. Rejection of the fast track will be the final blow to the Uruguay Round, which is close to completion after nearly a decade of negotiations.

The resolution offered by the majority leader, which I have cosponsored, is a challenge to President Bush. It challenges him to negotiate a North American Free Trade Agreement that will actually do what the President says it will do—stimulate growth, create jobs in the United States, expand exports and lead to hemispheric progress and prosperity.

The Gephardt resolution puts the President on notice that Congress will require strict and enforceable commitments relating to the environmental protection, health and safety standards, labor and industry adjustment, and workers' rights before agreeing to any North American Free Trade Agreement. It requires him to consult closely with Congress throughout the negotiating process. And it sets objectives for the negotiations on the reduction of trade barriers, protection of intellectual property, dispute settlement, and rules of origin.

This challenge to the administration is a tall order, and one I am personally doubtful will be met. However, we lose little by challenging him to try.

If he does succeed, the potential payoff is high. Free trade with Mexico, properly structured, can result in more jobs for Americans. A free trade agreement can result in a more prosperous North America that is more competitive against the far greater trade challenges posed by Asia and a united Europe. And economic growth through expanded trade can improve living and working conditions for our Mexican neighbors—ultimately relieving the strain that the vast differential in our standards of living places on the bilateral relationship.

The Gephardt resolution makes crystal clear that Congress is in no way abdicating its oversight responsibility and intention to play a very direct role in the negotiation of a North American Free Trade Agreement.

With the caveats and conditions spelled out in the Gephardt resolution, I urge my colleagues to join in this challenge to the administration to produce a truly valuable agreement with our partners in this hemisphere.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in 1988, Colorado exported 54 million dollars' worth of manufactured goods to Mexico, and in 1989, $70 million, a 30-percent increase. Our Southern neighbor is Colorado's ninth largest trading partner.

Obviously, Mexico is already an important trading partner for my State. Colorado businesses have been actively pursuing Mexican partnerhsips. They are poised for action in the case of a final agreement. A North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] will give Colorado businesses access to a $6 trillion market. Coloradans are planning for this agreement. They are counting on it.

Trade with Mexico is important to other States as well. In fact, between 1987 and 1989, 15 States more than doubled their exports to Mexico. The States with the greatest percentage of growth during that 3-year period were Montana, Nevada, Vermont, and Maine. Forty States and the District of Columbia registered an increase in the Mexican share of their exports in 1989. Thirty-six States rank Mexico among their top 10 export markets.

Without an extension of fast track there will be no agreement. Any agreement that comes back to this body subject to amendments will not survive the scalpel of special interests. NAFTA is too important to my district to allow that to happen. Vote "No" on the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, for years, Congress has debated the issue of free trade versus fair trade in regard to relations with many of our international trading partners, Japan in particular. In a few weeks, we will vote on legislation that again confronts this important issue, but this time focusing on trade with Mexico.

President Bush is presently proposing a North American free trade zone, stretching from the Yukon to the Yucatan, claiming it will provide an economic boost to its sponsoring countries. The President has authority until June 1, 1991 to submit a free-trade agreement to Congress for approval without changes, under the so-called fast-track procedure.

It is clear that such an agreement cannot be finalized before then, and the President is now asking for a 2-year extension of fast track to finalize his North American free-trade pact. However, there are some real dangers behind pushing a free-trade agreement the administration is calling for that does not take into account Mexico's present labor standards, drug trade and environmental problems.

What are the major problems with such an agreement, one that would reduce tariffs on imports to and exports from our third largest trading partner? After all, with a population of 90 million people, Mexico will continue to be an important neighbor in the years to come.

The greatest problem is the labor standard in Mexico versus our American labor standard. A free-trade agreement without laws governing wage standards will result in large numbers of companies relocating to Mexico, where government regulation is lacking and wage standards are practically nonexistent. This absence of Mexican governmental oversight could serve only to perpetuate the slave-like labor conditions for new employers.

Such cheap, unregulated labor would be a tremendous blow to the American worker. The result would bring for corporate executives greater profits, with little or no benefit to the consumer.

The European Common Market, for instance, has in its charter certain rights to social assistance, health and safety protection and vocational training. As it exists now, the proposed North American free-trade agreement would contain none of these conditions.

In addition, as currently proposed, such an agreement would only add to Mexico's already littered environment. At present, Mexico has enormous environmental problems stemming from toxic waste produced from many of its factories. What guarantee is there that more corporate operations in Mexico will not serve to degrade the environment even further?

To add to the agreement's difficulties, include Mexico's drug and immigration problems. A free-trade agreement without attention to these two areas would only make it more difficult for American law enforcement to prevent further drug trafficking and illegal immigration.

We already have evidence of how a United States-Mexico free-trade agreement might work. Since 1980, hundreds of United States companies have opened so-called maquiladora factories in Mexico, allowing the production of goods and their export back to the United States with minimal duty charges.

The maquiladora plants have already resulted in the loss of thousands of American jobs and the perpetuation of awful social and economic conditions in Mexico, where workers, often children, labor unregulated at substandard wages.

The American people don't want a pig in a poke. They want a fair-trade agreement, one that will protect American jobs and lift the standard of living in Mexico, while ensuring that environmental damage is reduced, not increased. Fast track prohibits congressional input into the pact that the administration will seek with the Mexican Government, so we will be left with only one up-or-down vote on the pact itself.

I have said that I will consider voting for fast track if the President can assure Members of Congress that his negotiations will produce results on the concerns I mentioned above. However, he has given little indication that his free-trade pact will actually resemble what we all want—fair trade.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President's request for an extension of his fast-track authority for negotiating trade agreements.

Last year, export expansion accounted for almost 90 percent of U.S. economic growth. An export-driven boost to our economy translates into thousands of new jobs for our workers. It is estimated that every $1 billion in exports generates 22,000 new jobs in the United States. There are now nearly 7 million U.S. jobs that are export related.

Fast-track authority and successful free-trade agreements are a key to our country's continued economic future. Disapproval of the fast track would relinquish important opportunities for future economic growth.

A free-trade agreement with Mexico will provide an important new market for American exports, creating new jobs and prosperity for Mexico and the United States.

A North American Free-Trade Agreement will strengthen our international competitiveness by joining three great nations in an economic partnership, each with important skills and resources.

And a successful completion of the Uruguay round is vital to open new markets to our goods and farm products, and to extend GATT rules to services, investment, and intellectual property.

Approval of fast track allows us to move forward with the negotiations. These talks are critical to future economic growth.

If we disapprove fast track, we will have wasted an important opportunity to expand our trade and strengthen our Nation's economic competitiveness.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 101, the resolution to terminate the President's fast-track authority to submit legislation implementing trade agreements to the Congress for a single, up or down vote. Fast-track authority is a bad deal for my constituents and a bad deal for this Congress.

We have been using fast-track authority to consider trade agreements for the past 17 years and what have we gained from using this process in the past? Nothing. Worse than that, we have fallen backward. Our exports to the rest of the world have been swamped by an ever-increasing tide of imports from Japan, Europe, and other nations. Our balance of trade with most of our major trading partners is way out of balance. We are losing money, we are losing jobs, and we are in a position of disadvantage with practically every other industrialized nation in the world. And it has been fast-track authority and a hands-off approach to trade by Congress that has dropped us into this quagmire.

This issue really is not terribly complicated and I did not have much trouble deciding how I would vote today. My district is 1 of the 10 poorest in the Nation and my constituents sent me here to represent them. Working people. People who search for jobs and cannot find them. Men and women who struggle to make it day to day. They are the people I am here to represent and from their perspective, fast track stinks.

I do not know whether ultimately I would be able to support a free-trade agreement with Mexico should one finally be negotiated. I have to admit that some of the fulsome free-trade rhetoric we have been hearing lately makes me somewhat nervous. The wonderful invisible hand of unrestrained, unregulated capitalism we keep hearing about has more often than not wound up wrapped around the necks of the workers of this country, impoverishing the many to enrich the few. But a free-trade agreement with Mexico might work; maybe it might be good for my constituents. But that depends upon what is in that agreement. And fast-track authority denies me and all of you the opportunity to have any real say in the contents of an agreement. All we can do is vote yes or no. There is nothing we could do to amend a free-trade agreement to protect our constituents and keep the invisible hands of the free-traders out of where they do not belong.

A bad free trade agreement with Mexico could be devastating for American workers. A lot can go wrong.

As it is, the pace at which U.S.-based multinational corporations have been abandoning American communities to relocate abroad has been accelerating over the last decade. Their output has increased 50 percent in the 1980's and now amounts to $15 billion. Hundreds of thousands of good, well-paying jobs have been destroyed in this country as American-owned corporations have fled our shores for the opportunity to exploit the cheap labor of Third World economies. By eliminating the few remaining disincentives to relocation, a bad free-trade agreement with Mexico could give new momentum to this parade of runaway shops that is killing our economy. IBM, Kodak, Zenith, Hewlett-Packard, and Apple are just a few of the Fortune 500 corporations that have shut down operations here and relocated their factories, and jobs, to Mexico in recent years. In the U.S. automotive industry alone, 75,000 jobs have been destroyed and moved to Mexico. A bad free-trade agreement promises only

to accelerate the flight of American corporations to Mexico that has been bleeding American workers and communities dry.

A bad free-trade agreement with Mexico could also shut down completely the small trickle of foreign investment that has been creating a few jobs across the United States in recent years. In recent years, Japanese corporations like Toyota and Nissan have been building plants in the United States to take advantage of the trade benefits of U.S.-based production. But if, under a poorly-conceived free-trade agreement, those companies can get the same trade benefits by locating in Mexico why would they even bother to locate in the United States? Mexican workers earn an average manufacturing wage of 57-cents-per-hour; U.S. workers earn an average of $10.47 per hour. What corporate executive in his right mind would choose us over Mexico with a wage disparity like that if he can get the same trade advantages south of the border?

Economists estimate that by 1999, 405,000 to 912,000 American jobs will be destroyed if a free-trade agreement with Mexico is not carefully worked out to protect the interests of our workers. Of those jobs, 500,000 will be relatively well-paying jobs in the manufacturing sector. By 1999, we could have a trade deficit with Mexico that surpasses a staggering $30 billion.

But a bad free-trade agreement with Mexico would not only injure American workers, it would harm workers in Mexico as well by consolidating and strengthening the new corporate colonialism that has a stranglehold over the poor nations of the Western Hemisphere. Throughout the 20th century, corporate chieftains have used the runaway shop to sabotage the efforts of American workers to win a fair wage and secure the right to work in a safe environment. When workers in the north organized unions and started bargaining for a fair wage, the corporations fled south to exploit the cheaper labor and union-free environment of the Sunbelt. Now workers in the Sunbelt are seeing those jobs vanish as corporations run off to take advantage of the cheaper and more exploitable workforce south of the border. We have not been sharing the wealth; we have been sharing the misery. In 1970, there were only 17 maquiladora plants in Mexico. Today, there are 1,700 which employ 500,000 workers. Yet the standard of living for Mexican workers has plummeted during this period. The hourly wages of Mexican factory workers have dropped 50 percent. Ten years ago, Mexican workers earned about one-third the wages of workers in Canada and the United States; today they earn just one-tenth of the wages of their counterparts in the north.

A bad free-trade agreement with Mexico promises to permanently lock in these abominable working conditions and living standards in Mexico. Unless the agreement is carefully negotiated so that it includes provisions which raise Mexican labor standards and wage levels to levels comparable to our own, we will not be doing the people of Mexico any great favors. We will only be sharing the misery. Workers on both sides of the border will lose.

If fast-track authority is terminated, we will have an opportunity to examine carefully any proposed free-trade agreement with Mexico and, if necessary, amend it to assure that the interests of American working men and women are protected. But if fast-track authority continues, we will have to rely on the administration to look out for our workers. The same people who fought tooth-and-nail to deny a paltry 10 cent increase in the minimum wage to the workers at the bottom of our economy. The same people who killed legislation giving workers a few weeks of unpaid leave to care for newborns or sick family members. And the same administration which today blocks civil rights legislation that is needed to give minority and women workers a fair shake in the workplace. This administration is no friend of workers; it never has been and it never will. The only way this Congress can ensure that the interests of working people are provided for in a free-trade agreement with Mexico is if we do it ourselves. And the only way we can do that is by passing House Resolution 101 and terminating the President's fast-track authority. Vote yes to disapprove fast track.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress will be asked to vote upon the extension of fast-track authority for President Bush to negotiate a free-trade agreement [FTA] with Mexico and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]. I rise today to urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 101 to disapprove of Presidential fast-track authority.

Let me make certain that you are aware of just what fast-track authority means. Under the fast track, the Bush administration would negotiate the FTA with Mexico and then it would be presented to the Congress for a straight vote to approve or disapprove. No opportunity would be provided for Congress to amend the proposed agreement, regardless of the flawed policies it might contain.

Establishment of a United States-Mexico free-trade pact, the administration argues, would provide a single North American market with a population in excess of 400 million, a market larger than the entire European Community. However, I have serious concerns about the ramifications of such an agreement for Maine. I base this position in part upon the failure of this and the previous administration to address the serious concerns of my constituents in earlier trade negotiations.

For example, during the negotiation of the United States-Canada FTA, the most serious problem Maine had with Canadian imports was in the natural resource area—potatoes, timber, and so forth—and the heavy subsidies and tariffs that Canada maintained for those products. We tried repeatedly to draw the attention of our negotiators to these problems. However, U.S. negotiators ignored these problems, and stated instead that they would be addressed in the ongoing, multilateral GATT negotiations. The GATT talks, of course, are still dragging on, with no resolution to these problems in sight.

So you will, then, understand my skepticism in these matters.

In addition, there are serious concerns about the impact a United States-Mexico pact might have on our domestic textile and shoe industries. These industries have been crippled by unfair foreign imports, and this plight has gone without redress from our trade policy makers. Since 1980, Maine has lost over 4,400 textile-related jobs, and over 7,000 footwear-related jobs.

Further the current trade deficit in textiles, clothing and shoes accounts for 26 percent of our total national trade deficit. Jobs in these areas could be even more vulnerable after a new free-trade pact. A Commerce Department report indicated that some industries—textiles and footwear, among others—would suffer unemployment of up to 45 percent as a result of a free-trade agreement with Mexico.

It is about time for this Congress to stand up decisively and say we will not tolerate U.S. jobs being traded away under the guise of free trade. America's workers have to know that at least the Congress will fight to make sure that they will still have a job. We have had enough placating of our so-called trading partners; it is time to negotiate in our interest.

The administration has attempted to make the argument that without fast-track authority Mexico will be unwilling to negotiate for free trade. In case anyone hasn't noticed, the only country pushing for fast track harder than the United States is Mexico. Has anyone stopped to think why? Obviously, they have figured out where all the jobs are going to end up.

Given these facts, I cannot abdicate my responsibility to my constituents by granting the administration authority to rush a United States-Mexico FTA through Congress. If the administration is confident about a free-trade agreement, then it should be confident enough to let Congress review it in detail. Adequate time must be provided for the Congress to scrutinize the proposed pact, and to make changes where necessary. Otherwise, I fear, the only thing on fast track will be U.S. jobs heading south.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Resolution 101, a resolution that would prevent extension of the fast-track negotiating authority for the President. Adoption of this resolution would severely hamper the ability to negotiate all trade agreements, and eventually result in harm to our economy.

Proponents of this resolution equate extension of fast track to an abdication of congressional responsibility in trade matters. This is not true. Congress retains the ability to fully debate the merits of any trade agreement sent up by the President, and retains the right to approve or disapprove that agreement. What the proponents fear is that we have to vote within a set time period with no opportunity to nitpick to death whatever document is brought forward.

Proponents of this resolution argue that we have negotiated a number of agreements—including trade agreements—without having to deal with the question of fast track. What they fail to point out is the treaties at question—especially the trade agreements—were considered noncontroversial to begin with, and in some cases were handled by voice votes in Congress.

The Uruguay round of GATT is extremely controversial and complex, and a Mexican free-trade agreement would present similar difficulties. All parties to these negotiations have specific interests to protect, including the United States. I do not believe we make the job of the President any easier when the other parties know that they could go to Congress to

scuttle deals that have been carefully crafted over months, even years, of negotiations.

The proponents of this resolution have some legitimate interests in the outcomes of these negotiations. I understand and share their concerns, particularly as they apply to energy resources, sugar beets and other agricultural products. Our trading partners have to understand that they have to make significant changes in their positions if they are to guarantee support of a trade agreement in this country.

By the same token, if this resolution fails, the President and his negotiating teams must understand that they must get input from Congress before finalizing any deal. Fast track does not mean carte blanche, and the Bush administration cannot ignore our legitimate concerns if they are to have any hope of passing the GATT Treaty or a free-trade agreement.

This is a difficult period we are entering. Europe 1992 is around the corner. Emerging market economies in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are looking for needed assistance. Constant economic shifts are developing along the Pacific rim—including the transfer of Hong Kong to China by the end of this decade. And the problems of excessive debt, explosive population growth and famine face Central and South America, Africa and the sub-Asian Continent. The President, as the only official elected by the entire country, must retain the right to speak with one voice in international negotiations. We should not hamper his ability to deal with these matters.

International trade is vital to our future. It will mean jobs at home and abroad. Therefore, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, as we begin debate on the President's fast-track trade negotiating authority, I would like to bring to my colleagues attention the attached AP news wire story.

As you can clearly see, Mr. Speaker, American companies cannot be trusted to protect the environment when they open factories in Mexico. However, the big question today is whether we can trust the President of the United States to make the Mexican Government comply with what we consider tough environmental standards. As the article clearly shows, it was not the U.S. Government, the EPA, or the White House which brought up these latest charges of environmental damage.

Must we rely on outside environmental groups to show the U.S.-owned companies will not respect the environment? Can we at all trust the President to force Mexico to comply with tough environmental standards? Can we afford to leave it up to American industry to respect the environment?

Mr. Speaker, much more is at stake here than just the President's authority. The real loser will be the environment; the polluted streams, the smog-filled skies, and the tainted drinking water. The Congress must have the ability to amend any FTA, if there are not adequate environmental safeguards.

The material follows:

BORDER SEWAGE—MAQUILADORA POLLUTANTS CITED AS THREAT TO BORDER SEWAGE PLANT

SAN DIEGO.—An environmental group says sewage samples from maquiladora factories south of the border contain enough petroleum pollutants to cripple a treatment plant the United States and Mexico plan to build.

"The hundreds of millions of dollars being spent to develop a new sewage plant could be wasted because that plant could be destroyed if this kind of industrial waste is pumped into it," said Craig Merrillees, trade and environmental specialist for the Boston-based National Toxics Campaign.

Government spokesmen say they doubt the planned $200 million plant, which is scheduled to begin treating renegade Mexican sewage in 1995, could be destroyed that way.

They acknowledged concern, however, about possible effects on the southern San Diego County facility from sewage created by the mostly U.S.-owned maquiladora plants in Tijuana.

"We anticipated this potential problem before we agreed with Mexico in July 1990 on the project," said Cruz Ito, spokesman for the International Boundary and Water Commission, a joint U.S.-Mexico agency that deals with border issues.

"In the agreement, Mexico commits itself to pre-treat any industrial discharges so we would not jeopardize the efficiency of the international plant."

Early this year, the National Toxics Campaign took eight samples of sewage from industrial areas dominated by the maquiladoras, which are factories owned by U.S. and other foreign firms and staffed by Mexican workers.

The samples contained up to 9 percent petroleum, which constitutes a violation of Mexican hazardous materials laws, Merrilees said.

"This (amount of petroleum) is far above the regulatory limits for hazardous effluent," he said. "What this testing proves is that violations of the law are routine in Mexico and that it is U.S. companies that are violating those laws."

That much petroleum waste likely would kill bacteria that would digest sewage nutrients in the planned binational treatment plant, said Pete Silva, a former IBWC engineer who now is the assistant deputy director of the city of San Diego's Clean Water Program.

The treatment process could be repaired and restored in a week or so, Silva said, but the plant's operating costs would rise. Raw sewage also would have to be pumped into the ocean while repairs are made, perhaps repeatedly, which could taint the offshore marine environment.

Samples collected by the environmental group also contained the heavy metals chromium and copper, which can be hazardous to marine life and wildlife in the Tijuana River Estuary at high accumulations.

The group's spot checks don't prove that all sewage bound for the planned plant will contain this much oil-related pollution or how often the sewage may be polluted, Silva said.

Past studies have shown that surges of petroleum and other industrial wastes are periodically found in Tijuana sewage, he said, making it more difficult to treat than U.S. sewage and potentially damaging to conventional treatment technologies.

Al Rich, president of the 175-company Western Maquiladora Trade Association, said the group's tests do not prove that binational factories are responsible for the petroleum discharges.

"It is very easy to blame the maquiladoras, but we are not the only industrial operators in Mexico," said Rich.

Recent shutdowns of 21 polluting maquiladoras by the Mexican federal environment agency, SEDUE, shows the government is cracking down on industrial polluters in Mexico, he added.

SEDUE officials, however, have declined to confirm the shutdown at those 21 smaller plants.

A July 1 deadline has been set for all 600 foreign border plants in Tijuana to register with SEDUE and detail the wastes they generate and how they dispose of such effluent, Rich said.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the House Resolution 101, the Dorgan resolution that disapproves of fast-track negotiations.

All of us agree that certain benefits might be gained from freer trade with Mexico and other countries. The issue before us today is not whether the U.S. benefits from free trade, but at what expense will those benefits come.

Will the benefits be achieved without firm and written assurances that the trade agreements address some key concerns? Or will the benefits be achieved with only token congressional input?

It's no mystery where the administration stands on this point. President Bush would have Congress rubber stamp any settlement he negotiates.

It should be fundamental to the negotiation process that Congress play an active oversight role in the negotiations to ensure that certain criteria are met.

Make no mistake about it. If the House votes for fast-track authority with little or no accountability, then we will be back here only to have an up-or-down vote on the final agreement. Under the administration's procedure, you can guarantee that American jobs will be lost and that we will export our environmental problems.

That kind of congressional oversight of negotiations is unacceptable.

As the fast-track procedures stand, Congress has little assurance that the administration will address several important matters, like lower environmental standards, weak labor laws, and health concerns.

To a degree, it is hypocritical of the United States to set certain standards at home for the health and safety of workers and the environment, and then turn its back on these standards abroad, all for the expectation of cheaper imported goods. Indeed, trade negotiations is one of the few places where we have leverage with other countries to improve their standards.

President Bush did send Members of Congress a letter saying environmental and labor standards will not be diminished by free trade. But I for one am not satisfied that these concerns will be addressed by the administration in a manner acceptable to Congress.

I had hoped the House would reject the closed rule, which allows for the consideration of only two resolutions—approval or disapproval of fast track. Then the House could have taken up the amendment offered by Congressman LEVIN, which would have provided some real accountability to the negotiation process, requiring a mid-term review of the negotiations, a written economic impact analysis of the agreement, a progress report, and a report on the environmental consequences of the settlement.

Since the House did not reject the rule, I am forced to vote against granting the President

fast-track authority because Congress would be surrendering much-needed oversight and input into the trade negotiations.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the measure to disapprove fast-track negotiating authority.

I wish I could support fast track. I strongly support a North American Free-Trade Agreement in principle. A free-trade accord that brings down tariff and nontariff barriers could increase United States exports to Mexico over the long run and help make the United States more competitive on the world market.

A free-trade agreement would undoubtedly benefit Mexico—probably more than it will benefit the United States since Mexico's economy is proportionally so much smaller than ours. A free-trade agreement could lock in the economic and trade liberalization measures that the de la Madrid and Salinas administrations have initated. An agreement could also secure access by Mexico's exporters to the United States market. All this would greatly benefit Mexico's economy, there is no doubt.

But our first obligation is to the working men and women of the United States. And right now, I don't believe that the Bush administration is sufficiently committed to the welfare of American workers. It has not demonstrated a great deal of concern for those who have already been displaced by a declining defense budget, the recession, and foreign trade. For example, according to a report prepared by the staff of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade:

The President has proposed the elimination of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act, a program which provides training for workers dislocated by foreign competition.

The President has proposed severe reductions in the Community Service Employment for Older Americans Program

The President fought the $200 million in defense conversion assistance that was passed by Congress as part of the fiscal year 1991 Defense Authorization Act, and only agreed to release the money this week, 6 months into the fiscal year.

Even the program that Vice President QUAYLE helped to create, the Job Training Partnership Act [JPTA], is slated for sharp reductions. According to the Department of Labor, these cuts would mean that 224,000 fewer Americans would benefit from JPTA employment and training programs next year.

President Bush should put aside his fiscal year 1992 budget proposals and come forward with a proposal for specific and substantive worker adjustment assistance. A promise to address the issue at some later date after a free-trade agreement with Mexico has been signed is simply not enough. The President has stated that his administration is committed to working with the Congress to ensure that there is adequate assistance and effective retraining for dislocated workers. The President has told Congress that a Worker Adjustment Program could be addressed 9 months to a year from now, in legislation implementing a North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Congress could wait until the negotiations are over before addressing the issue and hope that the President's somewhat vague promise will translate to sufficient funding next year. But American workers deserve more than promises. A North American Free-Trade Agreement may bring substantial benefits to the United States as a whole. But, according to numerous studies reviewed in the subcommittee staff report, some Americans are bound to be hurt. We must take care of those workers. Congress should make a specific dollar commitment for specific worker adjustment programs a condition for granting fast-track negotiating authority.

With respect to labor standards and worker rights the President still does not recognize that Mexico's lower standards and lax enforcement threatens American workers and he will not make a commitment to help those negatively affected. The President fails to see that if these issues are not addressed in the negotiations on labor standards in Mexico could be used to exert a downward pressure on hard fought for United States labor standards. That pressure has already been seen in labor-management negotiations in which American companies have threatened to move to Mexico unless a lower wage or health and safety standards were accepted by the negotiating union.

Furthermore, labor standards and worker rights are directly linked to trade and competitiveness. There is no doubt that companies in the United States that must pay higher wages or incur the costs associated with health and safety standards will be at a competitive disadvantage against companies that are not similarly constrained in Mexico. Labor standards and worker rights must be incorporated into free-trade talks.

Regarding the environment. Americans have another reason to be worried about administration's intentions with respect to a North American Free-Trade Agreement. The President fails to see that the environment and trade are integrally related. But clearly, lower standards in Mexico permit companies based in Mexico to enjoy a competitive advantage over companies that must comply with stricter environmental standards in the United States.

Unless the environment is addressed in a comprehensive manner in a free-trade accord, the United States will either have to lower its standards or face the prospect of seeing companies move south to remain competitive. According to the GAO, American companies have already moved to Mexico to escape United States environmental laws.

Mr. Speaker, I do support a North American Free-Trade Agreement. But unless and until the President makes more concrete commitments to worker adjustment assistance, the environment and worker rights, I cannot support fast track.

Mr. LAROCCO. Mr. Speaker, the recent debate surrounding the approval of what has been dubbed fast-track authority for the negotiation of a United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement should serve as evidence to the American public that congressional business is not always partisan. This is not an issue of executive versus legislative, Conservative versus Liberal, or Republican versus Democrat. Instead we have been called to make a choice between growth and stagnation.

A great many misconceptions cloud the truths behind the fast-track concept. By itself, it is nothing more than a procedure for the legislative enactment of trade agreements.

As a part of the 1974 Trade Act, Congress imposed the fast-track rule upon itself to avoid the counterproductive delays which would inevitably arise were the House and Senate to involve themselves in the intricate details of negotiating trade agreements. The fast-track procedures operate to require a "yes-or-no" vote on a given agreement within 60 days, and with no amendments allowed.

The President's existing fast-track authority expired on March 1, and he is currently seeking a 2-year renewal. It should be understood that he is now requesting what has, for the last 16 years, been the norm for trade agreement negotiation. It is not a blank check by which Congress agrees in advance to anything the administration might propose. Rather it says that Congress will vote on any agreement as a package. Fast track is merely a legislative process, and not a negotiating end.

In the words of President John Kennedy, "Let us never negotiate out of fear; but let us never fear to negotiate." I am confident that with the assistance of the fast-track process, the United States in cooperation with Canada and Mexico, will be able to establish the largest free-trade market in the world.

With a total of over 360 million consumers and an output of $6 trillion, a North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] would enable this continent to truly compete. As the world begins to divide into three major trading zones: the Asian-Pacific region, the European Community, and the Americans, the time has come for us to match the success of the other two blocks. Estimates have shown that the increase in United States exports to Mexico between 1985 and 1989 has generated over 400,000 new jobs in the United States economy. United States-Mexican trade exceeded $58.6 billion in 1990—double the 1986 amount. clearly, the time has come for Congress to consider bringing the North American trade relations full circle.

A NAFTA would eliminate trade barriers and current inefficiencies with our first- and third-largest trading partners. It would also serve as the catalyst for unparalleled growth in world trade while giving the U.S. economy the jumpstart it so badly needs.

It should be understood that this Congress will closely scrutinize all such trade agreements. Mexico should be no different than Canada. I will not endorse any trade pact unless it thoroughly addresses the environmental, economic, labor, health, and safety concerns of all Americans. I will not allow the fast track to become a green light for circumventing the production standards which this Nation has worked so tirelessly to establish.

I intend to endorse legislation insuring that the United States and its trading partners can reduce, and ultimately, eliminate competitive disadvantages resulting from conflicting national labor standards and environmental regulations.

Without an all-or-nothing, up-or-down vote on issues of trade, free trade becomes much less negotiable. The progress to be gained from an open market gets lost in bureaucracy. The United States has already finalized the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]-Tokyo round, the Israeli FTA, and the

Canadian FTA under this procedure. It has worked.

Mexico, on the other hand, has warned us that it will not negotiate tariff reductions without the fast-track process. The United States would not negotiate a final trade agreement with another nation knowing that its provisions can then be freely amended by that Government. Thus, we have no right to expect such nations to negotiate with us under those same conditions.

Due in part to common misunderstandings about the trade negotiation process, many Idahoans are concerned that the fast-track process of opening U.S. borders to the global market will have a detrimental impact on our great State. I have met with members of Idaho's silver, sugar, dairy, electronic, and timber industries. I have raised their concerns in personal meetings with President Bush, U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills, and Ambassador Rufus Yerxa, America's representative to the Uruguay round of the GATT. And I am happy to say that I have received assurances that Idaho's interests will be protected.

According to President Bush, his administration is "committed to working with the Congress to ensure that there is adequate assistance and effective retraining for (any) dislocated workers." In this area, I trust the President.

Additionally, I am dedicated to assuring that America's environmental standards will be protected, in agreements with Mexico and beyond. In 1988, Mexico adopted a comprehensive environmental protection law, and the Mexican Government is now engaged in setting specific standards pursuant to that law. EPA Administrator William Reilly has described Mexico as the developing country with the best record in terms of environmental protection, and the Mexico's President Salinas is committed to doing more.

The National Wildlife Federation has conducted a thorough study of the impacts of a NAFTA. It concluded that, if approached correctly, such an agreement would help promote and enhance ecological protection beyond U.S. borders. If the Mexican Government is required to meet our environmental standards and enforcement mechanisms as a prerequisite for trade, the world as a whole would reap the benefits for a long time to come.

Although America's relationship to Mexico, Canada, and the GATT in general are important issues, they are not directly at hand. Today, we are here to discuss the process by which we will negotiate them in the future. The fast track is the right track. We need a free-trade agreement. Congress can and will have a say in such agreements, and the concerns of American workers will be voiced.

I strongly support the fast track to growth and oppose the side track to protectionism, isolationism, stagnation, and fear. The time has come for the United States to place trust in ourselves, trust in our neighbors, and trust in the future.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Dorgan resolution, but with great respect for my good friend from North Dakota and with many of the same reservations he has identified. I, too, am concerned about the impact of a Mexican Free-Trade Agreement on American workers. I, too, am skeptical about Mexico's ability to improve its environmental and labor standards. I, too, am concerned about the significant wage disparities existing between the United States and Mexico.

Where I think I differ with those who oppose fast track is that I believe fast-track authority is the beginning of the process, not the end. Congress will have input with the administration throughout the negotiations. We are not abdicating our role in fashioning trade agreements because we, the Congress, have the final say. After all the negotiations are completed and all the details are worked out, Congress, not the President or the administration, must approve the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I have never been one to shy away from criticizing the administration for coming up short on our Nation's domestic policy agenda. I continue to believe that the President and his administration lag behind in addressing the real needs of our country such as health care, education, and the Nation's infrastructure. Moreover, the Republican administrations of the past 10 years have also been lacking in their trade policy.

Why, then, should we give this President and this administration fast-track authority? First, I believe it is important to keep the negotiating process moving forward. Second, I believe that if the Free-Trade Agreement is negotiated the right way, it will be beneficial for both the United States and Mexico. I think the agreement can be negotiated so that it does not rob our workers of their jobs and their livelihoods, and in the long-term, actually creates more jobs and better opportunities for all Americans.

Third, President Bush has pledged to address many of the issues which I have concerns about. The President promised to include transition measures to phase in the reduction of tariffs and nontariff barriers to avoid dislocations in import sensitive industries. The President promised to include snap-back provisions in the agreement to reinstate import duties for unduly impacted industries. The President promised to maintain the United States health and safety standards for products imported from Mexico. The President promised to help in the formation of an environmental plan in Mexico that is consistent with our own. Finally, and most important for me, the President promised to support an adjustment assistance program for workers who are dislocated by implementing the Mexican Free Trade Agreement.

Will the President be true to his word or will his action plan simply turn into another retreat on one of his promises? I don't know. I do know, however, that these promises have been made, not just to the Congress, but also to American workers and businesses. I intend to see that they are kept.

I will vote to give the administration fast-track authority. But, I will not give the President a blank check. If he cashes in on the livelihoods of American workers and their families just to adhere to a free-trade notion that has no foundation in the real world, I will be among the first to bounce the trade agreement back to the White House and work to change or defeat it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Mexican Free-Trade Agreement can be a good foundation for promoting the United States economic interests in Mexico as well as throughout the world. With fast-track authority, President Bush will have an opportunity to enhance our economic competitiveness if he negotiates with American interests in mind.

This is a jobs issue. If done the right way, the Free-Trade Agreement can mean more jobs for Americans and Mexicans alike. I think it is important to give our country the opportunity to achieve this win-win scenario. I urge my colleagues to support fast-track authority and vote against the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Dorgan resolution, and in support of extending the President's authority to negotiate a free-trade agreement with Mexico and Canada.

If a free-trade pact is negotiated it would provide tremendous benefits to all three nations. A North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] would unite 360 million people into the world's largest market with a total output of $6 trillion. It would enable North America to compete successfully with Europe and Japan in all areas of world trade.

My hometown of San Diego and the State of California would benefit tremendously from such an agreement because Mexico is already the third largest market for California exports; in 1989 California exported $4.2 billion in goods to Mexico. A free-trade agreement would provide even greater opportunities for California businesses and markets for our products and services.

Why are exports important? Because exports mean economic health for American businesses and more jobs for American workers. For every $1 billion in goods we export 22,000 U.S. jobs are created. For many years we have been told of the dangers of running a trade deficit—importing more goods than we export. A free-trade agreement will enhance our ability to export and strengthen our economy.

Some opponents of free trade with Mexico argue that we will lose many jobs to our southern neighbor because of its lower wage rates. This argument does not stand up to inspection. Making trade more open increases economic opportunities for all nations involved. Some people felt that when we began free trade with the Caribbean nations in the 1980's, we would lose jobs and be flooded with cheap imports that would hurt American business. Instead, our trade balance with those nations soared from a deficit of over $200 million in 1986 to a surplus of $1.8 billion in 1990. During this period, the U.S. economy added over 8 million jobs, many of them fueled by trade with the Caribbean. Free trade has helped, not hurt our economy.

For San Diego, Mexico is our neighbor and our business partner. Our business relations are good and free trade will improve them. Currently, we remain rightly concerned about the problems of drug smuggling and illegal immigration. A free-trade agreement will help address the root causes of these problems in Mexico. It will enable more Mexicans to find good jobs at increasing wages in their own country. This will reduce the pressures causing them to seek work illegally in the United States. In addition, legitimate economic growth will lessen the incentive to turn to drug traffick-

ing for income. Finally, a trade agreement will not reduce our law enforcement efforts against drugs and illegal immigration. Border security will be maintained and I will continue to strive to improve our control of the border.

We can't solve our problems with Mexico by pretending it is not there. We must seek solutions that are good for both countries. A poor Mexico will be less likely to cooperate on drugs, immigration, or the environment. A richer, more stable Mexico will be able to work with us on these important issues.

On the question of negotiations, are we going too fast? Will we give the store away? No, it is important to point out that the United States is not giving anything away. We are preparing to begin negotiations, which could bring our Nation many benefits. In the so-called fast track negotiating process, Congress allows the President to conduct talks with Mexico and Canada to produce an agreement. Congress still has the final decision on any proposed pact. The process involves extensive congressional input and many Members of Congress have already made their views known to the President and these concerns will be taken into consideration during the negotiations. Finally, there is a 3-month review period before the agreement is signed. A free-trade agreement and the legislation to put it into effect will not occur without the approval of both Congress and the President. I will certainly not vote in favor of an agreement that is not good for San Diego and the Nation.

In sum, I believe it is in the best interest of the United States to begin negotiations for a free trade agreement with Mexico and Canada. Closer economic ties will create jobs and economic growth for the United States and its neighbors. Let's not miss a great opportunity for all the nations of North America. I urge the House to defeat the Dorgan resolution and allow the President to negotiate on this vital trade and foreign policy issue.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the complexity of the GATT and a NAFTA demands that this body retain its full constitutionally mandated authority.

When we talk about free trade, today, we are talking about more than bringing down the tariff barriers. We have added to the agenda a series of barriers known as nontariff trade barriers. These nontariff trade barriers include consumer health and safety standards—sanitary and phytosanitary standards—environmental protection legislation, buy-America provision, and minority set asides.

Under the GATT, the decision on how much carcinogenic pesticides, such as DDT and alar can be on the fruit and vegetables Americans eat will not be made in America or even by Americans. Rather, the decision will be made by a small bureaucracy in Rome, the codex alimentarius. And you can be sure that their standards will be based on the lowest common denominator.

Even legislation designed to protect our environment would be under fire. For instance, the Clean Air Act which this body labored on for decades would be challenged by these agreements. Our efforts to protect the last great stands of the Pacific Northwest forests and the spotted owl would be undermined. Even reforestation plans and local recycling programs would be open to challenge.

And we can forget about buy-America provisions and minority set asides now in Federal, State, and local law. Not even a local municipality in Pittsburgh could favor Pittsburgh Steel over Japanese steel.

What is going to be on the table in Mexico and in Geneva is our Federal, State, and local sovereignty. It is our very ability to legislate to protect ourselves and our environment.

A free trade agreement with Mexico, a country we share a border with, must address environmental concerns. Proponents of fast track argue that as Mexico becomes enriched by free trade, they will pay more attention to cleaning up their environment. Until then what? Must Mexico continue to become a toxic waste dump while it waits for the big free trade payoff. We are just coming to the realiziation that much of the enviromental damage we have done to our country is irreversible. Last week, a Wall Street Journal article reported that we are meeting with no success in cleaning up the 5,700 Superfund sites across this Nation, that these sites may be beyond our ability to clean up.

This Congress has a vital role in ensuring that a free trade agreement does adequately address the question of the environment. The reality is that shared borders mean shared pollution.

With so much at stake, it is small wonder that a whopping 72 percent of the American electorate join me in urging Congress to assume its constitutional responsibility and disapprove fast track—Source: Garin-Hart poll.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution by the gentleman from North Dakota disapproving the extension of fast-track procedures in the implementation of two pending fair trade agreements. Fast track is a quick fix for the administration. However, it is a blank check that is dangerous to the public. A trade agreement as unprecedented as the Mexican Free-Trade Agreement is likely to have unintended effects, whatever safeguards are inserted. The least that we can do is to utilize the traditional checks and balances, including congressional review to help account for these effects.

I am no enemy of free trade. Fast-track authority is a quite different matter, however. This body should not give up its right to thoroughly review a trade agreement, particularly one that is so unprecedented. In almost every important economic respect—from wage levels to regulatory mechanisms—there are vast differences between Mexico and the United States. A trade agreement between a developing country and a fully industrialized nation needs more—not less—oversight.

The President recognized the potential loss of American jobs and offered some aid, but the vagueness and inadequacy of his proposal is hardly reassuring. No country in the world but ours would expose its workers to such sacrifice without adequate and explicit recompense. Even if we assume that the Mexican Free-Trade Agreement would be beneficial to most of us, the burden of any sacrifice should not fall on a minority who would be hurt. A recent ITC report states that "unskilled workers in the United States would suffer a slight decline in real income." It is these "unskilled workers" who are the bulk of those experiencing decline in income now. They frequently are women and people of color. These workers are the ones who can least afford to suffer a slight decline in real income. And the slight decline in real income would most likely come in the form of lost jobs. I have seen no offsetting proposals that would make up for continued erosion among those least able to afford it.

Nor are the President's environmental promises in the least convincing. Enforcement is everything when it comes to the environment. We know this lesson in this country all too well, where despite our wealth as a nation, competing interests often disagree and enforcement is often weak. Where is the evidence that Mexico would in fact resist such forces and, despite its economic needs, make short-term economic decisions for long-term environmental gains? What recourse do we have if a sovereign nation does not live up to standards of environmental regulation enforcement we desire? What has the President offered that would keep United States businesses who want to escape environmental regulation from moving their companies to Mexico?

The irony is that Mexico and many of our other trading partners do not put their own agreements on a fast track. According to the Library of Congress, Japan, Canada, South Korea, Brazil, Switzerland, Venezuela—to name a few—all have laws which subject trade agreements to legislative approval and amendment. And many other countries *may* amend trade agreements in their legislatures. I would like to insert this information into the RECORD.

TOP U.S. TRADING MARKETS

| Country | Must trade agreements be approved by the legislature? | Legislatures may amend trade agreements |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Canada | Yes | Yes. |
| 2. Japan | Yes | Yes. |
| 3. Mexico | Yes | Yes. |
| 4. United Kingdom (EC) | No[1] | NA. |
| 5. Germany (EC) | No | NA. |
| 6. South Korea | Yes | Yes. |
| 7. France (EC) | No[1] | NA |
| 8. Netherlands (EC) | No[1] | NA. |
| 9. Taiwan[2] | No[3] | No. |
| 10. Belgium-Luxembourg (EC). | No[1] | NA. |
| 11. Australia | No[4] | No. |
| 12. Singapore | No | No. |
| 13. Italy (EC) | No | No. |
| 14. Hong Kong | No | No. |
| 15. Spain (EC) | No[1] | NA. |
| 16. Brazil | Yes | Yes. |
| 17. Switzerland | Yes | Yes |
| 18. China[2] | No[5] | No. |
| 19. Saudi Arabia | No | No. |
| 20. Malaysia | No | No. |
| 21. Sweden | No[6] | No. |
| 22. Israel | No[7] | No. |
| 23. Venezuela | Yes | Yes. |
| 24. U.S.S.R.[2] | No | No. |
| 25. Thailand | No[8] | No. |

[1] EEC Countries: EEC agreements with third countries on commercial matters are negotiated by the EC Commission, the executive institution of the EC, in consultation with a special committee appointed by the European Council of Ministers; the agreements are then concluded by decision of the Council [EEC Treaty, Art § 113 & 228]. There is no obligation to consult the European Parliament on commercial treaties, but, in practice, it has been agreed that the Commission will keep the Parliament informed with the progress of all international negotiations.

[2] Not a member of GATT.

[3] Taiwan: According to the Coordination Council for North American Affairs, Taiwan's office in the U.S., trade treaties would be considered executive actions and not sent to the legislative branch for action, unless they required changes in the law.

[4] Australia: Acceptance by Australia of the GATT and three protocols signed in 1948 was approved by Parliament under the International Trade Organization Act, 1948. Treaty making, however, is an executive act and the later amendments to GATT have become binding obligations without concurrence of the Australian Parliament [E. Cooper, Customs and Excise Law 69 (1984)].

[5] China: China's constitution states in article 67, § 14 that treaties and important agreements are decided on by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress. Other treaties are concluded solely by the agencies under the State Council, under article 89, § 89, § 9. The Law of the People's Republic of China on the procedure for the Conclusion of Treaties, Dec. 28, 1990, confirms this in art. 3. Its definition of "important" (contained in art. 7) does not specifically mention trade agreements.

[6] Sweden: If the subject matter of the agreement is within the power vested in the Government (Council of Ministers) or a specific government agency, the agreement does not need to be approved by the Parliament.

[7] Israel: Israel does not have any statutory provision requiring such approval. In a 1968 decision of the Supreme Court, C.A. 131/67 Kamiar V. State of Israel, 22(2) Piske Din [Decisions of the Supreme Court] 85 [in Hebrew] it was held that treaties do not have existing law or create obligations which are not capable of being enforced without legislation. Trade agreements by nature have such influence on internal legislation.

However, in practice, the government of Israel committed itself to submit treaties to the notice of the Parliament. See the 1984 amendment to the Rules of Procedure of the Government, Directives of the Attorney General 64,000 A. of August 1, 1984 in Prof. Ruth Lapidot, International law within the Israel legal system, 24(1) Israel Law Review 34 (1990).

[8] Thailand: Under the 1978 Constitution which was abrogated after a recent seizure of power. New constitution being drafted by interim national assembly.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for House Resolution 101, to disapprove the fast-track procedure.

Until very recently, I had been undecided on whether to support extending fast-track authority to the administration in connection with negotiations on a North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] and a new agreement under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]. In the past, I have strongly supported efforts to reduce trade barriers with our trading partners.

While I believe that negotiations with our trading partners should be allowed to go forward, I oppose conditioning these talks on a procedure that gives Congress one vote, up or down, on an entire trade package. Further, I am not willing to be bound by the short time allotted Congress in the fast-track procedure to consider the far-reaching effects these trade agreements will have on the American public.

I have serious misgivings about the potential harmful impact of a NAFTA and GATT agreement. I am concerned that a NAFTA could result in the relocation of American jobs to Mexico, a reduction in real income to American workers, and greater deterioration of health and environmental conditions on the Mexican-American border. I also worry that insufficient rules of origin will allow other countries to evade United States tariffs by channeling their goods to the United States through Mexico.

I am concerned as well about a GATT agreement which, if we are not careful, could risk the sovereignty of U.S. health and environmental laws. Under current GATT procedures, the validity of domestic health and environmental laws can be challenged by a foreign party before a body of international representatives. The United States has some of the strongest health and environmental laws in the world. We can expect other countries to challenge them because the products they want to sell to American consumers are deemed inferior or dangerous under U.S. law.

I fear that a number of U.S. laws could be weakened or dismantled under GATT procedures, including bans on pesticides, food additives, unapproved medical devices, unapproved drugs, as well as requirements for nutrition and warning labels.

On May 10, I sent a letter, cosigned by Representatives GEPHARDT, WYDEN, SIKORSKI, and MATSUI, seeking the U.S. Trade Representative's assurances that the sovereignty of U.S. health and environmental laws would be protected in trade negotiations.

Unfortunately, the response I received from the administration yesterday does not contain the assurances I believe are necessary to protect the integrity of U.S. health and environmental laws. A copy of our letter and the response will appear in the RECORD following these remarks.

Before the administration receives an extension of fast-track authority in connection with GATT and NAFTA talks, I believe Congress should have explicit guarantees in a number of crucial areas. These same concerns must be addressed in any agreement that the administration negotiates, or the agreement should be rejected by Congress.

First, current procedures for adjudicating unfair trade practice issues place the burden of proof on the country whose law is being challenged. In the case of health and safety laws, this procedural hurdle is unacceptable. Therefore, any trade agreement must provide for a presumption of the validity of health and safety laws. The burden of proving that the law is a trade barrier must rest with the country challenging the law. The letter from the U.S. Trade Representative does not contain adequate assurances with respect to this issue.

Second, the United States must stand ready to defend all our health and environmental laws against challenge by other countries. This may be difficult where the administration has opposed the laws in Congress, particularly where it has argued that those laws are not supported by a reasonable scientific basis, which apparently would be the standard upon which laws would be judged. The letter from the U.S. Trade Representative contains some helpful assurances on this issue, but there is no indication as to whether the administration has systematically reviewed U.S. laws to determine whether they will be upheld under the GATT standard.

Third, under the draft GATT agreement, labeling can be treated as a trade barrier. As long as labeling requirements apply with equal force to both foreign and domestic products, I do not believe that they should be subject to challenge. The U.S. Trade Representative's letter does not go far enough in ensuring that laws requiring health and safety warnings will be protected from challenge as long as they do not discriminate in this way. Indeed, it leaves open the possibility that the nutrition labeling requirements that Congress mandated last year could be open to challenge.

Fourth, the United States must be free to use its own techniques to measure the risk of hazardous substances. The draft GATT agreement appears to push the United States toward international risk assessment standards. I am very pleased that the U.S. Trade Representative's letter appears to contain adequate assurances on this point.

Fifth, the process under which challenges to U.S. laws occur must be open to public scrutiny and debate. The right of the American public to protection from health and environmental hazards should not be endangered by a closed process before an international body. The letter from the U.S. Trade Representative does not contain any assurances in this regard.

Finally, State and local laws, applied equally to national and international products, should be insulated from challenge. The U.S. Trade Representative's letter confirms that a GATT agreement could allow foreign governments to challenge laws enacted by States and localities. California's Proposition 65 requires warning labels on certain products that contain carcinogens. If required to comply with international trade agreements, States and localities could lose the right to protect the health of their residents.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the U.S. Trade Representative's efforts to meet my concerns. I do not believe we have been provided adequate assurances, however, that the United States will retain the right to preserve its democratically passed laws protecting the health and well-being of the American public.

By disapproving the fast-track procedure, Congress will have the opportunity to fully consider contentious issues at the conclusion of the administration's negotiating process. International agreements and treaties have been adopted in the past under our regular rules procedures. Congressional authority should not be waived now, when critically important outstanding issues remain unresolved.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, DC, May 10, 1991.*

Hon. Carla Hills,
*U.S. Trade Representative*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR AMBASSADOR HILLS: We are writing to express our serious concern regarding the impact the GATT trade agreement currently being negotiated could have on our domestic health and safety laws. There are several provisions that are apparently being considered, and in many cases promoted, by our negotiators that would have a serious detrimental effect on U.S. health and safety laws if adopted in the final agreement. With respect to each of the issues that is raised below, please state the Administration's position, and provide any concrete, written assurances that you can to address the concerns raised.

1. Under the draft language, health and safety laws (such as those banning pesticides, food additives, unapproved medical devices and unapproved drugs) are presumed not to be trade barriers so long as they meet international standards. However, if they are not consistent with international standards, then the country defending the law must bear the burden of supporting its law. In many instances, our laws are far stronger and more protective than the Codex and other international standards. In our view, any health and safety law that is stronger than international standards should be presumed to be valid, and the burden of proof of its invalidity should be on the country challenging it.

What assurances can you give us that the burden of proof will always be on the country challenging U.S. health and safety laws, even when the U.S. laws contain more stringent requirements than international standards?

2. The draft contains various standards that would be applied to determine the validity of a U.S. law challenged under GATT. The most common standard appears to be "scientific justification" or "reasonable scientific basis." However, there have been instances where the Administration has urged the repeal of laws on the ground that the laws have no scientific justification (the Delaney clause banning carcinogenic food and color additives is an example). In other cases, Congress may act where the Executive Branch has found no scientific justification

for banning a product (for example, there is currently a bill pending in the House which would ban silicon gel breast implants because of safety concerns).

We do not believe that any of the U.S. health and safety laws was designed to discriminate against international trade. Therefore, we would have serious objections to any agreement that allows another country to challenge U.S. health and safety laws.

Does the Administration regard the full range of U.S. health and environmental laws as being supported by a reasonable scientific basis? Will the Administration vigorously defend every such law against any international challenge?

What assurances can you provide us that U.S. health and safety laws will not be declared trade barriers under this standard?

3. The draft also appears to cover labeling of products. For example, requirements of the Nutrition Labeling and Education Act of 1990 might be subject to challenge. Health and safety warnings required by U.S. law could also be subject to challenge. In our view, labeling requirements that are applied equally to domestic and imported goods should never be treated as trade barriers.

What assurance can you give us that U.S. labeling laws will not be subject to challenge under GATT or the Mexico agreement?

4. In the draft agreement, there is considerable discussion of risk assessment techniques, and there is at least a suggestion that international standards could override the methods used by a particular country. Risk assessment is the method by which some federal agencies determine the risk of particular hazards. What assurance can you give us that the U.S. will be free to devise its own methods of measuring the risk of pesticides, food additives and other hazards?

5. We are also concerned about the procedures that would be used to determine whether a U.S. law is a trade barrier. Apparently, decisions regarding the validity of U.S. laws would be made by a panel selected by GATT. The proceedings are conducted in secret. If our government did not defend a law adopted by Congress, there would be no opportunity for Congress or any U.S. citizen to defend the law.

What assurances can you give us that the process for challenging U.S. laws will be open and fair?

6. The draft contains proposals to extend GATT to state and local laws. This would subject a huge, unknown number of additional laws to challenge. For example, California's Proposition 65 (which contains warning labels on certain products that contain carcinogens) could apparently be challenged on the ground that it is a trade barrier. In addition, the draft agreement contains language which would obligate the U.S. government to require states and localities to comply with GATT.

What assurances can you give us that GATT will not be extended to state and local laws?

We look forward to receiving your response before the House of Representatives votes on extending fast-track authority for the GATT negotiations.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.
ROBERT T. MATSUI.
HENRY A. WAXMAN.
RON WYDEN.
GERRY SIKORSKI.

U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE,
*Washington, DC, May 22, 1991.*

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
*House of Representatives Washington, DC*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WAXMAN: Thank you for the letter you and your colleagues sent to me regarding sanitary and phytosanitary issues. I am happy to respond to the six questions you posed which relate to the negotiations in the Working Group on Sanitary and Phytosanitary (S&P) Regulations and Barriers being conducted under the auspices of the Agricultural Negotiating Group (ANG).

Before addressing your questions, let me emphasize that the agreement being developed by the S&P Working Group is essential for allowing effective challenges to illegitimate measures in the area of food safety, animal health, and plant health. S&P measures are often misused as a means to bar entry of competitive agricultural products, block opportunities for market development, and register dissatisfaction over other, unrelated trade grievances. In the future, improved liberalization of agricultural markets could significantly increase incentives to misuse S&P measures. Countries could see health-related measures as a way to continue blocking imports when other means are no longer available. We need improved multilateral rules to prevent such abuse.

It is important to note that the current S&P text has *not* been accepted by any country, including the United States. However, it is the position of both the interagency group studying the S&P issue and the Administration that the S&P text reflects a successful implementation of the objectives of the Midterm Agreement and a suitable basis for a negotiation. At present, brackets remain on several important provisions, indicating that country positions continue to differ. Despite these outstanding issues, we believe that with adequate attention these areas of divergence can be narrowed and ultimately resolved to the satisfaction of the United States.

Turning now to the specific issues you raised, in the order posed:

1. The placement of the burden of proof in GATT challenges of health-related measures more stringent than international measures.

The current draft text is specific in protecting the right to take science-based measures necessary for the protection of human, animal or plant health, including, when appropriate, measures more stringent than international standards. The United States will *not* give up its sovereign right to determine the measures appropriate to protect health, safety, or environment.

It is important to note that in a GATT challenge under the proposed agreement, there would be no presumption against, or special burden on, the party maintaining measures more stringent than the international standard. The question in this context would be whether the measure is science-based. A GATT challenge is *not* to second-guess countries' scientific determinations, but only to ascertain whether the measures were based on scientific information that indicates a public health or environmental threat and were evaluated using recognized scientific approaches. This does not require absolute scientific certainty, or even consensus within the entire scientific community. Rather, it would require that there be trustworthy information—such as human epidemiological data, or medical histories—that supports the risk assessment.

2. Administration regard and support for the full range of U.S. health and environmental laws.

We have great confidence in the processes used to develop U.S. food safety laws and regulations. More specifically, we believe that our processes conform to the criteria of the S&P draft agreement, and we certainly stand ready to defend our laws and regulations in the event of a challenge by another GATT country. In fact, the United States has been in full compliance with its obligations under the Tokyo Round Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade which established disciplines to prevent standards-related barriers for a broad range of agricultural and industrial products. (Title IV of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 implemented those obligations under U.S. law.)

3. U.S. labeling laws under the GATT or a North American Free Trade Agreement.

The GATT S&P draft text covers labeling requirements which are "directly related to food safety." Therefore it is doubtful, for example, that nutritional labeling or other labeling of a general educational nature would be covered by an S&P agreement. Regarding food safety labeling, there would be no concern unless another country could reasonably claim that our requirements acted as an unjustified trade barrier, which seems unlikely. We do believe, however, that food safety labeling should be subject to the general disciplines of an S&P agreement, e.g., it should be science-based and nondiscriminatory regarding imports. Product labeling requirements are covered by the broad disciplines under the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade and again I note that we have been in full compliance with our international obligations. These disciplines should also be relevant to any agreement signed with Mexico, though it is difficult to determine what will be covered in the agreement as formal negotiations have yet to begin.

4. Continuance of national sovereignty in measuring risks to health.

The United States feels strongly that each country has the right to undertake its own risk assessment. The draft S&P agreement would not require any particular method of risk assessment to be used, but rather would call for a country's method to be science-based, transparent and consistently applied. We believe that the U.S. approach to risk assessment meets these criteria.

5. The openness and fairness of the GATT process for challenging health-related measures that impact agricultural trade.

Our view is that the only approach for adequately addressing the unjustified sanitary and phytosanitary trade barriers facing U.S. agricultural exports is the development of an effective GATT process in this area. However, as I noted above, we certainly are confident and ready to defend any U.S. law or regulation in the sanitary and phytosanitary area that might be challenged in GATT.

6. The extension of GATT rules to state and local laws.

The issue of a national government's degree of obligation in seeing that its subnational (state and local) governments are in compliance with the GATT is a complicated and difficult "horizontal" issue, i.e., it is important for all GATT rules and not just the sanitary and phytosanitary agreement. The U.S. position is that, in the event of a finding of subnational nonconformity with the GATT, the national government can only be expected to make "reasonable efforts" within its existing system to bring its subnational governments into compliance with the GATT. The sanitary and phytosanitary agreement clearly will allow states to adopt standards stricter than na-

tional standards as long as they comply with the provisions of the agreement, e.g., they are science-based, transparent, and nondiscriminatory. On the other hand, it is important to note that no GATT agreement, including a sanitary and phytosanitary agreement, can be effective if the measures of subnational jurisdictions cannot be subject to scrutiny according to GATT rules. The obligation to take such "reasonable measures" was embodied in the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade and implemented in our domestic legislation under the Trade Agreements Act of 1979.

Again, I thank you for taking the time to elaborate your concerns. I hope that we can continue to have a productive dialogue on these issues.

Sincerely,

CARLA A. HILLS.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution of the gentleman from North Dakota disapproving the extension of the so-called fast-track procedures for trade agreements.

IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Our Nation faces enormous challenges in the 1990's. The American economy, and particularly American agriculture, now operates in a global marketplace.

Our responsibility here in this Congress is to help our Nation adjust to the new international climate, not to ignore it.

We must help our Nation regain its competitive edge. We must set our economic and trade policies on a course that will lead to better jobs at better wages for all Americans who want them. And we must maintain and expand our position in export markets.

As a member and chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I know how important trade and growth in export markets are to the economic health of the U.S. agricultural sector.

Our Nation's farmers are the most productive in the world and have been for decades. They produce not only enough food for our Nation, but enough to export more farm products than any other country in the world. Production from roughly one-third of our Nation's cropland goes overseas.

American agriculture can compete with any other nation's farmers—if given a level playing field and access to foreign markets.

URUGUAY ROUND

That is what the Uruguay round of GATT talks is all about. Most American farmers and most agricultural organizations want to see our Government make progress in lowering trade-distorting subsidies and barriers used by other countries, as well as reducing the cost of our own farm programs.

Without progress in the Uruguay round, our Nation will likely spend more on agricultural export subsidies and pay more to American farmers to idle productive land.

Taxpayers don't want that to happen. And neither do most American farmers.

That is why I hope the Uruguay round can achieve its goals of creating a more fair and open trading environment for the nations of the world. That is why a majority of farm groups support fast track, including the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Nation's largest.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Speaker, I also want to speak briefly about the proposed North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Mexico is not a threat to the American economy or American workers or American farmers. The fact of the matter is that Mexico's gross domestic product—the measure of its economic output—is only about 4 percent of our own Nation's.

Some are concerned about the food producing capabilities of Mexico. But the fact is Mexico is mostly mountains and deserts. It has only seven-tenths of an acre of arable, food-producing land per person. The United States has nearly 2 acres per person. Mexico has 85 million consumers who live in a country that already cannot produce enough food for its population.

But what Mexico is, in fact, is an important export market for the United States, our third largest trading partner.

My colleagues should know that in 1989, Mexico ranked among the top 10 export markets for 36 States. For five of those States—Texas, Arizona, North Dakota, Missouri, and Kansas—10 percent or more of their exports went to Mexico in 1989.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is in our national interest to promote the economic, political, and social stability of our neighbor to the south.

A Mexico without a strong, vibrant economy cannot keep its people from illegally crossing the border.

A Mexico without economic growth will not have the resources to improve enforcement of its own environmental laws.

A Mexico without hope of a better tomorrow will lose its resolve to fight drug trafficking.

Worst of all, the tremendous progress made by Mexico in reforming its economy may fall by the wayside, and political and social instability will likely take its place—possibly right along our border.

That is why I support the President's desire to negotiate a mutually beneficial and complementary free-trade agreement between the United States and Mexico.

American agriculture and American consumers have a big stake in the United States-Mexico negotiations.

Last year, Mexico was our fourth largest market for United States farm products and our second biggest source of food imports.

Overall, American farmers stand to benefit from freer trade with Mexico, particularly with increased access to the Mexican consumer market.

Yes, there will be winners and losers. That is why a free-trade agreement must contain safeguards for American farmers, workers, and industries, as well as the Mexican counterparts, to ease the transition.

The administration's action plan requested by the majority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, and the distinguished chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee signifies a commitment from the President to address the legitimate concerns many have raised about a free-trade agreement with Mexico.

The President has pledged to provide for an adequate worker dislocation program. He has promised to press for a sufficient transition timeframe and safeguards in the area of tariffs. He has said he will insist on strict rules of origin for products.

And he has assured the American people that our Nation's vital environmental, health, and safety standards will be preserved in an agreement.

Mr. Speaker, this action plan must not just be a set of wishful or unfulfilled promises. It must be backed up by a commitment from the administration, working with the Congress, to fully realize its goals.

FAST TRACK AND CONGRESSIONAL POWERS

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with those who say fast track gives away congressional power.

The fast-track procedure, in fact, preserves congressional powers to regulate foreign commerce and promote the general welfare of our citizens.

Under fast track, we say that Congress must be consulted throughout the negotiation process. We as individual Members of Congress and within the appropriate committees have ample opportunities to influence the negotiating posture of the administration even before we vote on a final agreement.

There are some who think that if Congress extends fast track then any free-trade proposal or GATT agreement reached by the administration will become law automatically.

That is simply not true. I, for one, will oppose any trade agreement that unilaterally disarms the import safeguards needed by some segments of American agriculture.

I can assure American farmers and workers that this Congress will end the negotiations if it doesn't feel the President is keeping the best interests of the American people in mind during these negotiations.

Finally, Congress can vote down a final agreement if we're not satisfied with the final result.

I support the extension of fast track. But I reserve the right to oppose any final trade agreement presented to the Congress—be it from the Uruguay round or the proposed North American Free-Trade Agreement—that is not in the best interests of American agriculture or our Nation.

Today, let us extend the fast-track procedure so the administration can negotiate agreements and Congress can have the opportunity to vote.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of American farmers and the economic future of our Nation, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am casting my vote today against extension of fast-track authority for the United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement. I do this in part to protest the failure of the Bush administration to develop a domestic policy that will deal effectively with the economic problems of the working men and women in America.

I have no objection to attempting to negotiate a treaty with Mexico that would be good for America, but what is the hurry?

Let us instead put on a fast track solutions to America's domestic problems: declining wages and increasing taxes on the working families of America; better jobs; adequate unemployment compensation protections during

this serious recession, and keeping jobs at home.

Let's have a fast track for America. Let's be careful and cautious as we negotiate a trade agreement with Mexico.

I believe a hastily negotiated Mexican Free-Trade Agreement could hurt American workers, and believe me, working families in America are already hurting.

In the decade just past, working families in America saw their income, in real dollar terms, decline substantially while the income of the wealthy jumped. The income of the richest 1 percent of Americans grew by whopping 113 percent while the income of America's poorest declined by more than 10 percent.

As we enter the decade of the 1990's, more and more families are required to have both spouses in the workplace just to make ends meet. Single parent families have incredibly difficult times. Today, half the mothers with children under age one work outside the home. More than 80 percent of the women working in America are in their childbearing years. Most work because they have to, not because they want to.

I have talked to my constituents about this issue. Workers in Nebraska are very concerned about losing their jobs. I have talked to workers in the Fruehauf plant. They are afraid that once Mexico changes its laws and allows foreign corporations to own businesses on its soil, more American businesses will move south to take advantage of the incredibly low wages.

I have talked to workers at the Omaha AT&T plant. They tell me that some parts of their operation have already moved out of the country. They fear that more jobs will be lost to Mexico.

Nebraska farmers well remember the administration's promises when the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement was presented to the public. Administration officials promised that our negotiators would prevent Canadian farmers from flooding the United States market with grain after United States wheat producers were restricted under the trade agreement from selling wheat in Canada. Tens of millions of bushels of durum wheat flooded the U.S. market. U.S. durum wheat prices collapsed and U.S. wheat producers lost millions of dollars of income. What was done by the Bush administration? Nothing.

Nebraskans are skeptical that fast-track negotiations for a free trade agreement will help Americans. They say instead, let us go slowly.

Why don't we give fast-track consideration to the problems we face in America today? I call on the administration to put Americans first. We need better access to health care for the 37 million uninsured Americans. We need more affordable health care for everyone. We need health care the elderly can rely upon. We need jobs here at home. In short, we need to take care of our own here at home first.

The last 10 years have taken a toll on middle America. I believe our first priority should be to create economic opportunity for working men and women here at home. Let's put that issue on the fast track!

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, after much careful deliberation, I have decided to vote for the Dorgan resolution today.

I agree that we need a fair trade agreement with Europe and Mexico. I recognize that we will have to sacrifice some to make an agreement possible, but I am sure that given the right treaty, the long-term benefits to all will outweight these negatives.

What I object to is the process this House has imposed on itself and the likely result that process creates.

We are deciding more today than whether or not we will be able to amend a trade agreement negotiated by the administration. We have already decided by adopting the rule, that we cannot place any restrictions or limits on the process itself.

We were elected by our constituents to render our own judgment on these matters. Instead we are unilaterally surrendering that judgment by defeating this resolution. We, not the executive branch, have implicit authority in the constitution to regulate trade and obligate this Nation to international treaties.

Why should we hand our responsibility over to the executive branch? Can we expect the administration to negotiate a good deal for the environment, a good deal for American workers, and a good deal for agriculture when they know we aren't able to modify it? I'm not impressed with the administration's track record in any of these crucial areas.

Can we expect them to aggressively defend these values, when they know that we cannot separate the provisions affecting one country from those affecting another?

By defeating Dorgan today we surrender any ability to influence the results. We can have a trade agreement without surrendering our constitutional rights. Yes, I can still reserve my right to vote against the final product by supporting fast track. But, the reality is that this vote would be a futile gesture as we will be prevented from offering even a single amendment, in defense of our values and our constituents.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution and in support of continuing the President's authority to conduct trade negotiations under the fast-track mechanism.

The negotiation and implementation of trade agreements require special cooperation between the Congress and the administration.

By ensuring a vote of implementing legislation within a fixed time period—and by shielding this legislation from amendments—we allow our negotiators the latitude to secure the best deal possible.

The request for fast-track extension has been submitted primarily for the ongoing Uruguay round of the GATT negotiations and the North American Free-Trade Agreement, commonly referred to as the Mexican FTA.

Fears about the outcome of these negotiations should not cloud the debate about fast-track authorization. This debate is about process, not content. Without fast track, there won't be any process.

Mr. Speaker, I have had reservations in the past about this GATT round. I was concerned that agriculture would be traded off to secure agreements in other areas.

But I was in Brussels for these talks last December, and I can assure you that our negotiators did not blink in the face of pressure from the European Community, Japan, and Korea.

They are sticking to their guns, because no deal is better than a bad deal.

Because of our negotiators' resolve, our trade competitors have agreed to discuss specific binding commitments in each of the key areas of agricultural reform: market access, export subsidies, and internal supports.

We are finally making real progress. It would be foolish to walk away from that progress just when we are on the brink of achieving our goals.

Others have expressed concerns about the Mexican FTA, Mr. Speaker, and that's understandable. The agreement would encompass some 360 million people with almost $6 trillion in economic output each year.

That is an awesome market, and legitimate concerns have been raised about its impact on the economy. But those concerns can best be addressed in the agreement, not by stubbornly insisting that there not be an agreement.

If the negotiations for a Mexican free-trade agreement and a new GATT compact do not produce satisfactory proposals, then we just vote no. Fast track does not give the administration the keys to the store. It does not allow the administration to make law all on its own. All it does is give the administration the ability to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that Congress will retain the necessary oversight in the negotiating process, just as we were consulted on the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement.

After the President gives notice of his intent to sign an agreement, he will submit legislation, and we will have 60 to 90 days to hold hearings and conduct up to 20 hours of floor debate, then we vote.

Support for fast track is not an endorsement of any agreement, it is an endorsement of the principal of negotiating for an agreement. Support for fast track is a commitment to the principle that free trade is worth exploring.

I believe it is vital to the future of our economy and to American agriculture that we nurture the promise of truly free trade.

I urge my collegues to oppose the resolution, and I thank the Chair.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DORGAN]. The President has asked that the Congress extend fast-track procedures for any trade treaty he may negotiate between May 31, 1991, and June 1, 1993. Specifically, the President has stated he heeds the fast-track procedures in order to revive and conclude the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]; to negotiate a free-trade agreement with Mexico or a North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA] involving the United States, Mexico, and Canada; and to negotiate free trade agreements with other western hemisphere countries.

Implementation of any of these treaties will have a profound affect upon a wide range of domestic laws. Laws enacted to promote family farms, ensure adequate supplies of agricultural products at prices our citizens can afford, and to enhance the competitiveness of selected industries, and the security of the jobs of those employed in those industries, will un-

doubtedly be affected. A wide range of additional statutes, including laws enforcing health an safety standards, labor standards, and environmental standards may also be adversely impacted. For example, pursuant to the current GATT agreement, Mexico alleges that laws enacted by this body to protect marine mammals constitute an unfair restriction of trade. If such a charge prevails, laws enacted to protect porpoise and other mammals from tuna nets will be effectively repealed.

We are assured by opponents of House Resolution 101 that fast-track procedures fully protect congressional participation and prerogatives. In fact, all that is protected is the right of Members to vote up or down on the treaty implementing legislation as submitted by the administration. Though the implementing legislation is referred to appropriate committees of jurisdiction, the committees must report the bill within 45 days or it is automatically discharged; the full House must consider it within 15 days thereafter; and the implementing legislation may not be amended at any point.

To argue, as some have, that fast-track protects or even enhances the Congress' proper role in assessing and ratifying international agreements entered into by the President is preposterous. The whole purpose of fast-track is to limit the ability of Congress to work its will with regard to such agreements.

If we can agree to the obvious, that fast-track is a substantial limitation on the authority of Congress, we must then contend with the argument that fast-track is essential because without it other countries will not negotiate with us. In other words, because other countries find our Constitution to be confusing, cumbersome, and inconvenient, we must act to effectively alter the system of Government established in the Constitution by voluntarily limiting the role that the Founding Fathers established for the Congress. In the 16 years since fast-track was initiated, 92 international agreements have been negotiated. Eighty-nine of those agreements, covering subjects ranging from trade to taxes to arms control to environmental protection, have been implemented by the Congress pursuant to normal procedures. Only three agreements have been approved under fast-track procedures. Fast-track may be convenient to the President of the United States, but it is by no means essential to his ability to negotiate international agreements.

The argument that fast-track procedures are essential to the negotiation of a free-trade agreement with Mexico is especially specious. Many contend that such an agreement will have disastrous consequences for our economy. Even the proponents of such a treaty acknowledge that at best the gains to the U.S. economy would, in the words of the Ways and Means Committee, be modest. It should be recognized by both proponents and opponents that such an aggreement offers far more potential benefits to Mexico than it does to the Untied States. It is ridiculous to contend that Mexico would refuse to even negotiate a free-trade agreement unless the Congress agrees to give up its authority to consider and amend the legislation implementing such an agreement.

Particularly with regard to a free-trade agreement with Mexico, there are good and sufficient reasons to ensure that the Congress maintain all its prerogatives. All agree that such an agreement will result in some job loss in this country. Serious concerns have been raised as to whether this country will meet its obligations to those workers who are dislocated. The administration acknowledges such an obligation and assures us they will include adequate dislocation assistance. In fact, according to the Ways and Means report, a dislocation assistance program will be incorporated in the free-trade agreement itself.

If ever there was a gift horse that deserved to have its mouth examined this is it. If we are to judge the adminstration's promises by its past performance, there is every reason to be extremely concerned. The same administration that is promising to enhance dislocation assistance, and to do so in a vehicle that is immune from amendment, is currently seeking to repeal the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. Our current Unemployment Insurance Program has and continues to deteriorate. It is estimated that the Unemployment Insurance Program offers 33 percent less income today than it did in the 35 years prior to 1980, when George Bush was first elected to national office. Only 4 in 10 workers even receives unemployment benefits today. This is the commitment that this President has demonstrated to dislocation assistance. And now we are asked to go ahead and export jobs because we can depend on the President to look out for dislocated workers. Further, we are being asked to give the President carte blanche authority to design the dislocation assistance program, surrendering even our ability to amend it.

Similar concerns have been raised with regard to environmental concerns, safety and health, child labor, and workers rights. In each instance, based upon the administration's record to date, there is sufficient reason for this Congress to question the commitment of the administration and to protect its discretion.

The potential damage of a poorly drafted free-trade agreement to the economy of this country is difficult to overstate. A free-trade agreement with Mexico does not simply invite American manufacturers to move south of our borders, it practically renders it an economic necessity. More than 50 percent of the Mexican workforce earns less than $6 a day. Let me reiterate, more than half of all Mexican workers earn less in a day than an American minimum wage worker earns in 2 hours. Proponents of the treaty contend that this gigantic incentive to reduce labor costs does not really exist because Mexican workers are not as productive as American workers. What they fail to account for is the enhanced productivity that new facilities will provide. A free trade agreement with Mexico will result in substantial job loss in the United States. In the view of this Member, any such treaty deserves careful, detailed, deliberate consideration from a wide variety of perspectives. Regardless of how one may feel about fast track with regard to GATT, approving fast-track procedures for a Mexican free trade agreement is not simply unnecessary, it is irresponsible. I urge adoption of H. Res. 101.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Dorgan resolution. Achieving genuine progress in reducing world trade barriers is too important an objective to risk jeapordizing a hard-won agreement by congressional amendment.

Trade barriers have a significant impact on the everyday lives of Americans in terms of the cost of protectionism to consumers. It is estimated that trade barriers cost consumers $80 billion in 1988. A more recent study by the President's Council of Economic Advisors revealed that reducing global trade barriers by one third would add $1.1 trillion to the United States cumulative GNP over the next 10 years—the equivalent of a $17,000 check for each family in the United States.

Clearly it is in our collective best interest to continue working toward free trade. Much of our economic growth in recent years has been driven by exports and it is anticipated that future growth will also be heavily dependent on increasing the level of our exports. In 1990 alone export expansion accounted for 84 percent of GNP growth.

Today Congress will vote on what is sure to be our most important contribution to free trade during this session of Congress—whether to grant the President's request to extend the fast-track negotiating authority.

Fast track is a mechanism created by Congress in 1974 to give the administration greater latitude in negotiating trade pacts with other countries. Under fast-track authority, Congress foregoes its right to amend a trade agreement, limiting itself to either supporting the agreement or voting it down and sending negotiators back to the table. Fast-track authority is considered essential to achieving substantive progress toward free trade—most countries will not enter into good faith negotiations if they face the prospect of the agreement unraveling when it is sent to Congress.

The current fast-track authority, granted in 1989, expires on June 1 of this year. President Bush has requested a 2-year extension of fast-track, which would give the administration the opportunity to successfully complete the Uruguay round of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] and initiate negotiations on a free-trade agreement [FTA] with Mexico.

The 2½ months between the President's request for extending fast-track and Congress' vote were laden with debates, hearings and studies. Most of the debate focused in the details of what might be included in a free trade agreement with Mexico, rather than the merits of fast track authority and Congress' role in trade negotiations, however.

While the concerns raised about the potential impact of a free trade agreement are important, the fundamental question before us was the role of Congress in trade negotiations. Congress certainly has a vital role to play in providing guidance during negotiations and voting on the implementing legislation. But I do not believe Congress should have the opportunity to amend an agreement carefully crafted and agreed to by other sovereign nations. It is important that Congress retains, and exercises when necessary, our right to reject an agreement and order further negotiations, but I do not believe we will make any substantive progress toward reducing trade barriers if we allow the 535 arm chair quarterbacks in Congress to amend a multilateral agreement they did not negotiate.

Granting the President's request to extend the fast track will send an important signal to our trading partners that the Congress has full faith in the ability of the administration to negotiate a trade agreement which will promote and secure the best interests of the United States, thus enabling the U.S. Trade Representative to negotiate from a position of strength.

The benefits to the United States and the world economy from lower trade barriers is substantial. Market access is especially important for the United States, as increased access would enhance our exports, which in turn would lower our trade deficit and help pull us out of the current recession. Illinois ranks sixth in the number of jobs directly related to export industries and would thus significantly benefit from the growth in exports which would be generated through lower trade barriers.

Obviously, successful completion of the two trade agreements covered by this extension of the fast track are vital to spurring economic growth. Most Members of Congress are generally supportive of extending the fast track for GATT negotiations, in which 107 nations are taking part.

The Uruguay round is attempting to improve market access by lowering tariffs and other trade barriers. Negotiators are also hoping to bring standards for investment and intellectual property into greater harmony, lower agricultural subsidies and set up rules governing dispute settlement and dumping practices. Clearly the United States has a great deal to gain by successful completion of the round—and a great deal to lose if it fails. Extension of the fast-track authority is essential to completing the round as the Europeans and Japanese, fearing an increasing protectionist sentiment in Congress, have threatened to pull out if the extension is denied.

Extending fast track for the potential free trade agreement with Mexico is more controversial. Legitimate concerns were raised about wage differentials, potential loss of American jobs, differences in environmental standards, and the potential of back door access to U.S. markets by third countries. All of these concerns have been discussed at length by Congress and on May 1, the President submitted an action plan to Congress to outline his intentions for addressing these issues.

Studies have shown the overall employment impact of a United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement would be a small net increase. While displacement is anticipated in some sectors, the administration has agreed to negotiate significant transition periods for those industries which may be adversely affected. The administration is also going to work with Congress to provide trade adjustment assistance for workers who are displaced by the agreement.

With regard to environmental concerns, the administration has pledged to retain the right to exclude any products which do not meet United States health and safety standards and work with the Mexican Government to promote better enforcement of environmental laws. In negotiations concurrent to those on the free trade agreement, the administration also plans to design and implement a border environmental plan addressing air and water pollution, hazardous wastes, chemical spills, and pesticides.

Illinois ranks sixth in the Nation in terms of the value of exports to Mexico. In 1990 Illinois exported 15.7 billion dollars' worth of goods to Mexico, an increase of 13.2 billion dollars over the previous year. Clearly Illinois would benefit substantially from a free-trade agreement with Mexico and extending the fast-track authority is necessary to achieve a solid agreement.

I believe we must explore the possibilities of free trade if we are ever to reap its benefits. I plan to keep a close eye on the issues raised as negotiations proceed and will reserve judgment on the final agreements until they are presented to Congress. Free trade is critical to our Nation's economic strength and security and I have confidence in the ability of President Bush's negotiating team to develop an excellet free trade ageement.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, today, we are debating a proposal to change Federal policy by not extending fast-track authority, which allows the administration to negotiate international trade agreements with the reasonable assurance that Congress will not attempt to make piecemeal changes after the completion of negotiations.

This change that would, in effect, undercut our negotiators' ability to hammer out an agreement by saying to other nations that we reserve the right to change the rules in the middle of the game, if Congress does not like the outcome.

This is not a vote for any specific trade agreement. Although several are currently under negotiation, none have reached the stage where a vote would be appropriate.

Under the fast-track authority, negotiated agreements will be submitted to Congress at the appropriate time and we reserve the right to reject the agreement at that time.

The President has pledged to address concerns regarding the environment and employment issues by issuing a detailed action plan.

We must move forward, recognizing the changing nature of the economy on a worldwide scale.

Like it or not, we live today in a world economic system, and we must view our actions today in that light. As Americans, we understand how free enterprise competition works—because we invented it.

Our current national economic situation is not caused by any failure in American free enterprise capitalism. It is a measure of increased worldwide competition. After World War II, when most of the world's industrialized nations lay in ruins, the United States had free reign, and we were the one and only kid on the block.

Today, we are still first among equals. Our dollar still sets the standard among currencies and our ability to develop innovative goods and services is still the best.

But as we look toward the 21st century, we cannot be complacent. We also cannot afford to measure our actions today based on our experience at an earlier time when we had no real competition from other nations.

When we look at the way our domestic economy developed, we see patterns of behavior that help to explain why we need to preserve the President's fast-track authority.

Most major industries in this country began as regional companies with specialized products and grew to become diversified companies with national markets. In today's economy, we have taken the next step, with international companies that specialize in interrelated products and services.

When our Nation was found 215 years ago, a debate began which continues to this day. It is a basic question for all large nations: What are the powers of the States and what are the powers of the Federal Government? Most of the upheaval in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and elsewhere is a fight over this basic question.

We resolved many of the differences among our States with the interstate commerce clause, which essentially gives the Federal Government what could be called a fast-track authority over the movement of goods and services.

Our world economy poses new and different challenges, however, and we must take a new approach to the question of international commerce—a regional approach.

When President Reagan negotiated a fast-track trade agreement with Canada, he announced his intentions to create a hemispheric trade agreement. This regional alliance is specifically designed as a counter-weight to the European Economic Community and the Pacific Rim nations, our major regional competitors.

In order to see the importance of this regional approach, all you have to do is look at our current trade patterns.

In the State of New Jersey, our No. 1 export trading partner is Canada, which purchased $1.2 billion in goods and services from State businesses during 1989. Fifth on that list is Mexico, with $391 million in purchases from New Jersey.

It is significant that European nations are 3d, 4th, 6th, 7th, 9th, and 10th in terms of the purchase of State goods and services. Japan is No. 2 and South Korea is No. 8.

As the world economy continues to regionalize, we will need to pool our resources as a hemisphere to be successful in the New World economy.

Many of these changes have already occurred. We cannot turn back the clock. What we can do—and must do—is to prepare for the future now.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 101, which would disapprove President Bush's request for a 2-year extension of fast-track trade negotiating authority.

President Bush currently is negotiating three major trade agreements: The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]; the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative; and the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. The Bush administration's major focus is a free trade agreement with Mexico, which would complete the NAFTA. Those negotiations will end if the President's fast-track authority is revoked.

I have not made any decision about liberalizing trade with Mexico. I will examine carefully any agreement which President Bush brings back to the Congress. I will not support an unfair agreement.

But I believe there are tremendous potential benefits to a free trade agreement between the United States and Mexico, and that is why I want to allow President Bush to continue the negotiations.

The Department of Commerce estimates that since Mexico entered the GATT negotiations in 1986 and reduced their top tariffs from 100 percent to 20 percent, almost 264,000 jobs have been created in the United States as a result of increased exports to Mexico.

Per person, Mexicans spend more on imports from the United States each year than do people in the European Community—$350 per person versus $266. Seventy cents out of every dollar Mexico spends on imports is spent on United States goods.

A Mexican free trade agreement also would eliminate Mexican barriers which hamper significantly United States exports. Mexico requires 36 percent local content in autos manufactured in-country. Mexico forces auto companies to export auto products worth 2½ times the assembled vehicles they are allowed to import for sale in Mexico.

A Mexican free trade agreement holds great promise for my home State of Kansas. Kansas exported $187 million worth of goods to Mexico in 1990, which translates to about 3,800 jobs for Kansans. Mexico ranks third among the 150 export markets for Kansas, and purchases 11 percent of Kansas exports.

We cannot deny President Bush the authority to at least pursue an agreement. I urge my colleagues to vote against House Resolution 101.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, following this debate as I have over the past several months, it seems to me that supporters of this resolution are primarily concerned with two apsects of a free trade agreement.

First, there's fear over the reduction of various barriers between Mexico and the United States and how that will translate into a flight of jobs and capital from our country to our southern neighbor.

And, second, there's concern that the agreement itself will not adequately address the difference between the United States and Mexico regarding conditions of environmental and labor standards.

In other words, if you're afraid of Mexico—if you don't want to see our neighbor become strong but would rather do what you can to sustain conditions of poverty and squalor—you'll support this resolution which rejects an historic opening of Mexico to North America.

Or, if you're afraid of letting the administration negotiate the details of the agreement—if you feel it's time to abandon the strategy of congressional-executive partnership for trade negotiations established by President Franklin Roosevelt 57 years ago—then you'll support this resolution which strips the President of trade negotiating authority.

But, you'll be making a big mistake. Those of you who are concerned about issues such as drugs, immigration, environment, and labor conditions must realize that the best way to address these problems is to give the Mexican economy a working vehicle for growth. More resources in that country will translate into a cleaner and healthier environment, higher wages and improved working conditions, improved infrastructure, and less corruption.

And those changes will be good for us, not bad. Mexico's growth means more money, more markets, more consumers for United States goods. It will increase sales opportunities for U.S. firms, increase real income in the United States, create jobs, and spur growth here as well.

But we, in Congress, are not able to negotiate that sort of a deal. We cannot stick to our word, we don't know the meaning of final offer, and we have an even worse conception of sticking to deadlines. If the administration doesn't negotiate this deal, it won't be negotiated, period.

I believe fast track is essential. Vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am intensely opposed to giving fast-track authority to the President of the United States on agreeing to a free trade agreement with Mexico, and for very good reasons.

The main reason is obvious: The Congress, under a fast track, would have no opportunity to amend a negotiated agreement on trade with Mexico, no matter what effect, particularly adverse effects, it might have on jobs for workers in the United States displaced by unfair and foreign competition. Worker displacement, in this regard, could come about, and very probably will come about, either because countless numbers of Mexican nationals will come across our borders and compete for available jobs here, agreeing to accept lower wages, or by business and industry moving factories and plants out of the United States to Mexico, again where starvation wages are paid and cheap labor abounds.

Agreeing to giving the President a blank check for negotiating future trade policies with Mexico, without any congressional oversight or amendatory authority is ludicrous on its face when you consider that once we are forced to vote the agreement up or down, the Mexican Legislature must vote to approve it, and the Mexican Legislature may amend such trade agreement.

The Congress of the United States is not allowed to amend trade agreements entered into with Mexico, but Mexico's Legislature can amend. That, Mr. Chairman, is frightening.

I wasn't a Member of Congress in 1974, when President Nixon, another President who loved and excelled in foreign policy matters, was allowed to slip in the now well-known fast-track authority. But then Nixon was into empire building, whether it fostered a strong economy in the United States or not. I know that President Bush has gone on the record with a statement to the effect that he was "more comfortable" with foreign policy matters than domestic ones, but I didn't know he had gotten into the Nixon mindset of empire building, with no thought given to its long-term effect on the people here at home.

Thanks to research done by my esteemed and gracious colleague, Representative JILL LONG of Indiana, I have learned that not only does Mexico's Legislature have the right and opportunity to amend trade agreements with the United States, but so does Canada, Japan, South Korea, Brazil, Switzerland, and Venezuela. My, my.

Mr. Chairman, I would not sacrifice even one job in these United States for the sake of a free trade agreement with Mexico. Not one.

West Virginia's current unemployment rate is 8.3 percent, an increase of 1.7 percent over last year's rate—compared with 5.5 percent as a national unemployment rate.

The President has promised that if a loss of jobs occurs as a result of any trade agreement he negotiates, and in exchange for a congressional rubberstamp of approval, he will strongly support training and retraining programs for displaced workers here. Ha.

I am not in the least disposed to trust the President to keep that promise—not after viewing his recommendation in this year's budget to zero out the trade adjustment assistance compensation program, already in law for workers displaced due to foreign competition.

I am not disposed to trust the President who threatened to veto the Clean Air Act if the Byrd amendment stayed in, an amendment which provided for just compensation for coal miners who would suffer huge job losses as a result of the act's acid rain provisions. Let no one forget that the acid rain provisions were at the behest of Canada, our most recent free traders.

I assure you they did not care about displacing coal miners in the United States. And speaking of Canada and free trade agreements, Canada has twice challenged its 2-year-old trade agreement with the United States. They won the first, and the second is still pending in our Federal court of appeals.

Let me tell my colleagues what the first Canadian challenge was. It was a challenge to our policy of requiring food products shipped into the United States to be free of contaminants such as feces and metal shavings, among other contaminants. When Canadian officials sought to ship pork products into the United States, our Government advised Canada that we would be inspecting truckloads of meat products for cleanliness, Canada said sanitary inspections were a violation of the trade agreement. They won, and now the United States can only inspect one out of every 15 truckloads of pork products, but only after notifying Canadian officials which one of the trucks will be stopped and inspected.

Tell me Mr. Speaker, if you were Canada, wouldn't you make sure that the one truck to be inspected was clean as a baby's breath, while the other 14-truck caravan continued on its merry way across United States borders with food filled with feces and metal shavings? I know I would.

The second Canadian challenge is based on whether Canada can manufacture and ship into the United States asbestos and asbestos products that are banned from manufacture and use in the United States because of its cancer-causing effects on the general public. That free trade challenge is pending in the Federal court of appeals. Wonder who's going to win that one?

Let us talk for a minute about labor laws. There aren't any in Mexico that I've been able to find that provides either decent wages or decent working conditions. But the worst part about the laxity in Mexico's labor laws is that they take babies out of the schoolroom and put them to work—for long hours and pennies for wages under deplorable conditions—deplorable enough when it comes to adult workers—God help little children.

Last year, as a result of a Department of Labor effort to look at a lack of compliance by American business and industry with child labor laws, American business and industry now find themselves being fined or otherwise penalized due to those violations.

A further result of those violations is that Congress now has legislation pending to further strengthen child labor laws in the United States—where such laws are already the most rigorous in the world. Yet we are perfectly willing to enter into a trade agreement with Mexico where children are exploited every minute of the day and no one turns a hair. No one is outraged. No one appears to care.

In the United States we have a new Clean Air Act—to help make America environmentally sound—which as I have stated resulted in the displacement of American coal miners because Canada demanded antiacid rain laws—and we are about to enter into a free-trade agreement with a country—Mexico—where the environmental standards are a joke, and suffer additional worker displacement.

Let us talk for another minute, Mr. Chairman, about buy American.

I am advised that Carla Hills, the U.S. Representative for Trade, has clearly stated that mandatory buy American laws, policies, statutes—wherever they exist in whatever form—at the Federal level, or even within State agreements, will be illegal under the GATT proposal.

We are about to put billions of dollars into rebuilding America's infrastructure, its highways and bridges and byways. We may even consider another tax on gasoline in order to find it—another tax burden on Americans—and yet we will not be able to guarantee the buy American provisions in the Surface Transportation Act under the Mexico Free-Trade Agreement. We who serve on the Transportation Committee are aware that the administration already wants to weaken the buy American mandate under the statute by providing so-called waivers under certain conditions—something I personally will oppose doing in the reauthorization of the highway bill this year. But under a free-trade agreement with Mexico, we will be foridden, prohibited, denied a mandated policy of buy American.

To make all existing buy American laws illegal for purposes of free trade agreements is un-American in the extreme.

Mr. Speaker, the reasons why Congress must have the right to amend any Mexico Free-Trade Agreement are many. Here today I have mentioned: First job loss; second, environmental/food safety/health laws; third, labor laws, especially child labor laws; fourth, by American mandates; and fifth, the fact that other countries with which we have agreements require their own legislatures to approve such agreements with us, and which also have the right to amend such agreements.

There are probably dozens of other reasons not mentioned in my remarks, but which will be covered by others in this body today, for not agreeing to a fast-track authority with no opportunity to amend.

Of all the ones I have mentioned, the loss of American jobs for Americans is my gravest concern. I mentioned that West Virginia's unemployment rate is higher, and has been higher, than the national average for over a decade. West Virginia has never made a full economic recovery from previous recessions, from a decade of draconian cuts in Federal assistance to the States, and the adverse effects of Reagan supply-side economics. At least not to the extent that a majority of States have.

Our coal mining unemployment situation was exacerbated last year under the Clean Air Act amendments.

In the last year, 900 manufacturing jobs have been lost in West Virginia.

In the construction industry alone, West Virginia's unemployment rate is at 18.8 percent, compared with the national rate of only 11 percent.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me just warn my colleagues that when the GATT agreement comes back to Congress, it is estimated that it will be comprised of approximately 4,400 pages. Not only can't we amend it, it will take years and dozens of people reading it, hopefully with law degrees, before Congress will know about all the legal traps that may be contained in it. It will probably spawn a whole new generation of consulting firms, established just to analyze and advise those who have to deal with it in order to do business in and with Mexico—and especially given the Mexican court system of delay and obstruction when it comes to compensatory and punitive judgements against them. But that's another story—and one that will have to play itself out. It will cost exhorbitant amounts of money and jobs—before the leadership of this country will get the message. By then, it may be too late.

How much better it would be to give outselves the chance of successful negotiation of future business and trade contracts, in a businesslike manner, by making sure the final version if the free-trade agreement doesn't contain those pitfalls, those legal traps, from which we may never be able to extricate outselves once this body gives its rubber stamp approval.

Pretty soon—just a few more instances of the legislative branch handing over its duty and responsibilities to the executive branch—and Congress can just go home. No one will need us. The President can reign supreme in all things, dictating the terms of American policy however it suits him. There is a name for that though. It is called a dictatorship, defined as "the absence of the exercise of the free will of the people"—the people we were elected to represent—the reason Congress exists, the people we are failing here today.

I support the Dorgan amendment disapproving a fast-track authority for the free-trade agreement with Mexico, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to rise in support of House Resolution 101 to deny fast-track authorization for the United States-Mexico free-trade negotiations and the continuation of the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT].

The disapproval resolution sponsored by my esteemed colleague, Representative BYRON DORGAN, is a clear statement for the working men and women of this country that the people retain the ultimate power to decide their own economic fate through this duly elected Congress.

It is the Congress that is charged with the responsibility to establish trade policy, and this obligation is explicit, without exception, in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution:

> The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with other nations.

There are no qualifications here. There are no extenuations. The intent is clearly stated and should be clearly understood. This is a matter of separation and balance of power. The participation and assent of Congress in this, or any other trade negotiation, is an essential element of the democratic process.

In our present circumstances of a new world economy, the potential for unalterable damage to our own job market, our environment, our domestic industries and agriculture, is much too enormous for Congress to confer to anyone but itself.

Multilaterial trade agreements can be negotiated without fast track. Since 1960, 25 such agreements have been ratified by the Members of Congress under normal procedures. There is no reason, I believe, why this treaty should be handled any differently, unless for the convenience and motivation of an administration engulfed in its own political dogma of everything for big business and nothing for the little people of America.

Mr. Speaker, I find it curious that the administration would seek fast-track authority to have the bargaining power and leverage to negotiate the best possible agreement with our trading partners. The nations we deal with in the European Community, however, even now involved in the Uruguay round negotiations, do not themselves give any such prerogatives to their own negotiators.

Clearly these nations have reserved to themselves any concessions or judgments on the negotiating process and the particulars of its outcome. This is no disadvantage to them, and should not be perceived in any such way by our own representatives to GATT or the United States-Mexico talks.

On another level altogether, the credibility of the administration to adhere to the intent and terms of Congress' wishes in an international trade agreement is sorrowfully suspect. One need only recall the many instances of subsidized foreign imports that chip away at our own American producers' market share. Particularly menacing is the administration's proclivity to allow the agricultural exports of too many other nations to access our home markets to the detriment of America's own farmers, laborers, and blue-collar workers.

The sugar industry in Hawaii is especially vulnerable to the perfidy of special and differential GATT concessions, unenforced dumping and flooding protections, and other broken promises to the environment, the animals and sea life, the consumer, the working American.

The sugar support program costs the Treasury not a penny while safeguarding our domestic industry from the pillage of heavily subsidized foreign sugar producers. Cutting price supports by a fixed percentage as offered in GATT's "Hellstrom Proposal" will do nothing for the relative inequity inherent in the world sugar market.

Mr. Speaker, my sugar industry, like the dairy, cotton, peanut, wheat, barley, oat, and too many other industries, have little faith that

their concerns will be looked after in an up-or-down fast-track vote. The real track record is all too obvious that this administration has a trade agenda far removed from the best interests of the workers most vulnerable to job losses, displacement, or injury from a short-sighted trade policy.

The choice is clear, Mr. Speaker, the Congress can abdicate or be steadfast in its commitment to its constitutional responsibilities. I urge every Member sworn to uphold that Constitution to act accordingly and disapprove fast-track authority by voting for House Resolution 101, the Dorgan resolution.

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 101, and in favor of extension of fast-track negotiating authority.

I have long supported a North American Free Trade Agreement. Given the creation of the protectionist bloc known as "EC '92," and the need for the United States to leverage that bloc, completion of a North American FTA is now more important than ever. Fast track paves the road for such an FTA.

However, my deep disappointment over the hapless Uruguay round of GATT trade negotiations prevents me from supporting fast track without some reservation. The fact that fast track extension would allow the GATT to stumble along hopelessly for another 2 years causes me great distress. And, the fact that this plays into the European Community's effort to insulate itself from foreign competition concerns me even more.

As the GATT process marches on, the EC's negotiating position will only become strengthened. Lest we forget that most of the Community's attention is still focused on the conclusion of EC '92, and the increased leverage over its trading partners that it stands to gain as a result.

When we approved the United States-Canada FTA, we should already have been seriously discussing the next logical agreement. Instead, U.S. officials defensively assured the world that we would not upset the multilateral GATT process by concurrently pursuing other bilateral or regional FTA's.

Meanwhile, the EC was hurtling decisively toward EC '92, and gaining enormous leverage over impending GATT negotiations in the process. We did what we felt was in the best interest of the world trading order. The EC did what was best for the EC now, it is the EC who holds the cards.

The closer EC '92 comes to fruition, the more immutable the Community can afford to—and surely will—become in the GATT. In fact, by proceeding full bore with EC '92 throughout the GATT process, the EC has stated boldly to the world trading community that if a GATT agreement is reached based on EC wishes and demands, the Community would be more inclined to bring its EC '92-related directives into conformity with whatever results from a new agreement.

Absent any GATT agreement, however, few tears will fall from the eyes of European Community trade ministers. EC trade officials have the attitude that if a GATT agreement is going to be reached, it is going to be based upon terms more palatable to the Community. Because, if no agreement is reached, those wishing a position in the European ballgame will be forced to play by the severely protectionist European rule book, EC '92.

To those who have delusions about the EC addressing the agriculture issue in a sincere and forth right manner, consider this: In a recent meeting with my Trade Subcommittee colleagues and EC trade ministers, I pointed out the importance of the EC instituting agricultural reforms that we all know to be essential. At once, several of the ministers emphatically rebuked my comment with—"wait a minute, Congressman, we didn't promise any reforms . . . we agreed to talk . . . that's it!"

I regret that fast track will allow such a belligerent attitude to perpetuate. The European Community's mischief—and the GATT comedy of errors held hostage by it—are not deserving of a stage on which to perform.

On the positive side, however, fast-track authority will also facilitate the negotiation of a North American FTA, and hemispheric and other bilateral FTA's beyond that.

In fact, we now have a perfect opportunity to forge our first free trade pact with a major Asian trading partners. With over $75 billion in foreign exchange reserves and an increasing thirst for American goods, Taiwan may well be just such a partner. Aside from being the right thing to do, such a pact would send shock waves through Japan and the People's Republic of China—and all to the benefit of American trading interests.

It would convey to the Japanese that no longer is it the only major economic player in the Asian region, and that the United States is going to serve its own interests by forging formidable commercial alliances with viable Asian trading partners in order to combat Japan's protectionist policies, and expand the access of United States firms to lucrative new markets. More generally, for those who decry prospects of a world trading system broken down into nothing more than regional trading blocs, it would be difficult to define a United States-Taiwan FTA as the cornerstone of any regional bloc.

This type of FTA could also be held up to the People's Republic of China [PRC] as an example of the kind of commercial activity that could be developed between our two countries if the PRC's leadership would enact a truly free and open—Jackson-Vanik-consistent—emigration policy, and not oppress Chinese students crying out for freedom, democracy, and basic human rights.

We are heading into a 21st century that will pose even greater competitive challenges to America than the current century. If United States businesses and workers are going to prosper in this brutal environment, we must stop relying on a GATT incapable of leading the way to true global trade expansion. We also must strengthen our negotiating position vis-a-vis emerging European and Asian trading blocs.

I am supporting fast track because it sets the stage for completion of a North American free trade area and, hopefully, western hemispheric and United States-Taiwan FTS beyond that. If negotiated properly, and with America's interests foremost in the minds of U.S. trade negotiators and policymakers, such pacts will help America leverage the trading blocs I just referenced, expand opportunities for U.S. firms, and forge a truly fair and open trading system for the 21st century and beyond.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 158, the previous question is considered as ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 192, nays 231, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—192

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abercrombie | Harris | Payne (NJ) |
| Ackerman | Hatcher | Payne (VA) |
| Alexander | Hayes (IL) | Pease |
| Andrews (ME) | Hayes (LA) | Perkins |
| Andrews (NJ) | Hefner | Peterson (FL) |
| Annunzio | Hertel | Peterson (MN) |
| Applegate | Hoagland | Poshard |
| Aspin | Hochbrueckner | Quillen |
| AuCoin | Holloway | Rahall |
| Ballenger | Horn | Rangel |
| Barnard | Hunter | Ravenel |
| Bentley | Jacobs | Ray |
| Bevill | Jenkins | Reed |
| Bilbray | Johnson (SD) | Roe |
| Bonior | Johnston | Roemer |
| Borski | Jones (GA) | Rose |
| Boxer | Jones (NC) | Rowland |
| Brewster | Jontz | Russo |
| Brooks | Kanjorski | Sabo |
| Brown | Kaptur | Sanders |
| Bruce | Kennedy | Sangmeister |
| Campbell (CO) | Kildee | Savage |
| Carr | Kleczka | Scheuer |
| Clay | Kolter | Serrano |
| Coble | LaFalce | Shuster |
| Collins (IL) | Lancaster | Sikorski |
| Collins (MI) | Lantos | Sisisky |
| Condit | Lehman (CA) | Slaughter (NY) |
| Conyers | Levin (MI) | Smith (FL) |
| Costello | Lewis (GA) | Smith (NJ) |
| Cramer | Lipinski | Snowe |
| Darden | Lloyd | Solomon |
| DeFazio | Long | Spence |
| DeLauro | Lowey (NY) | Spratt |
| Dellums | Manton | Staggers |
| Derrick | Markey | Stallings |
| Dingell | Marlenee | Stark |
| Dixon | Martinez | Stearns |
| Dorgan (ND) | Mavroules | Stokes |
| Duncan | McCloskey | Studds |
| Durbin | McDade | Swett |
| Dwyer | McNulty | Tallon |
| Dymally | Meyers | Taylor (MS) |
| Early | Mfume | Taylor (NC) |
| Eckart | Miller (CA) | Thomas (GA) |
| Edwards (CA) | Miller (OH) | Torres |
| Engel | Mineta | Towns |
| English | Mink | Traficant |
| Erdreich | Moakley | Traxler |
| Evans | Mollohan | Unsoeld |
| Feighan | Moody | Valentine |
| Flake | Murphy | Vento |
| Foglietta | Murtha | Visclosky |
| Ford (MI) | Nagle | Volkmer |
| Ford (TN) | Natcher | Washington |
| Frank (MA) | Neal (MA) | Waters |
| Frost | Neal (NC) | Waxman |
| Gaydos | Nowak | Weiss |
| Gejdenson | Oakar | Wheat |
| Gilman | Oberstar | Whitten |
| Glickman | Obey | Wise |
| Gonzalez | Owens (NY) | Wolpe |
| Goodling | Pallone | Yates |
| Gray | Patterson | Yatron |

NAYS—231

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allard | Anthony | Atkins |
| Anderson | Archer | Bacchus |
| Andrews (TX) | Armey | Baker |

Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Boucher
Broomfield
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Cardin
Carper
Chandler
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Cooper
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Dickinson
Dicks
Donnelly
Dooley
Doolittle
Downey
Dreier
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Espy
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Fields
Fish
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Gordon
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hobson
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Kasich
Kennelly
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
Lagomarsino
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
Luken
Machtley
Martin
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
Michel
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Myers
Nichols
Nussle
Olin
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parker
Paxon
Pelosi
Penny
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Ramstad
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Roybal
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (IA)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solarz
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torricelli
Upton
Vander Jagt
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Weldon
Wilson
Wolf
Wyden
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Browder
Dornan (CA)
Hopkins
Lehman (FL)
Levine (CA)
McCollum
Vucanovich
Williams

□ 1446

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. BROWDER for, with Mr. DORNAN of California against.

Mr. WILLIAMS for, with Mr. MCCOLLUM against.

Mr. DOWNEY. changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DARDEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, previous schedule commitments prevent me from being present and voting on the United States-Mexico and other trade agreements.

I have spent considerable time during the past 6 weeks trying to assure that the Congress and thus our constituents be an integral part of the pending trade agreements.

For the most part, the fast-track process effectively removes Congress from the procedure.

If I were present, I would vote "aye" on House Resolution 101 introduced by Representative DORGAN. I would vote "aye" on House Resolution 146 introduced by Representative GEPHARDT.

## EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESPECT TO THE U.S. OBJECTIVES THAT SHOULD BE ACHIEVED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS OF FUTURE TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 158, I call up House Resolution 146 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 146

Whereas the achievement during the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations of the negotiating objectives set forth in the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 would be in the best interest of the United States;

Whereas a North American Free Trade Agreement (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as "NAFTA") that promotes economic growth be in the best interests of the United States if it increases met employment and enhances the international competitiveness of United States industries and workers;

Whereas serious concerns have been raised about the potentially adverse effects of a NAFTA unless it is accompanied by—

(1) adequate safeguards and protections for United States industries, farmers, and workers facing potentially increased competition from imported products, and

(2) a vigorous program of environmental protection and enforcement to ensure that trade liberalization takes place in a manner that enhances environmental protection;

Whereas it is essential to ensure the existence of an effective and adequately funded program which provides adjustment assistance to all United States workers who may lose their jobs and become dislocated as a result of a NAFTA;

Whereas through an exchange of letters, the President submitted to the Congress on May 1, 1991, an action plan (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as the "Presidential response of May 1") describing in detail the objectives the President will seek to achieve, within the NAFTA itself and in parallel actions, in order to ensure that such industry, labor, and environmental concerns are fully addressed;

Whereas the congressional fast track procedures set forth in section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (providing for expedited consideration in the House and Senate of bills to implement trade agreements entered into under section 1102 (b) or (c) of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988) will be extended so as to apply with respect to trade agreements entered into during the 2-year period occurring after May 31, 1991, and before June 1, 1993, unless a resolution disapproving the extension is adopted by either the House of Representatives or the Senate before June 1, 1991;

Whereas the extension of such fast track procedures depends upon the existence of a cooperative, bipartisan working relationship between the Congress and the executive branch in which the full range of interests and concerns relating to the negotiation and implementation of trade agreements can be considered and resolved in a manner that best serves the national interest; and

Whereas such fast track procedures were enacted by the Congress as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, with the full recognition of the right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedures of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as any other rule of that House: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That is is the sense of the House that—

(1) on the basis of the Presidential response of May 1, including the commitments therein to address issues relating to environmental protection health and safety standards, labor and industry adjustment (including worker adjustment assistance), and worker rights, and on the expectation that the commitments set forth in that response will be carried out, the fast track procedures, as set forth in section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974, should be extended;

(2) in order to implement fully the Presidential response of May 1, and to maximize the potential for reaching agreements in the overall best economic interests of the United States—

(A) the United States Trade Representative and other appropriate officials in the executive branch shall, throughout the course of the negotiations on a NAFTA, consult closely and on a regular basis (as has been the case with the Uruguay Round) regarding the status of the negotiations and the progress in achieving the objectives set forth in such response with Members of Congress, including the Committee on Ways and Means in the House, the Committee on Finance in the Senate, any other appropriate committee of jurisdiction in the House and the Senate, and with the Speaker-appointed Chairman's Advisory Group on trade negotiations,

(B) the United States Trade Representative and other appropriate officials in the executive branch shall consult extensively with, and seek the views and advice of, interested parties in the private sector throughout the course of the negotiations,

(C) the President shall, as early as practicable but no later than the date of his notice of intention to enter into a NAFTA, submit a full report to the Congress indicating the extent to which satisfactory progress has been made in achieving the objectives set forth in the President's response of May 1, and

(D) the reports required under section 135(e) of the Trade Act of 1974 of the Labor

Advisory Committee for Trade Negotiations and Trade Policy, the Industry Policy Advisory Committee, and, where appropriate, other policy, sectoral, and functional advisory committees, with respect to a NAFTA shall include an assessment as to whether and to what extent each committee believes satisfactory progress has been made in achieving the objectives set forth in the Presidential response of May 1;

(3) any trade agreement negotiated by the Administration should seek to achieve the applicable negotiating objectives set forth in section 1101 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, in particular—

(A) to reduce or eliminate tariff and nontariff barriers and other trade distorting measures, including the barriers cited in the National Trade Estimates Report on Foreign Trade Barriers,

(B) to ensure adequate and effective intellectual property rights protection and enforcement,

(C) to reduce or eliminate barriers to trade in services,

(D) to liberatize conditions for investment, and

(E) to include effective mechanisms for the periodic review of the operation of the agreement and for consultation and dispute settlement;

(4) a NAFTA must provide strict rules of origin and enforcement measures to ensure that the benefits of the agreement accrue only to the parties thereof, foster job creation within North America, and effectively preclude the granting of benefits to articles transshipped from, or subject merely to minor operations in, third countries.

(5) a NAFTA must permit the United States—

(A) to maintain strict health and safety standards and their enforcement with respect to imports of agricultural commodities,

(B) to provide sufficiently lengthy transitional and adequate safeguard measures to minimize industry, agricultural, and worker dislocations and to remedy the effects of injurious increases in imports, and

(C) to maintain United States laws against injurious subsidies, dumping, and other unfair trade practices;

(6) implementation of a NAFTA must be accompanied by an effective worker adjustment program, developed by the Administration and the Congress, that is adequately funded and ensures that workers who may lose their jobs as a result of such agreement will receive prompt, comprehensive, and effective services, either through a new program or improvement or expansion of an existing program; and

(7) in carrying out the objectives of the Presidential response of May 1 relating to environmental protection, the President should seek to develop a joint program to address border environmental problems related to air and water pollution, hazardous wastes, chemical spills, pesticides, and enforcement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Pursuant to House Resolution 158, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 15 minutes, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 15 minutes, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] will be recognized for 15 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

□ 1450

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the pending resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCMILLEN].

Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution because I think the conditionality involved in this resolution adequately addresses the concerns of labor, the environment and health. I think that this proposed free-trade agreement is a watershed in relations with our southern neighbors. We all have rightfull concerns about the health, the environment and labor concerns, and I know that this body will ensure that those concerns are addressed.

Let me just address a couple of points that I think have been raised that need to be further discussed. When we look over the last 10 years and see our exports to Mexico have increased from $12 to $28 billion, that translates into 20,000 American jobs for every $1 billion increase in exports. Clearly, we have a lot to gain by this agreement.

Furthermore, the average American tariff for Mexican goods coming into America is only 4 percent. What we are going to see is a reduction of that 4 percent, not the mass influx of goods that have been argued here today.

The proposed free-trade agreement with Mexico is a watershed in the relations with our southern neighbor. It provides an opportunity to expand our already strong trade ties with Mexico and will remove trade barriers through trilateral negotiations. There are many precedents being set here.

Furthermore, American industries and agriculture have much to gain from increased access to Mexico's markets, and there is no doubt that this will perpetuate the distinctly global nature of American companies. Mexico will benefit from continued capital investment and higher wage levels. This will provide needed stability and allow for increased Mexican domestic expenditures on such necessary investments as infrastructure.

Having said this, I remain concerned over many legitimate issues raised by my colleagues and others over the trade agreement. I feel strongly that these issues need to be addressed in the negotiations and cannot be placated by a facile argument that what is good for American companies is necessarily good for American workers and consumers.

American companies are increasingly global by nature—manufacturing or assembling in many different countries—and this is to their credit. But for workers in the United States, the suggestion that American companies are eager for the low-wage unorganized work force of Mexico is a grave concern. This concern is one I share.

Statistics from an Economic Strategy Institute attestation to the Committee on Ways and Means highlights concern that the United States may not secure much economic gain from an FTA with Mexico. Open Mexican markets must be accompanied by investment incentives for North American investors, without which, free investment by foreign competitors could easily transform Mexico into a platform for low-wage exports into the United States market.

Furthermore, a comprehensive agreement must not ignore the necessity of cleaning up the environment and setting laws that provide for a decent standard of living and educational opportunities. Without provisions detailing a transition of Mexico's laws, regulations and enforcement procedures toward similarly effective laws and enforcement in this country, American companies will seek to move to Mexico simply to avoid the more stringent regulations.

To combine lax regulations and enforcement with deplorably low wages is a recipe for disaster. There is no question that the United States will suffer job losses and the erosion of our environment, especially among the border States, if nothing is done in this area. Such an outcome should not be the goal of a free trade ageement.

Many of these issues would not be so contentious if we had some form of industrial strategy. There is legitimate concern over the fact that this country lags behind others in worker training, that assistance for displaced workers has been seriously eroded over the last 10 years, and Government sponsored incentives for industry to pursue high technology are wanting. American exports have increased, and will continue to increase, but America as a country will not benefit without policies and a strategy designed to promote a high-tech, high-wage America.

I will support fast-track authority for a free trade agreement with Mexico. But I will not vote for a final agreement which does not adequately deal with the aforementioned concerns. As I'm sure all are aware, an agreement which does not do so will face powerful opposition in this Congress, and will, ultimately, benefit no one.

Fast track, however, is an opportunity. Entering into negotiations with Mexico will allow us to establish some conditionality to the environmental and labor concerns which have been rasied with Mexico. Furthermore, it is important to note that exports have been the driving force behind the U.S. Economy. Exports to Mexico, in particular, have risen from $10 to $20 billion in the last 10 years. This translates into 25,000 American jobs for every billion dollars in increased exports.

Finally, I want to emphasize the fact that fast track is not a blank check for the administration. Rather, it is the beginning of a partnership in a long and arduous negotiating process, one in which Congress will continue to play a key role. This role is ensured by the fact that Congress does not have to abide by the restrictions within the 1988 Trade Act for amending an agreement negotiated under fast track. All legislation passed by the Congress with rulemaking statutes allows the House to

alter rules binding upon itself. In other words, my colleagues and I here in Congress may change the rules of fast track, thus exempting ourselves from the restrictions against amendment if the final agreement does not adequately reflect our concerns.

In conclusion, it is clear to me that a free trade agreement encompassing Mexico, Canada, and the United States makes sense. The interdependence and growing interconnectedness of these economies is already taking place. We can either allow it to continue on an ad hoc basis—with seriously negative side effects—or we can take the initiative and shape the future relations of our national economies through negotiations. I choose the latter, because it is in the long-term interest of all parties concerned. However, it is clear that an agreement void of substantive environmental and labor provisions would not fulfill this promise.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH].

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 146, an extension of the fast-track procedure.

Extension of the fast track is a vote for open markets, future economic prosperity, and American leadership.

During 1990, nearly 90 percent of U.S. economic growth was attributable to exports. Nearly 7 million jobs are export related. One in six U.S. jobs is tied in some way to exports.

It is important that we move forward with negotiations. These talks are vital to future American growth. If we disapprove the fast track, we will have wasted an important opportunity to expand our trade and strengthen our Nation's international competitiveness.

I have studied President Bush's action plan carefully. It shows that the President is personally committed to protecting the environment and worker rights, and providing effective adjustment assistance and retraining for workers in the United States. I believe him.

Congress, the private sector, and the administration have worked closely together during the course of all multilateral negotiations to guarantee and protect our ability to compete at home and abroad.

Let us remember that granting fast-track authority is only the beginning of a trade negotiation.

Congress retains the unqualified right to disapprove any agreement if it concludes that the administration has not done its job. And there is a tradition, and a clear expectation, that the administration will work with the Congress in drafting implementing legislation.

Accordingly, I am convinced that we should move forward. The President has responded to our concerns in his action plan and should be given an opportunity to negotiate.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 146, a resolution that expresses the sense of Congress that existing fast-track procedures for approval of trade agreements should be extended. The President has made a commitment to address potential problems such as the environmental protection, worker health and safety, and adjustment mechanisms for adversely affected sectors.

The resolution reinforces those commitments and establishes specific criteria by which trade agreements will be judged when completed and brought back for congressional approval. By adopting this resolution, we will be affirming a comprehensive statement of U.S. negotiating goals and objectives that will signal a unity of purpose to our trading partners. Hopefully our actions today will revitalize the Uruguay round and guide them to a successful conclusion as well as provide a strong foundation for the historic task of creating a North American free-trade area.

This resolution also demonstrates the extensive participation by Congress in the formation of trade policy and implementation of trade agreements.

It is patently false to say that fast track undermines the constitutional role of Congress in international trade. If anything, that role is enhanced because of the statutory requirements for extensive consultation at every level, constant monitoring of the progress of negotiations, and final accountability in the implementing process.

The resolution merely restates our constitutional prerogatives and defines our ambitions for future negotiations. I will vote "yes" on House Resolution 146.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT].

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of extending fast-track negotating authority and in support of House Resolution 146.

The fast-track procedure was first adopted by Congress in 1974, and as reaffirmed in 1979. We included fast track in the 1988 trade bill after concluding that a further extension was necessary. With it, the President has the bargaining power to negotiate agreements in the best interests of the United States, and to assure his negotiated agreements will be voted up or down by the Congress.

Congress plays an integral role in fast track. Throughout the process of negotiation, Congress is in close consultation with the President and the U.S. Trade Representative, thus guaranteeing that the final agreement reflects the concerns of Congress. If the agreement does not, Congress will reject it.

Using fast track, we have concluded three very successful agreements, each of which were approved by large majorities in both Houses of Congress. We should approve fast track today to insure that two more critical negotiations—the Uruguay round of GATT and those related to a North American free trade agreement—can likewise proceed to successful conclusions. Fast track is a partnership between the President, the Congress, and the American people, and it works.

We have heard a great deal recently about the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed North American free trade negotiations. I fully support the President in his desire to eliminate tariffs and other barriers to trade among our neighbors to the north and south. A North American free trade agreement would create the largest free market in the world, with over 360 million consumers and a total output in excess of $6 trillion.

The proposed agreement will serve as a catalyst for economic growth and development in the United States, Mexico, and Canada. In recent years, Mexico has undertaken a vigorous program of market-oriented, structural economic reform. Inflation has fallen dramatically, the peso has been stabilized, tariffs have been slashed and capital repatriation is accelerating.

The United Staes has already seen the benefits of Mexico's economic modernization. Since Mexico joined the GATT in 1986, it has overtaken such economic powers as Germany to become the United States' third largest trading partner, with two-way trade totaling $58 billion in 1990.

In the past 5 years, United States exports to Mexico have more than doubled, growing from $12.4 billion to $28.4 billion, and generating over 260,000 new jobs in America. In my own State of New York, exports to Mexico grew 63 percent from 1987 to 1989. By 1990, Mexico ranked eighth among New York's 188 export markets. A North American free trade agreement will insure that this progress continues throughout the 1990's and beyond.

Furthermore, extension of fast track is necessary for strategic as well as economic reasons. Denial of fast track and the consequential deterioration of commercial ties with Mexico may well provoke a return to the days of "anti-gringo" paternalism, economic stagnation, and instability. It is in our best interests to have stable and prosperous neighbors on both our northern and southern borders.

Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that free trade increases the social and economic prosperity of the parties involved. Recently the Dallas Morning News stated:

> Tied as we are by geography, it would be folly for Mexico and the United States not to confront the future as partners. It is in the best interest of every citizen of Canada, the United States, and Mexico that all three prosper. The implementation of a free trade agreement would certainly advance that goal.

I fully share those sentiments, and urge my colleagues to support fast track in pursuit of that goal.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is well to remember why fast-track treaty authority was enacted in 1974. Whether one is for or against the North American Free-Trade Agreement should not affect our position in granting the President fast-track authority. The Government of the United States must be in the strongest position possible when negotiating our trade treaties. Fast-track authority was created to allow our U.S. Trade Representatives to negotiate with the confidence of

support or rejection of a treaty in its entirety, thus protecting the negotiating positions after months, often years of work.

Contrary to what critics would have us believe, fast track does not grant the President a blank check with which to negotiate. Rather, the extensive consultation and notification requirements contained in the accompanying House Resolution 146 ensure that Congress can be an influential partner from initiation through implementation of an agreement. Mr. Speaker, I believe that President Bush and our Trade Negotiator, Ambassador Carla Hills, have already demonstrated their willingness to work with affected groups. We have only to look at the President's submission to the Congress of May 1, addressing labor and environmental concerns about NAFTA.

House Resolution 146 is a clear statement by the House of Representatives of objectives to be achieved in the neogotiations—economic growth that increases U.S. employment, health and environmental guarantees. We call for consultation on a regular basis throughout the negotiations, not just with Congress, but with the private sector. We ask that labor and business advisory bodies give us periodically their assessment of progress toward our objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I too had reservations about the impact which free trade with Mexico would have on the United States. However, after careful study of this issue, I believe that the benefits of a North American Free-Trade Agreement are undeniable. The United States-Canada-Mexico trading bloc would create the largest market in the world, encompassing more than 360 million consumers with a total output of approximately $6 trillion.

Since 1980, United States exports to Mexico and Canada have doubled, rising from $55.3 to $111.4 billion; 70 percent of what Mexico imports is from the United States. And, since Mexico still has greater barriers to United States exports than the United States has on Mexican imports, this trend can only be expected to improve with the establishment of a free trade area.

Exports are critical to our economy, accounting last year for more than 88 percent of its entire growth. More exports mean more export-related jobs. My home State of New York has a large stake in the successful conclusion of both the Uruguay round and the North American Free-Trade Agreement. New York State has the second largest number of export-related jobs in the United States—391,700—with merchandise exports in 1990 totaling over $29 billion.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there may be some relocation of American jobs. President Bush is firmly committed to a worker adjustment program in connection with Mexico free trade. I would argue that the exodus of U.S. manufacturing jobs will not stop if fast track and NAFTA are not approved. In fact, jobs will continue to move to low-cost sites in the Far East.

By jointly pooling the resources of Mexico and the United States, we will be able to more effectively compete with our major economic competitors, the European Community and Japan. To the degree that the Mexican work force can contribute to the production of North American products, our competitiveness can only be reinforced in the global market and at home.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me. I rise in support of the Gephardt-Rostenkowski amendment and thank the gentlemen for presenting it here today.

What we have before the Congress today is not only about an individual, two individual agreements and the manner in which Congress treated them, it is about the way we treat American workers in a global marketplace. As we go forward with the fast track and the negotiations for the GATT and the United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement, I think it is very important for us to set some terms so that it is very clear to the negotiators what we will vote for when they come back from the table.

Up until now, we had plenty of opportunity to protect our workers, whether it is for trade readjustment, relocation, retraining, whether it is as fundamental as our own educational system.

I do not think we have risen to that task. I think our workers feel exposed. I think the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution is an assist in helping those workers.

I would hope for more, but this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is the very least we can do.

□ 1500

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our very magnanimous colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, lowering trade barriers increases the export opportunities for American businesses and lowers the cost of U.S. imports from abroad. Free trade also improves world production by moving investments and resources to countries where they can be utilized more efficiently.

Today, a broader range of issues is being addressed in multi- and bi-lateral trade agreements, making negotiations more complex than ever. Fast-track authority provides the President with the credibility needed to convince other countries to lower their barriers to trade.

Although I understand the need for a negotiating mechanism to expand foreign markets and support the extension of fast-track authority, I am concerned that any North American Free-Trade Agreement might adversely impact certain sectors of the economy, particularly agriculture. The Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution clearly outlines objectives negotiators should be striving to achieve and I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 146.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE].

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly to oppose the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution. I do it with real regret, because I have the highest regard for both of these gentlemen.

Furthermore, I agree with 90 percent of the resolution. It rightly expresses congressional concerns, and expresses them well. However, one paragraph of the resolution states explicitly that fast track should be approved. I find it inconsistent to vote for a resolution with that language supporting fast track, when I have just voted for the Dorgan resolution disapproving fast track.

Mr. Speaker, were it not for that one sentence in the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution, I could enthusiastically support it. I regret that I cannot vote for it today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, today I cast my vote in support of the President's request for extending fast-track authority in trade negotiations for GATT, the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative, and, in the issue that has dominated this debate, pursuing a North American Free-Trade Agreement between the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

But while I voted with the President, I will also send along this message: Negotiate, Mr. President, but negotiate well. While you have my support today, if you bring back to the Congress agreements that do not satisfactorily address the serious and legitimate concerns that have been raised by so many of us over the past few months, you can expect my opposition next time. That's why passage of the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution, and adherence to it, is so important.

In particular, this Member of Congress will be watching closely for a convincing and enforceable provision to guarantee environmental practices along the United States-Mexico border, to ensure against improper labor practices and to impose strict rules of origin, and for provisions and funding for a first-class program of education, training, and adjustment assistance to displaced American workers.

In supporting the extension of negotiating authority, I am not forgetting the many doubts, concerns, and uncer-

tainties I share with many critics of fast-track authority. But I believe that Congress will be able to maintain its prerogatives in this matter while allowing the President to negotiate effectively.

If we were deciding today the issue of fast track for Mexico separate from that for GATT, I might be voting differently. The challenge of negotiating with 107 nations, as in the GATT talks, clearly requires the President—while still consulting closely with Congress—to be able to conduct talks without the prospect of micromanagement from Capitol Hill. But the nature of the North American talks, particularly with Mexico, with its broad effects on many sectors of our society and the special circumstances of our shared border, suggest that the proper role for Congress to play in that endeavor is considerably more extensive.

Like many here today, I have studied and reflected upon this issue for months. While I am generally supportive of efforts to expand trade among nations, I have found myself sharing the concerns about a Mexican free-trade agreement that have been raised regarding environmental quality, worker readjustment, labor standards, rules of origin and the like.

I believe the possible benefits of a freer trade environment between our two countries, primarily increased access to expanding Mexican markets for American businesses and an improved standard of living for many poverty-stricken Mexicans—and the positive consequences for stability throughout the North American Continent—compel us to move forward, albeit with caution. This is a time we may wish to remember the words of President Kennedy: "Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate."

Today's vote is not the final statement on this issue. It only marks the beginning of the process. I plan to follow closely the administration's conduct in these trade negotiations, and I expect them to live up to the standards the President has set for himself regarding consultation. I'll be reading the fine print of any agreement. I promise him my vigilance in making sure that American workers and American consumers get a fair shake in any agreement.

Mr. Speaker, outsiders watching the debate that has been conducted over the fast-track issue could reasonably conclude that we had before us today a full-fledged agreement to approve or disapprove. This reflects the skillful work of the opponents of fast track who have defined this debate as one which presumes a bad outcome to the negotiations we've authorized. It's a case where we're prone to borrow trouble. And, honestly, there's some reason to do so, given our record in trade negotiations over the last 10 years.

But we are not debating an agreement today, only the means of negotiating one. The issue we should be discussing today is whether the Congress of the United States can adequately maintain its prerogatives to represent the diverse interests of the American people under the fast-track procedure.

I have been encouraged by the President's stated commitment to consult closely with Congress on a host of issues during the entire process of negotiations. In 1988 the Reagan administration worked reasonably well with Congress as it worked out a comprehensive agreement acceptable both to the United States and Canada. The Bush administration should use that as the basis for still better ways to involve Congress in shaping an agreement with Mexico.

One thing that will help keep any United States-Mexico negotiations in perspective is the impressive outpouring of views that have come from environmentalists, labor unions, businessmen and women and countless others who have put the debate on fast track on the front pages. Clearly, Congress has gotten the message, and I think both the Bush and Salinas administrations have, too.

Frankly, I reject the argument that once the administration has an agreement in hand it will be impossible, in the limited time provided for debate, to adequately consider its substance. I'm not about to vote to pass anything I don't understand, and I'm not about to stand by while this or any administration railroads through the Congress a measure as important as a North American Free-Trade Agreement. I know that view is shared by a majority of my colleagues on both sides.

A free-trade accord between the United States and Mexico and Canada will have profound implications for all three of our countries. It is appropriate that we have focused during the debate on fast track on a whole range of effects.

There are two issues in particular that stand out in my mind, and it's up to the administration to address them if it wants my support for an eventual agreement.

Earlier this month Congressman RON WYDEN and I and several other colleagues wrote to the Special Trade Representative, Ambassador Carla Hills, to urge the administration to go further than it had in addressing environmental concerns. Specifically, we insisted that there be a workable program to address environmental problems related to air and water pollution, hazardous waste, chemical spills, and pesticides. We expressed hope that the design of such a program could be submitted to Congress for review not later than submission of a NAFTA, and include sources of funding and a timetable for implementation.

This letter was sent after thorough consideration of the President's response to Chairmen ROSTENKOWSKI and BENTSEN and majority leader GEPHARDT. I appreciated the President's stated commitment not to weaken our Nation's environmental laws and to protect the health, safety, and environmental standards of Americans. I was also pleased to learn that the administration plans to undertake a study of broader United States-Mexico environmental issues with particular respect to a NAFTA, and to do so in a timely fashion with an eye toward permitting the Congress to review such a study before any legislative consideration of a NAFTA. And I took seriously the administration's endorsement of recent environmental initiatives by the Mexican Government.

Even so, we believed that a program such as we described would be beneficial to both United States and Mexican communities who will be most affected by a NAFTA. We were concerned that previous enforcement standards in Mexico, throughout the country in general and in the maquiladora region in particular, were too lax and could adversely affect air and water quality in many United States communities. In that light, we believe there should be an agreement, within a NAFTA, on specific, minimum joint environmental standards to apply to new production facilities on both sides of the border.

The second item in our letter dealt with the effects of a NAFTA on American workers and with safety standards and workers' rights on both sides of the border. There must be a comprehensive program of adjustment and retraining to ensure that workers who may lose their jobs can continue to function as fully contributing members of our economy and our society. I'm glad the President recognized the need to assist dislocated workers who have adjustment difficulties, and I'm encouraged by his commitment to working with Congress to create an effective worker adjustment program that is adequately funded. I look forward to reviewing its proposals before consideration of a NAFTA.

I am not interested in supporting an agreement that does not address worker safety standards or does not ensure respect for recognized worker rights. In our letter to the administration, we urged negotiations of an enforceable agreement on these issues along GATT lines. While the debate in this House has rightly focused on how Americans will be affected, it would be foolish if any trade agreement does not also address the fundamental needs of Mexican society—higher wages, better working and living conditions, greater opportunities—that have led many Mexicans to come to this country in search of a better life.

While I've spent some time discussing the Mexican dimensions of the fast-

track question, I want to return for a moment to the overarching issue of improved multinational trade at issue in the Uruguay round of GATT negotiations. There are many items in contention here, resolution of which are critical to the United States. These include intellectual property rights and protections, reduction of non-tariff trade barriers, opening up agricultural trade, as well as others. While the GATT discussions have been prolonged and frustrating, their successful conclusion has to remain a top priority for us. The case for approval of continued negotiating authority—as problematic as it may be with respect to NAFTA—is compelling.

Mr. President, you have the authority. You have made essential commitments to respect the concerns and the role of Congress in meeting its responsibilities. We wish you wisdom and toughness and success in the negotiations. We promise you careful scrutiny of the results.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, for me a vote for fast track is a vote pure and simple to allow the administration to negotiate a treaty with Mexico that benefits my State and my Nation. I do not give this vote lightly. In fact, I have expectations, expectations that the promised parallel negotiations on worker rights and environmental protection promises will be kept. This means a strong worker adjustment mechanism must be enacted and paid for, and this means a basic agreement must include a strong rule on origin.

Mr. Speaker, these are real concerns, these are real problems, and they must be resolved if the administration expects to get any agreement when it comes with their negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can have an agreement that benefits both nations, both Mexico and the United States of America, and I vote today to give the administration a chance to negotiate just such a treaty.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONNELLY].

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the President's request to extend fast-track authority. Simply put, a good United States-Mexican Free-Trade Agreement is in the best long-term economic interests of the United States.

Failure to extend fast-track authority would have devastating consequences for our trade negotiators, not only on the proposed United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement, but also for the current round of GATT negotiations. It would say to our world trading partners that the United States is not a reliable trading partner and that our negotiators do not speak for the United States. It is absolutely crucial that our trading partners know that the United States speaks with one strong voice.

The fast-track procedure has served our Nation well for 50 years. It in no way restricts the rights of Congress. The administration will consult closely with us during the negotiation process, and we retain our constitutional prerogatives to reject an agreement which does not meet with our approval.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, will not vote to support a fast-track agreement that does not take into consideration Congress' legitimate economic and environmental concerns. For a free-trade agreement to be successful, it has to satisfy the economic interests of both parties, not their political interests or their diplomatic interests. I assure you, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, that we will keep the administration's feet to the fire on this most critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must respond, has a duty to respond, to events in the world. In 1992, Europe will become a common market. For all intents and purposes, Japan and South Korea have created de facto common market in Asia. We do not live in a vacuum, and our Nation must be able to compete in the world market. A United States-Mexican Free-Trade Agreement is the best way to do that. I urge that fast-track authority be extended.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending fast-track authority to the President. In the debate today we have heard stories about businesses closing, and about jobs being lost to Mexico, to the Asian Basin, and to other countries around the world. These stories are true. The issue we must debate today is how we are going to stop this from continuing.

Mr. Speaker, I have not heard word one about how we are going to prevent the loss of jobs in the future. I suggest to Members that the way to do this is to empower the President to negotiate with our neighbors, to force them to lower trade barriers, to eliminate domestic content requirements, and to adhere to basic worker protection provisions that businesses in this country have to live with.

Mr. Speaker, if we do this, I contend that our businesses in this country will be able to compete more effectively. That will mean more American exports and more American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, some Members have tried to argue that, by giving the President the authority to negotiate, we would be surrendering our constitutional prerogatives.

The fact is that after the President negotiates, he must come back to this Congress and seek final approval. I hope the President understands that this is a very contentious issue in this body. The President will need to consult very carefully, with every congressional committee that has jurisdiction, if he is going to gain our approval for any international agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is that when we come back to approve a final trade agreement, we will be shooting real bullets. I know I speak for many of my colleagues what I say that I will not support a final trade agreement unless the concerns that we have all expressed have been adequately addressed.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the very able gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

□ 1510

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of fast track. This is a historic vote which is vital to the country's continued leadership in the international market. I think of our willingness to lead on the issue of free enterprise, because surely we don't mean "free" only to our domestic marketplace. Without the extension, our negotiating authority would be seriously questioned, and the U.S. competitiveness in the world market would be at stake.

Critics of granting the President fast-track authority contend that a free-trade agreement with Mexico will result in major job losses in the United States when companies relocate to Mexico. Opponents also argue that businesses will move across the border to take advantage of environmental standards that are less stringent and not as well enforced as they are in the United States. Those are not trivial concerns. However, President Bush has responded constructively to critics of the proposed free-trade pact with Mexico by pledging to take the appropriate measures to protect this country's workers and the environment. In my view, the administration has offered a responsible compromise on all the issues of concern.

A North American Free-Trade Agreement provides a unique opportunity to strengthen our economy and those of our neighbors. Fair and open trade between the United States and Mexico will bolster both countries' economies and directly improve the well-being of Americans and Mexicans alike. The Mexican market offers special advantages for United States industry and commerce. First, Mexico's geographical proximity to the United States offers companies conducting business in the Mexican market the prospect of reduced transportation costs. Second, Mexico is rich in natural resources, particularly oil. An open partnership with our neighbor would reduce our reliance on oil supplies from an unstable Middle East region. And finally, as Mexicans aquire new jobs and skills, the value of their work will increase

and they will be less likely to illegally seek work in the United States.

For Texas, special benefits would accrue from a free-trade agreement negotiated between the United States and Mexico. While the United States is a net importer of goods and services from Mexico, Texas is a net exporter. In 1989, total exports from Texas to Mexico exceeded $9.7 billion—almost a third of Texas' $31 billion in total exports. Further, while total exports from Mexico grew by 13 percent in 1989, exports from Texas to Mexico grew by an even larger 18 percent. And each year, 100,000 American jobs are created due to increased United States sales to Mexico; 30 to 40 percent of those jobs are created in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, free trade with Mexico is essential if we are to compete with the rapidly forming trading blocs in Europe and the Pacific Rim. A trade pact linking the United States, Mexico, and Canada would create the world's largest trading bloc, with 350 million people and an annual economic output of $6 trillion. Hopefully, this experience will pave the way to creating an entire new free-trade hemisphere stretching from Canada to the United States and down through Central and South America. A free-trade agreement with Mexico should be only the first step in achieving the largest free market in the world.

The reality is that the United States cannot effectively promote free trade unless the President can rely on fast-track procedures when negotiating trade agreements. Those who would argue that fast-track authority denies the Congress a role in the process are wrong. The law clearly states that the President must consult with Congress prior to entering the talks and regularly throughout the negotiations. Fast-track authority gives the President credibility when negotiating trade agreements with foreign leaders, while still guaranteeing Congress the final authority over commerce with foreign nations as required by the Constitution.

Today we have the opportunity to open the door to our neighbor and welcome it to a new era of cooperation and friendship. No other country so directly affects the welfare and security of America as does Mexico. Make no mistake about it—a free-trade agreement offers both countries great advantages. I urge my colleagues to support the fast-track procedures that will allow negotiations between the United States and Mexico to proceed expeditiously.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding the time to me.

I would only say that I think it is important at this point to also point out to my colleagues the statement made by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] on the floor just a short time ago. He pointed out that we all are going to have an opportunity to approve or disapprove of an agreement. That is going to happen in how long, 1 year, 3 years, 5, 6, 7, we are not sure. But we do know that it is going to be difficult to negotiate a free trade agreement with a country with the disparity of wage rates, with a different culture, and indeed, even a different language, something that we did not confront to that extent with Canada that we will with Mexico.

But I also have to say to the administration to beware of all of the letters that the administration has received and the response we received back from the President of the United States. In my letter I also pointed out that this administration has got to come to a commitment to provide the necessary infrastructure that is going to be necessary and needed for increased commerce between Mexico and the United States. We do not have enough Customs agents in the United States to deal with the commerce we have today coming from Mexico, nor do we have enough inspectors in the Agriculture Department to deal with it.

I am a supporter of this resolution and the free-trade agreement. But again, I say to all of my colleagues, let us be aware that it is going to cost something. The United States, like Mexico, is going to have to make a commitment to the infrastructure needs as well as the health, the environment, and the wage rates and labor standards and all of the rest that we have talked about today. There are some pretty mundane things that we are going to have to commit to, and I fully expect the administration's support to pass that legislation during the time that negotiations are ongoing for a free-trade agreement with Mexico.

I would also say to my friends and colleagues that I think this debate has reached a good level. I think it is now time to get on with the business of opening the doors between our two great nations.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the respected gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding this time to me, for fast track now is on track, it is a reality, and let the negotiations begin.

I think the full impact of the Rostenkowski-Gephardt resolution or the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution is simply common sense. The President and his negotiators are going to have to talk to the Congress of the United States. We have just had a rather close vote on the Dorgan amendment, which was the killer amendment, which was the test of whether fast track was gong to go forward. That was the easy job.

The tough job is going to be now to negotiate an agreement that can pass this Congress, because definitely there are going to be winners and losers.

I think the House is to be congratulated, particularly our Democrat colleagues for recognizing that there is one President of the United States and investing in him the authority to go ahead and negotiate something that then comes back to the Congress. I think they are certainly to be congratulated for that, and I think the leadership has had one of its finest moments in doing this.

But I would hope that the President, the trade representatives would negotiate hard with the Mexican Government so that we can come up with an agreement that will strengthen both sides of the border. Anything that is good for the Mexican Government, that is good to strengthen the economy of Mexico, has got to carry benefits into the United States.

There will be some jobs exported, but there will also be a lot of new jobs created in this country, and this is what is important, and this is the way we measure the validity of the agreement, we measure the probable success of the agreement.

I congratulate the House on its previous vote and support the resolution that is presently on the floor.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my very able and thoughtful friend and classmate, the gentleman once again from the "Show-Me" State of Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. Speaker, today, Congress stands at a crossroads that will shape the future of American trade policy. The world today is changing and we must adapt to those changes. Expanded trade is a critical part of a changing world order that has a lot to do with open and expanded world markets. Opening world markets never comes easily nor will it in the future. The opportunity does not come very often, but when it does—it is well within the American spirit to seize the moment. That moment is today and the tool by which we must attempt to expand our world trading opportunities is the fast-track procedure.

Fast track must not mean that congressional oversight is slighted or traded away. The events surrounding the breakdown of the GATT negotiations last December in Geneva illustrate the resolve this Congress and the administration must exhibit in representing the best interests of American working men and women. This resolve has reinforced by the administration's rejection of a GATT agreement that was not in the best interests of either American workers or American farmers. Indeed, that very rejection of a bad agreement is one of the principal reasons that administration is asking for the extension of fast-trade authority today, and I believe is the best evi-

dence of the administration's commitment to the kind of agreement that we will be proud of rather then one we blandly accept. The administration didn't try to sell a bad deal then, so why should they now?

Lest we forget, this vote today is to allow our negotiations to continue. No trade agreement can come about without further discussions. Be assured, this body must be committed to fully scrutinizing the reports of our trade negotiators both in GATT and in a North American Free-Trade Agreement. While it is the responsibility of our trade negotiators to bring home a sound trade pact, such an agreement must bear the most thorough examinations and scrutiny of the Congress, and we have full assurances that we will be in full consultation as the process goes forward.

I fully believe that Congress does have the responsibility to preserve critical domestic industries. For example, the textile industry in the Eighth District of Missouri employs thousands of men and women whose livelihood depends on a trade policy that does not give away the store. Targeting valuable industries such as textilies for the bartering table is unacceptable. Achieving expanded markets for one area of our economy while placing the negotiating burden on another area must not be allowed and I have shared this vital concern with the President, himself.

However, I believe deeply that the process must go forward. The President has advised us that the Congress will be in constant consultation with our trade negotiators through both our GATT and Mexican trade negotiations and I believe him. I have been present at GATT negotiations in Geneva and can assure the Members of this body that Congress has a voice in our trade deliberations; however, it is also the responsibility of this body to ensure that that voice is heard. I strongly urge my colleagues to allow our critical trade negotiating efforts to continue to do so within the parameters of concern expressed in the Rostenkowski—Gephardt resolution.

We have to negotiate before we have anything to judge. Let us negotiate diligently, assiduously, be partners in the process, do the best we can—and then judge whether something has been produced that is worthy of our people's trust.

If it has not we should vote "no."

If it has, we can enter a bright new era for enhanced trade opportunities on a level playing field, that will enhance job opportunities and our basic standard of living.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I also yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding me this time and I urge a yes vote on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I heard Members on the previous resolution saying we want to send a message. Here is the message, and it is loud and clear, and it says clearly what the sense of the Congress is as to what our negotiators should be considering in any agreement that is reached with Mexico. I think this is a very important statement by this body as to what would be acceptable, because eventually, if an agreement is reached, we will have to vote it up or down. And it is important that our negotiators know ahead of time what our concerns are. I think it spells them out clearly, and certainly will be an important blueprint for those who do go forward in the negotiating.

I think also that the importance of the GATT negotiation should not be overlooked, and I would urge all of my colleagues, as our negotiators work on these areas of trade with Mexico and the GATT agreement that they be very aware of what is happening and have an opportunity to offer input to those who are putting together these agreements. It is vitally important that we get responsible negotiated agreements in both instances.

We have an opportunity to make America, the United States, No. 1 again in exports as we were 6 years ago from 1983 to 1989.

As the Constitution in article 2, section 2 clearly states, not only must we consent, but we must advise, and this resolution today is part of that advice that we are giving to the administration.

I urge a strong vote in support of this resolution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my qualified support for fast-track trade negotiation. But my support, and I believe that of many of my colleagues, should not be construed by the President as a blank check. We are not giving the President permission to send the Nation headfirst into a potentially destructive round of negotiations. Rather, we insist upon a carefully thought-out, long-term plan of action.

No one can deny the benefits of a healthy trade relationship with our North American neighbors. As nations increasingly come to the view that open markets are in their best interests, the laws of comparative advantage will continue to gain momentum. A unified Europe will be an economic juggernaut after 1992. The strength of the Pacific Rim economy has left many of our industries in turmoil.

A dynamic North American economy is unquestionably in our national interest. Mexico is already our third largest trading partner. By the year 2000, Mexico will be a market of 100 million people. My home State of Utah already exports over $30 million in goods to Mexico annually. Increasingly, our struggling economy will have great difficulty competing in world markets without stronger economic ties to our large southern neighbor.

Many of my colleagues share my belief that this debate must serve to remind the administration that our support is tentative. I give no commitment to vote for the end product of their negotiations. The process of economic integration in Europe has taken decades to evolve to its present stage. Time and careful efforts will be required to achieve a comparable, and competitive, unified North American market.

This is a matter of international trade, not interstate commerce, and the administration must extract a commitment that Mexico will enforce its environmental, OSHA, child labor, and minimum wage standards. We must question the extent to which the Mexican Government can adequately enforce its labor and environmental standards. In spite of the numerous reassurances of Carla Hills, Robert Mosbacher, and William Reilly, I have serious concerns about the President's commitment to heed the recommendations of this resolution. When asked to quantify the impact on American industry, the President has merely assured us of ambiguous trickle-down benefits for American workers.

Free and fair trade is so vital to our national interest that the administration must be given an opportunity to formulate a trade agreement. Hence, my vote today is, in a very real sense, an act of faith, but it is faith which will be accompanied by careful surveillance. "Faith Without Works," as the Bible tells us, "is dead." The trade bill will be too, so far as I am concerned, if it does not reflect these concerns.

Fears of widespread job losses pervade today's debate. For thousands of American families, these fears are very real. But let us look beyond emotions and have a look at the United States-Mexican trade relationship today. The tariff on our exports to Mexico is 10 percent. The tariff on goods from Mexico is 3 percent. Thus, passage of a trade bill and the elimination of these tariffs alone creates a disincentive for companies to move operations.

The wide disparities in wages are another major point of contention in today's debate. Wages in Mexico are so low that there is, in fact, little preventing American industry from fleeing to Mexico at this very moment. A free-trade agreement would only raise these wage rates. And as Mexico is better able to enforce its existing labor and environmental laws, the incentive to flee to Mexico is diminished even further. The conditions are ripe for a mutually beneficial agreement, and we should allow the administration the opportunity to continue these negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, we will subject that final agreement to the most careful scrutiny possible. The administration must show continued commitment to environmental protection; it must be committed to working closely with the Mexican Government to ensure adequate enforcement of minimum wage, child labor and occupational safety standards; it must protect our Nation's intellectual property rights; and it must ensure enforcement of point-of-origin rules. Only a commitment to substantive action will suffice—assurances of the Mexican Government's good intentions will not.

It is understood that, when an agreement is finally reached, there will be tremendous pressure by the President, the minority, and many special interest groups to sign the agreement—regardless of its weakneses. But, Mr. Speaker, let me make it perfectly clear that I will reject an agreement if the administration fails to adequately address the concerns laid out in the resolution.

I believe that this debate sends a clear signal to the President as to Congress' demands for a free-trade agreement. If, in a few months, the administration puts forth an agreement only to find it rejected, it will have no one to blame but itself. I urge the administration to live up to its written commitments—we will be watching.

## SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. McCATHRAN, one of his secretaries.

□ 1520

## EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESPECT TO THE U.S. OBJECTIVES THAT SHOULD BE ACHIEVED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS OF FUTURE TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining all the way around?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] has 10 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 9½ minutes; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] has 8 minutes; and the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] has 8 minutes.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], from San Diego, who is a new Member of this House and represents the border.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extension of fast-track negotiation authority.

Mr. Speaker, I live in San Diego, which is one of the border cities, and I live free trade, antidrugs, illegal immigration every single day.

As a matter of fact, I went across the aisle, and some of the people here who are from the inner sections of the United States, several Members asked me what was the flag that I was wearing next to the American flag. It happens to be the flag of Mexico, and not many people knew that.

I deal with Mexico daily. We had over 65 million personnel come across the San Diego border last year. Each one of those individuals spent over $350 per individual. That meant economy to the United States.

It has been stated before by my good friend, the gentleman from New Mexico, that over 70 cents of every dollar goes to the purchasing of exports in Mexico itself, and I think that is important.

Mr. Speaker, President Salinas de Gortari to me is the Abe Lincoln of Mexico. I have been there for over 25 years. I have been to Mexico over a thousand times, and each time I see improvements from President Salinas.

They tell us that pollution is rampant, and it was at one time, where Mexico had more environmental laws on the books than we had in the United States, but they did not follow those laws; they did not enforce them. Well, I can tell you today they do.

On March 18, President Salinas shut down an oil refinery that was polluting. It cost him over $500 million and over 5,000 Mexican jobs. He is committed to cleaning up the environment and helping us. I border the Tijuana River. My good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], who is on the opposite side of this, worked very hard for years and years to clean up the Tijuana River. Commissioner Genaji, with the help of President Salinas, is establishing a sewage system to take care of that.

The maquiladoras were shut down—some of the businesses—because they were polluting the environment. Those are all positives.

The San Diego border has had over 800,000 pounds of cocaine come across.

Chief Burgreen, the chief of police, told me just a few weeks ago that the Mexican Government is working with the United States more than they ever have in the past. It is stopping illegal immigration. It is stopping the flow of drugs coming across the border and working with us on binational issues.

We have looked at a binational airport. We have looked at binational trade. We have looked at others as well that they are helping us with.

Mr. George Gerstenberg, from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, has stated that violations from Mexico on produce are less than American products.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gerstenberg stated that the EPA and FDA use of pesticides is not accepted in the United States. Mexico is shutting that down. I have got a bottle here that a special-interest group put out and said that DDT was used. DDT has been banned. They said in one of the statements, "If you vote for free trade, your produce will be slathered with this deadly stuff." It does not exist in Mexico.

I am in strong support of a free-trade agreement.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], a highly respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today I will cast a vote that I believe will directly and profoundly affect Connecticut's economic future. I will vote to authorize the President to enter into GATT negotiations and negotiations with Mexico and Canada on a possible North American free-trade agreement. These negotiations seek new, broader international law to assure peaceful governance of economic competition and promote worldwide economic growth.

For those committed to a more peaceful and a less hungry world, this vote is historic. For a state as dependent on exports as is Connecticut, this vote is crucial.

Exports are the lifeblood of Connecticut's economy as of the Nation's economy. Even during last year's recession, our exports increased by 17 percent, and the expectation is that the demand for Connecticut-made machine tools, telecommunications equipment, and other products will grow significantly through free-trade agreements. For example, a recent trade exposition in Mexico showed clearly that there is real export growth opportunity for Connecticut. Our exports to Mexico rose 75 percent in the past 2 years, as Mexico unilaterally dropped selected tariffs and opened some of her markets. If negotiations further drop barriers, there is every reason to expect exports of a great variety to increase.

Despite Connecticut's almost sure gains under the agreement, a number of interest groups are opposed to it. Some labor organizations fear that American workers will lose jobs because of lower wages in Mexico. In fact, companies that need lower labor costs to remain competitive have already moved to foreign soil. This has kept some American companies alive and enabled many to preserve and even expand more highly skilled and higher paying jobs here at home.

We do, however, need strong support for workers and communities that suf-

fer dislocation, not just as a result of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, but for all new U.S. trade agreements, changes in defense policy, and improvements in environmental laws. We also need safeguards in any trade agreement that will assure gradual transitions and minimize the anguish of change.

Some environmental groups argue that American companies will rush to Mexico to avoid our tough environmental laws. A decade ago, this may have been true, but Mexico has made tremendous progress in strengthening its environmental laws and enforcement. The fact is, Mexico recently passed a comprehensive environmental protection law in 1988 that closely parallels the tough standards administrated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and our States. Mexico beefed up its enforcement budget by 636 percent in the past year alone. Over 5,000 inspection visits were conducted in the past 2 years, resulting in 980 temporary or permanent plant shutdowns.

Mr. Speaker, the opponents of moving forward under so-called fast-track authority oppose moving fast and urge some kind of normal process. In point in fact, fast track is not fast. The United States-Canada Trade Agreement took 4 years to negotiate under fast-track authority. Further, no other authority exists under which a multifaceted trade agreement can be negotiated. The fast-track laws were written by Congress specifically to increase congressional influence during negotiations by spelling out a clear consultative process. Further, many of our toughest trade laws that best protect American industry have been passed as part of the fast-track process.

Free trade negotiations do not result in agreements that impose a one size fits all solution. They merely structure economic growth between nations. The United States-Canada agreement lowered trade barriers in some areas, set out a program of gradual change in other areas, and set aside other problems for future discussion, specifically because our national interests differ so significantly in some areas that they could not be reconciled at this time.

At the heart of this debate is the future of our relationships with our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere and our trading partners around the world. Technology has irreversibly shrunk our world and linked the future of all nations together. We must sit at the negotiating table with Mexico as we do with the nations of Europe and Asia. Otherwise, we will send a signal to the rest of Latin America that we don't need their markets, we don't want their goods, we don't care about their future progress.

As the nations of the world explore open markets and new relations, the United States cannot afford to stand in isolation. Trade agreements structure the development of economic relationships among nations and thereby contribute to the prosperity of all and to the creation of a more peaceful world. This is not a zero-sum game. We can all be winners or all losers. This is especially true for Connecticut employees and employers alike. I vote for America to win. I urge a yes vote on House Resolution 146 to assure the President the negotiating authority he needs until the direction from the Congress that will assure successful negotiations.

□ 1530

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the fast track. Let me say, first, I want to congratulate both the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for their excellent leadership on this issue.

I also want to say, ladies and gentlemen, that basically fast track makes eminent sense. I am a free trader. I believe that America must compete effectively to stay No. 1 in the world. We have to successfully compete economically. That if we build walls, plain and simple, yes, we will have trade among ourselves, but in a new international economy, that will automatically consign the United States to a third-rate power.

So while the Japanese, the Germans, and the others are trading all over the whole world, America is only trading with itself. That is a formula for disaster. It is a tough fight. The whole world was our oyster after World War II, and it is not any more. However, we can do it.

I have faith in the American people, American industry, and American workers, that given time, we will succeed, and to not go to fast track is simply saying that we all know it, that we will not have free trade, that this group or that group is going to stand in the way, because they might be hurt despite what is good for the whole country.

We must have fast track. I say to my colleagues, very simply, I am not sure that the agreement negotiated with Mexico is going to make sense. In the world's economy, negotiating with a country that has a much lower standard of living—and there are other competitors—that may not be the right thing to do. But to say, now, that we do not even want to let the President negotiate a treaty—and we all know there can only be one negotiator, not 535—does not make sense. It is turning our back on the challenge. It is saying that America cannot make it. It is saying that we cannot trade openly and win the competition with Japan, Germany, and whoever else. I urge a vote for fast track.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], a thoughtful and hard-working member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 146, legislation which authorizes the extension of fast-track procedures to implement trade agreements entered into after May 31, 1991.

For the better part of this century, Congress and the executive branch have recognized that the negotiation and implementation of trade agreements require special cooperation. That partnership was reflected in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and reiterated in the Trade Acts of 1974, 1979, and 1988. While assuring Congress meaningful participation throughout the negotiation process, fast track provides two guarantees essential to the successful negotiation of trade agreements—a vote on implementing legislation within a fixed period of time and no amendments to that legislation.

Critics charge that a vote for fast track is a vote to abrogate congressional responsibility. Nothing could be further from the truth. Fast track includes extensive consultation requirements. It allows committees with jurisdiction to review and recommend changes to any agreement before it is signed. Fast track enables Congress to hold oversight hearings as well as draft implementing legislation. Finally, under fast-track procedures, Congress has the opportunity to accept or reject any agreement that is negotiated. I ask my colleagues, is that an abrogation of our congressional responsibility?

Critics charge that a vote for fast track is a vote against the environment. Let's listen to some of the facts: To begin with, Mexico has no intentions of becoming a dumping ground for North American industry. In 1988, Mexico adopted comprehensive pro-environment legislation that closely parallels the tough standards set forth by Congress and the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

The Mexican Government has committed itself to improving enforcement. Between 1989 and early 1991, the Government of Mexico imposed some 980 temporary and 82 permanent industrial closures for noncompliance. To illustrate its seriousness, on March 18, 1991, the Government permanently shut down Mexico's largest oil refinery, costing 5,000 jobs.

President Bush has promised Congress that the United States will ensure that our right to safeguard the environment is preserved in the North American Free-Trade Agreement. We shall maintain the right to exclude any products that do not meet U.S. health and safety standards as well as maintain our right to impose stringent pesticide, energy conservation, toxic

waste, and health and safety standards. Furthermore, USTR will coordinate an interagency review, drawing on the resources of agencies with environmental expertise and in consultation with interested members of the public.

Critics charge that a vote for fast track is a vote against labor and American jobs. Again, let's listen to some of the facts: At present, our exports to Mexico support some 538,000 United States jobs. Several Government and independent studies suggest that job growth under a free-trade agreement with Mexico would see a 64,000 net increase, the bulk in manufacturing.

The Office of the United States Trade Representative calculates that a successful GATT round would boost U.S. GNP by $1 trillion over the next 10 years. That's an extra $16,800 in income for every family of four over the next decade. On the other hand a failed GATT round would jeopardize American exports, risking the export-related jobs of millions of Americans.

The Mexican Government has ratified 73 International Labor Organization [ILO] conventions on workers' rights. Mexico's laws provide for comprehensive rights and standards for workers in all sectors. In fact, Mexico's labor standards are comparable to those in the United States, Europe, and other industrialized countries. A substantially higher proportion of the Mexican work force is unionized than is the United States work force.

United States and Mexican officials have agreed to address the specific concerns addressed by the labor community. Those include: occupational health and safety standards; child labor; work conditions and labor standards. Finally, by promoting economic growth in Mexico, a free-trade agreement will generate greater prosperity and resources that Mexico could devote to improving the situation of workers.

In closing, let's not judge a trade agreement that has yet to be negotiated. Now more than ever we must recognize the importance of international trade. If we are going to continue to enhance economic growth, then access to foreign markets must be maintained and expanded. I urge my colleagues to vote for economic growth and prosperity by voting in support of House Resolution 146.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Stanford, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from "some other" university.

It is an error to attempt to repeal the laws of economics. We have tried this a number of times. We have tried to repeal the law of supply and demand by price control. In the trade area we tried to do this by allowing tariffs to spiral and by import quotas on particular terms.

The truth is we cannot sooner or later repeal the law of economics. We may as well adapt to it. We have today a chance to allow the law of economics to apply in the area of law, the law of comparative advantage.

What does that law mean? Well, it would not mean an end to jobs in the United States. No, far from it. It would mean a shift more toward capital-intensive jobs. That is to say, American laborers would have to work more in the capital-intensive areas. It is true that products that have more of a labor advantage would flow down to Mexico. That is something that I think Members should stipulate. The point is, though, that that is not bad.

Think about what in the United States is a capital-intensive industry: agriculture. We are one of the most, in fact, we are the most capital-intensive agricultural sector in the world, not to mention the fact that a fair amount of our agricultural produce is prevented from getting into Mexico by a very high tariff structure.

In the intellectual property area, fast track means we can continue to negotiate in GATT, where we might be able to achieve some hoped-for accommodation of intellectual property rights throughout the world, so the products of our minds are fairly able to compete throughout the world.

Do not fear the application of the law of economics. Do not think we can repeal them. By voting for fast track today we can say to the world and to the newly developing economies—particularly those coming out of socialism—capitalism works. We can say to our hemisphere, trade with Mexico is as important as trade with Canada. We can say to ourselves, Americans can compete.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, many dire consequences have been predicted for the United States and Mexico by opponents of the fast-track procedure. They warn us of environmental havoc, job losses for American workers, and misery for Mexican workers. I understand the apprehension of those opposed to this agreement but the evidence I have seen did not persuade me to cast a vote to revoke the President's authority to seek increased economic growth and expanded trade in the United States through a North American Free-Trade Agreement.

I have seen documentation that the trade we have had with Mexico has been very beneficial to our Nation. More specifically, since 1986, hundreds of thousands of American workers have been kept on the job because United States manufacturing exports to Mexico have more than doubled from $10.4 billion to $20.4 billion.

I have heard from business concerns and individuals in my district who are very worried about this legislation. I appreciate the threat that textile, fiber and apparel industries fear from a free-trade agreement and my decision to support the fast-track process has not been made without considerable study and thought. In the end, it seemed to me that regardless of whether or not a free-trade agreement is reached, many of the estimated job losses that would go to Mexico—would go anyway—or they would go to Asian countries where the United States has less influence to address concerns like child labor and environmental abuse.

Also since 1986, the United States textile, fiber and apparel industries have moved from a trade deficit to a trade surplus with Mexico. A recent Labor Department study suggests that the abolition of remaining tariff barriers between the United States and Mexico would bring a net total of between 44,000 and 64,000 manufacturing jobs to the United States over the next decade.

It is my conviction that U.S. interests are best served by a trade policy that seeks to open markets for U.S. goods and services, not by closing our own markets. The least we can do is allow the negotiations to continue and give the President a chance to work toward an agreement which will provide expanded trade opportunities for the United States and the economic benefits that accompany it.

If the final product doesn't do that, the resolution maintains the constitutional right of Congress to be consulted regularly during the course of any negotiations carried out under this procedure. If Members of Congress are not satisfied with the agreement, then they have the right to reject whatever is negotiated.

Beyond that if an approval of the treaty leads to job displacements the Gephardt resolution and the President's request include provisions designed to assist import-sensitive industries adjust to the displacement and assure adequate assistance and retraining for dislocated workers.

In closing, I want to state that my support for the fast-track procedure does not guarantee my support for the final agreement. I will certainly not vote in favor of any trade agreement that is not, in my opinion, in the best interests of the United States of which will seriously harm the people in my district.

And I hope and firmly believe that the administration will continue to work with Congress in a bipartisan manner to fashion an agreement which will better America and foster our improving relations with Mexico.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have seen much debate on the issue before us today and we will see further

heated debate in the future as we proceed through the negotiating process on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the North American Free-Trade Agreement. We have heard supporting and opposing views on the opening of markets in this new global economy and the potential impact such an agreement will have on America's business, industrial, and agricultural sectors, as well as the American laborer. The agriculture industry in Florida, a $6.3 billion industry, is largely comprised of citrus fruit, and vegetable production that competes with Mexican production a majority of the year. These producers are not protected by any USDA subsidy program.

The only programs they must follow are regulations from EPA and FDA in order to guarantee food quality and safety for America's consumers.

In order to guarantee the American agriculture producer the opportunity to compete on a fair and level playing field in the international trade arena, we must ensure their concerns are adequately addressed during the negotiations with Mexico.

It is imperative that the administration use the expertise and knowledge of the Agriculture Technical and Policy Advisory Committees and other technical advisory committees in order to ensure adequate input from sectors within American agriculture and business. Mr. Speaker, the assurances I have received form President Bush and his Cabinet leave me comfortable that Florida's agriculture industry will have extensive input into the formulation and negotiation of a North American Free-Trade Agreement.

In the interest of the American people and after many months of meetings and discussions. I am convinced that Ambassador Hills will work in earnest with Congress and the American agriculture and business interests as we move through these negotiations.

In closing, I would state to my colleagues today's vote sounds the bell for the beginning of the game. In the future should we decide the playing field is not level and the competition is not fair, we can call the game. If America is allowed to compete freely and fairly, we can proceed into a world market that will greatly benefit the United States.

I encourage my colleagues to support House Resolution 146, which supports the trade negotiations between the United States and Mexico based on President Bush's commitments on key environmental, health, and labor issues.

□ 1540

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER].

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Let's be clear about what we have done here today. We have authorized the President to attempt to negotiate a treaty that will eventually transform the United States, Mexico, and Canada into one large free trade zone.

We have done so in the belief that a treaty, properly negotiated, can enhance the economic well-being of our country and its people. We have done so because we believe it will create more American jobs, good-paying jobs to support American families. And, we have done so because we believe there are large, previously untapped markets for American-made goods in Mexico that will now open to us.

Last week a friend of mine, someone who worked for a number of years at one of our two auto assembly plants in Delaware called me asking if I were going to be voting for fast-track authority, which I have done today.

My friend asked, "Why?"

I explained that I thought it was in the best long-term economic interest of our country and its people and went on to explain why.

My friend expressed disappointment, almost a sense of abandonment, not so much by me but by the Congress in general.

He said, "How about our plant workers who are going to lose their jobs in the years ahead?"

I acknowledged to my friend the prospect that, yes, regrettably, there likely would be some displacement. There will be a need on our part to try to ease as best we can the transition of people from our livelihood to perhaps another. There will be a need for retraining.

Indeed, in response to the prodding of our own leadership here, the President and his administration have promised to be sensitive and to look to the needs of working Americans who may one day face difficulties because of free trade agreements. That may be negotiated.

The resolution before us today seeks to make sure that the actions of this administration in the months ahead match the words of the administration that we have heard to this point in time.

On an earlier day, another speaker once said that "a rising tide lifts all boats." This rising tide of the free trade agreement will lift most boats. This rising tide will not lift all boats. Some boats will take on water. Some boats may sink. Some people may lose their jobs. Some families may be placed in jeopardy.

Those of us who advocate trying to negotiate a United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement with out votes today say to American workers, "Trust me. We won't forget you, those of you whose livelihood may be at stake."

We politicians are famous for promises that we make but do not always keep. This is a promise that must be kept. As this administration attempts to negotiate this treaty in the days ahead, it must be sensitive and be true to the commitment that we have made to workers who may be one day displaced. To the extent that we are true to the spirit of this resolution, 1 year from now, when we vote on a free trade agreement, that agreement may be approved. If we forget the spirit and letter of this resolution, I say to the President, 1 year from now when we vote on a free trade agreement with Mexico, that agreement will be defeated.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of extending fast-track authority.

We are standing at a major crossroads today, debating the basic authority of the executive branch to negotiate agreements with our trading partners. We can go forward or backward. We can forge ahead or turn within ourselves. We can make progress with our friends and trading partners, or we can turn our backs on them. Major choices on extremely important public policies.

I take no second place to anyone in my commitment to jobs creation in my district and to environmental protection. I have a 100-percent record of support with the League of Conservation Voters. I am proud of it, and I earned it.

Either we are going to help Mexico win its battle with environmental degradation or we are going to permit the degradation to continue. The responsible environmental position is to work with Mexico, and we cannot do that if we are not at the table—pushing, prodding, demanding.

Prosperity in North America will give all of us the resources to match our desires for a clean environment. Wishing will not do it. Hand wringing will not do it. Doing it will do it.

Times are tough for manufacturing in the valleys that comprise my congressional district, but we know that our region has a manufacturing future because our resources are great and our work force even greater.

Manufacturing is staging a comeback in America, and U.S. exports are expanding, the trade deficit is narrowing, and exports will hasten the recovery.

Trade policies on our part have created a favorable environment abroad for United States export expansion, and nowhere is this more clearly borne out than with Mexico. United States exports to Mexico have grown from $12.4 billion in 1986 to $28.4 billion in 1990. The trend is up, and the only way to keep it going up is to work with Mexico. Right now, United States goods and services are responsible for 70 percent of all the goods and services

Mexico buys from other countries. It is a premier market for items made in America—made in America by American workers.

It would be foolhardy to let that progress slip away. Barriers against United States goods sold in Mexico have been coming down. We must continue to work to have the barriers completely removed.

If we turn our backs on the Mexican market now, there are others in the international arena who can and will scoop up what we foolishly throw away. The Japanese are tough aggressive trading partners, and I do not see any sense in handing them our export markets on a silver platter.

Changes in the economic relationships among nations are inevitable. They are taking place now, with or without a free trade agreement. It is better that Americans seek to govern this process of change, rather than being turned into its victim.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gephardt amendment. I do so, Mr. Speaker, because up to the time that I read the amendment, I had not made up my mind how I was going to vote on this subject matter. I was concerned about the fact that the health and safety standards of this Nation would not be included in that negotiation, but the Gephardt amendment is very clear. It says that any North American Free-Trade Agreement must maintain strict health and safety standards.

Then it goes on to assure me that other matters will be taken care of. For example, I was very concerned about the effect it would have on workers here in the United States and whether or not there would be job training and other benefits. Again the Gephardt amendment addresses itself to that problem. It says that any trade agreement must be accompanied by an effective and adequately funded worker adjustment program developed by the administration and the Congress of the United States.

In other words, it is not just the administration that is going to do it. We in Congress will play a role in that regard.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that granting this fast-track authority will eventually result in a treaty. It will result in something that will be beneficial not only to Mexico, but to the United States. I am sure it will create more jobs in Mexico.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] is recognized for a total of 2 minutes.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank all of my colleagues that I solicited to vote and who voted for the fast track approval. This is to assure you of the commitments made by me under the jurisdiction that I and our committee will have.

The concerns expressed will be addressed, and hopefully they will be alleviated to some extent or totally.

We are not going out to chase phantoms in the sky. We are not going to stop competition altogether, but your legitimate concerns will be addressed.

Let me assure you that what happens today is not a victory for one side or another. It is just a procedure. The work is yet ahead of us, and I hope that we can continue working with good will and with the enthusiasm necessary to see that we enhance our global position as a country and that we bring two friends, Canada and Mexico along with us, when we do so.

The concerns that you have expressed to me will be addressed, and hopefully those concerns will be alleviated or met, I can assure you of that; but now we need to work together to see that the final task is one that all of us can be proud of and one that will make us worthy to be remembered for having been a part of that final conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and the gentlewoman for their time.

□ 1550

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of fast track.

GET FAST TRACK ON TRACK

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for allowing the President to negotiate trade agreements under expedited fast-track procedures.

Mr. Speaker, this vote will have major long-term economic consequences, not only for the United States, but for Canada, Mexico, all the nations involved in the Uruguay round of the GATT talks, and all the countries involved in the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative, which will seek free-trade agreements—FTA's—with the nations of Central and South America. This amounts to well over 100 countries. It will characterize the tone and scope of U.S. trade relations for the next decade.

Opponents of free trade would have us believe that this vote is really going to be on the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. I am sure many of my colleagues in the House have various reasons for their opinions on NAFTA. But to portray this vote as a vote for NAFTA is putting the cart before the horse. As Senator LLOYD BENTSEN has put it, this is a vote on a clean sheet upon which U.S. trade relations will be drafted. And a vote to deny fast track for any reason will tie the administration's hands in negotiating all trade agreements, including the all-important GATT. Indeed, continuing GATT negotiations is reason enough to support fast track.

Opponents of free trade say fast track will take Congress out of the discussion on NAFTA. Not so. Under fast track, the administration is merely given wider latitude to negotiate an agreement for congressional approval. The administration is still required to continually notify and consult with Congress, a policy to which the administration is committed. Once an agreement is negotiated and submitted to Congress, a vote must occur within 60 days. What disturbs some of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, is that no amendments are permissible under fast-track procedures. But this merely reflects the simple reality that trade agreements, like treaties, can unravel if multiple amendments are attached. How can a President assure a negotiating partner that the deal they reach is the deal Congress will consider? Fast track assures a simple up-or-down vote before the full House and Senate. If the Congress doesn't like the agreement, it can vote it down.

Now I know we in this body loathe not being able to put our own personal stamps on legislation. We all like getting a shot at amending bills and gaining a little political mileage. Well, the Senate is familiar with this type of situation. They are, after all, in a similar position when they consider any treaty. And trade agreements are, effectively, intricate trade treaties with foreign nations. Their strength—like those negotiating military or diplomatic terms—comes from the ability of negotiators to guarantee that the terms agreed to will be the terms voted upon.

Fast track is not a new invention. It has been used since 1934, and has proven very effective in striking a balance between congressional oversight and executive power in forging trade agreements. It was used to implement the results of the Tokyo round of GATT negotiations in 1979, the FTA with Israel in 1985, and the FTA with Canada in 1988. Congress approved all of these agreements with resounding majorities.

What is at stake today as we consider this extension of expedited negotiating procedure? Nothing less than the structure of U.S. trade relations into the foreseeable future. This in itself is reason enough for some of my colleagues, representing their adopted big labor constituencies, to find occasion to scuttle any possibility of fast-track extension. They fear free trade. They fear even letting an agreement get as far as a written document. They do not understand that, as Mr. Sidney Weintraub from the Center for Strategic and International Studies so aptly put it, free trade is not really about trade—it is about income and employment. Unfortunately for big labor, free trade bodes ill for organized unions, as opportunities will come not as government-created, union-prone jobs, but as private sector, union-resistant jobs.

The most important agreement to be negotiated under fast-track extension will be, of course, the Uruguay round of GATT. This is critical. The failure of GATT would likely lead to increased pressures to raise trade and investment barriers around the globe. A rapid move away from open markets could trigger a global trade war and would have devastating

economic results, culminating in a global recession or worse. Our last all-out trade war provoked, if not initiated, the Great Depression which, incidentally, turned out to be the period when labor organizers made their enormous strides—something to think about next time you notice big labor's full page ads condemning fast track in the Washington Post.

Mr. Speaker, exports are increasingly important to U.S. economic growth. Our merchandise exports expanded by almost 75 percent between 1986 and 1990, accounting for over 40 percent of the 4-year growth in U.S. GNP. In 1990 alone, merchandise exports expanded by 8.6 percent, yet accounted for 88 percent of GNP growth.

Conventional wisdom predicts that our current recession will be relatively short. Whether or not this comes to pass will depend on the export sector, and the outlook for growth this year appears favorable. It is estimated that if U.S. exports grew by 6.6 percent this year, it would add 1 percentage point to GNP growth. Last year goods and services exports grew by 6.2 percent.

But regardless of the favorable outlook and in the looming shadow of such tremendous economic opportunities, opponents of free trade are comfortable in playing upon the fears of the American public that a free-trade agreement with Mexico would exacerbate existing cultural and economic divisions between our two countries. They characterize support for fast track as a vote against U.S. labor to the benefit of Mexican labor, against the environment, and in favor of unchecked illegal immigration. Nothing could be further from the truth. More rightly, NAFTA would make manufactured American goods more competitive worldwide, increase exports for both the United States and its neighbors, create more American jobs in the long run, and help Mexico escape the cycle of poverty which makes its environmental record so disastrous and is the cause of the frenetic flight north by Mexican citizens.

If NAFTA is negotiated successfully after fast-track approval, the free flow of goods between the three countries of North America would create a huge market comprising some 360 million consumers—88 million in Mexico alone—with a total output of about $6 trillion. Canada and Mexico currently rank first and third respectively among United States trading partners. The United States in turn, accounts for two-thirds of their total trade. Three-way trade came to about $237 billion in 1990. Since 1980, United States exports to Mexico and Canada have risen faster than those to the rest of the world, from $55.3 billion to $111.4 billion.

United States trade with Mexico has improved substantially since Mexico joined the GATT in 1986 and began a unilateral policy of lowering trade barriers. Since then, United States exports have more than doubled. Consumer goods exported from the United States to Mexico rose from $1 billion to $3 bilion, while exports of capital goods grew from $5 billion to about $9.5 billion. By 1990, Mexico was our third largest agricultural export market. Major United States exports to Mexico include motor vehicle parts, processed foods, electronic components, telecommunications equipment, electrical switchgear, and aircraft.

Yet Mexico still maintains many barriers to United States goods. Mexican tariffs range from 10 to 20 percent—United States tariffs on Mexican goods range from zero to 8.5 percent—and a restrictive import licensing policy, affecting 40 percent of United States agricultural exports, remains effective. And though Mexico has liberalized its investment climate, many United States investments in manufacturing and services are still forbidden. This is why NAFTA would be so beneficial for the United States.

A major benefit for U.S. businesses is they would be able to couple high-technology with low wages to compete more effectively with competitors in asia and Europe. The current maquiladora system offers a glimpse of that potential. Maquiladoras are assembly plants located in Mexico near the United States border which export finished goods back to the United States. Only the value added by inexpensive Mexican labor is subject to tariffs. Labor unions claim massive numbers of U.S. jobs are lost due to the maquiladoras. But it is estimated that for every one job created in the maquiladoras, another is created in the United States, especially in those industries that supply parts which are assembled in Mexico. And according to many of the American companies already operating under the maquiladora system, if it were not for this cheap source of labor, they would have long ago moved offshore, out of North America entirely. This is a simple reality and an eventuality which would be much worse for both U.S. workers and consumers.

A 1988 study of 900 United States firms by the USITC revealed that the vast majority of those surveyed believed that assembly plants in Mexico had improved their overall international competitiveness. Most of the firms also indicated that if the Mexican alternative were not available, they would probably have moved to East Asia.

The use of cheap labor is a business tactic that has been used to great success by the Japanese in Singapore, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Red China. It is also supposed to be one of Eastern Europe's most attractive investment features. And besides, evidence suggests that if the United States does not move in, others will. Whereas the maquiladoras used to be almost exclusively American, now Sony, Matsushita, Samsung, and Toshiba are active players.

Improvements in the U.S. economy due to NAFTA will be largest in regions close to the border, my home State of California, for instance. Over all, it is estimated that NAFTA will result in an increase of 44,000 to 64,000 jobs in the United States over the next decade, the bulk being of the high-paying manufacturing type.

But what makes NAFTA so important geopolitically is that it will serve United States vital interests by making Mexico a more stable and prosperous country. This will translate into progress on such important issues such as drug interdiction, immigration, and the environment. Illegal immigration from Mexico is at an all-time high. The Mexican Government has little incentive to limit the exodus because the Mexican economy simply can not support the work force. Workers who travel to the United States for employment also send wages back to family members in Mexico, thereby contributing to the Mexican economy. A more prosperous Mexico would not be a place to escape en masse, but a nation of increasing opportunity.

Similarly, Mexico's environmental record has been unfairly criticized. There is no doubt that an invigorated Mexican economy able to provide a better standards of living for 88 million Mexicans would be a major advance for the environment. The Mexican Government is sensitive to this issue. It recently announced that companies seeking to relocate in Mexico would have to comply with emission standards at least as strict as where they came from. The United States Environmental Protection Agency now has the first ever environmental attaché posted at the United States Embassy in Mexico City. And the United States and Mexico have signed agreements on the construction of a water treatment plant in Tijuana, Mexico, a sewage treatment plant in Nuevo Laredo, Mexico, and the expansion of an overburdened sewage treatment plant in Nogales. I think it is abundantly clear that further economic revitalization of Mexico would produce even greater results on vital environmental issues. After all, only prosperous countries can afford to protect the environment. Environmentalism is not for poor countries.

But the most important benefit of free trade with Mexico is that it will help ensure the political stability of Mexico. This is a country trying to shrug off a socialist economy that has subjugated its least fortunate citizens to abject poverty. A cracking economy, coupled with the political corruption that has tainted elections as well as everyday life, is creating a volatile social situation in Mexico. Everyone knows of the illegal immigration problem. Suppose we closed our border air-tight and there was no where for the campesinos, who are only seeking a better life, to run? Would not that create a dangerous situation? Many people—myself included—justly fear political unrest heretofore unseen so close to U.S. borders. The national security implications are phenomenal. We simply have to give Mexico the opportunity to support its own weight and assure its own stability.

In closing let me summarize for my protectionist friends, Mr. Speaker, the benefits of a NAFTA agreement—and I would remind you that there will not be so much as a draft until next year. NAFTA will help United States companies to meet the competition posed by other high-wage countries like Japan who already export low-wage, low value-added jobs elsewhere in Asia. It will increase U.S. income and employment over time. It will increase Mexican income growth. This, in turn, will benefit States bordering Mexico, increasing both exports and new jobs. The Bush administration plans to eliminate trade barriers gradually under NAFTA, and to set up worker adjustment programs to retrain displaced American workers. Further, NAFTA would help to stem illegal immigration, stabilize Mexican democracy, and solidify the economic reforms put into place by Mexican President Salinas. Indeed, an American failure to help our poor neighbor and third biggest trading partner prosper economically would be as shortsighted as Western Europe failing to assist Eastern Europe.

Fast track will allow these and other important decisions to be considered in the most expeditious manner possible. This is not a time for partisanship. It is a time for realistic appraisal of what is at stake in U.S. trade relations. Support fast track. Give the President the latitude he needs to negotiate agreements, and we will have an opportunity to pass judgments later.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I find it ironic that some of the members from Ohio and Michigan and other industrial States are opposing fast track. Ohio exported nearly half a billion dollars' worth of goods to Mexico, and Michigan exported almost 1½ billion dollars' worth. This figure has more than doubled since Mexico began liberalizing its trade barries in the late 1980's Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania together accounted for over $42 billion of worldwide exports in 1989, mostly manufacturing. Between 20,000 and 25,000 jobs are created for every 1 billion dollars' worth of exports. Manufacturing exports are the brightest spot in our economy. Those jobs are mostly high grade manufacturing jobs.

These Chicken Littles, that are claiming the sky is falling and the Mexicans are going to take away our manufacturng jobs, need to look at the exports to Mexico and the relative barriers. Even with high barriers to our products we are exporting to Mexico at a fantastic rate.

U.S. manufacturing, thought to be dying through the last decade, is actually, overall, making a huge comback. We are making a comeback for two reasons: Quality, and exchange rates which lead to exports. Just look at the front page of the Washington Post from this past Monday, and the front page of the New York Times from Sunday, April 21. That's right, "Made in America" is back in style. Manufacturing export-led growth is the best thing we have got going for our economy.

There's a lot we must do to promote "Made in America"—long-term investment incentives, rational regulation, and a more manufacturing-oriented use of the $70 billion Federal R&D economy but curtailing export, which is what the Dorgan resolution will do, goes in the exact opposite direction.

Ford, Xerox, IBM, Corning, and many others have improved their bottom lines dramatically since turning to the quality revoluton. These companies have also used the internatonal market to their favor. "Made in the USA" is once again becoming the international calling card for quality.

Let's talk competitiveness. There is no way overall that Mexican manufacturers can compete with the United States. Mexico needs our products and our industrial plants and equipment to bring itself out of the 19th century, and into 20th century.

Those Chicken Littles who say "the sky is falling" and "the Mexicans are coming," simply haven't seen the data.

We are headed into the 21st century. Mexico can not produce the high value-added, high technology, high quality products that we can. The quality revolution hasn't hit Mexico. Let's face it: "Made in Mexico" does not cut it like "Made in America." Mexico is not Japan, it is not Germany, it is not Great Britian, it is not even Korea.

Yes, they'll produce too, but the bulk of the tools and materials they produce with are likely to be made in the U.S.A. Seventy cents of every Mexican dollar spent on exports is spent on U.S. goods and services.

Pennsylvania alone accounted for over 580 million dollars' worth of exports in 1990, more than triple the 1987 figure. Furthermore, Pennsylvania exported over 8½ billion dollars' worth of largely manufactured goods to the world in 1989. And Mexico ranked fifth among the 177 markets for Pennsylvania products.

No one can tell me that expanded trade with Mexico is not going to be good for my constituents. In the industrial heartland, the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania, jobs and workers at AT&T, Air Products & Chemicals, Bethlehem Steel, Binney & Smith, Daytimers, Inc., Fuller Co., Ingersoll-Rand, ITT, Just Born Candies, Keystone Cement, Lutron, Inc., Mack Trucks, Pfizer, Inc., Rexroth, Inc., Rodale Press, Stanley-Vidmar, Union Pacific Corp., Victaulic Co., and many, many others will benefit from expanded trade with Mexico.

Getting beyond the rhetoric, expanded trade with Mexico is a win-win situation. It is good for U.S. manufacturing jobs and manufacturing workers, and it is good for States like Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan, as well as the U.S. economy overall. That is why I, from the manufacturing-intensive, union labor-rich Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania, support the President's request for extension of fast track, oppose the Dorgan resolution and support the Gephardt resolution.

U.S. FIRMS STAGE COMPETITIVE REVIVAL—INCREASED EFFICIENCY, CHEAPER DOLLAR HELPING TO BOOST EXPORTS

(By Evelyn Richards)

American manufacturers—written off by many commentators in the 1970s and '80s as dinosaurs doomed to succumb to Japanese and other foreign rivals—have staged a remarkable comeback reviving American competitiveness in many industries.

Xerox Corp. has halved the cost of producing a copier and has steadily increased its share of the U.S. market since the mid-1980s. General Electric Co.'s exports have grown more than 20 percent, to $6 billion, in the last two years. Cummins Engine Co., the largest American manufacturer of heavy-duty diesel truck engines, has doubled its output per worker since 1985 and cut prices of its engines by nearly a third.

Henry B. Schacht, president of Cummins, predicted in a recent interview that after the current recession ends, "the U.S. will be ferociously competitive in manufacturing. . . . It's a great place to be in business," he added, "a marvelously competitive base."

Such euphoria is not universal, and U.S. firms still face daunting competition from Europe, Japan and new economic powerhouses like South Korea and Taiwan. Administration officials describe friction between the United States and Japan as particularly tense now and recent studies of technological competition predict that Japanese firms will continue to chip away at the American lead in many key markets.

The determination of firms like Cummins to stay competitive internationally has cost a lot at the bottom line; profits have been down in recent years, and nonexistent since mid-1990, as a long-running slow-down for truckmakers took its toll.

But a five-year growth of American exports is strong evidence of restored competitiveness, according to many economists and business leaders. In the latest figures, released last week, U.S. sales overseas rose in March to their third-highest monthly level ever.

Part of the surge in exports can be explained by a dramatic lowering of the dollar's value compared with currencies in Japan and Europe. Engineered in 1985 by the Reagan administration amid a crisis for American manufacturers, the change provided U.S. producers the opportunity to cut prices sharply on goods sold abroad.

Exchange rate adjustments alone do not explain improving performance by U.S. firms, however. According to foreign and American business executives and experts, many U.S. companies have radically improved the quality of their products, cut costs and improved efficiency, and generally shown a willingness to learn lessons taught to them painfully by Japanese, German and other competitors.

The Cummins story, and others like it sprinkled throughout U.S. manufacturing, suggest that some American companies have made headway in honing their competitive edge in the last few years.

"The fears of deindustrialization—the notion that our ability to produce goods has diminished—were exaggerated," said Robert Z. Lawrence, an economist at the Brookings Institution and an authority on international competition.

Statistics show that U.S.-based manufacturing companies remain highly competitive in a wide range of products, including diesel engines, heavy construction equipment, computer software, high-speed computers, medical instruments, aircraft, chemicals and pharmaceuticals.

Many of the success stories suggest that U.S. companies have learned from their mistakes.

Xerox for example, regained lost ground by improving quality. When low-cost, high-quality Japanese producers began cutting into Xerox's sales of small office copiers in the United States. Xerox officials embarked on a worldwide effort to improve the quality of their products—reducing defects that slow down production lines, raising the performance of equipment and making goods that are more in tune with the needs of customers.

To get ideas of how to do this, they studied the way Ford Motor Co. lays out its assembly lines, how General Electric Co. uses robots and how American Hospital Supply tracks its inventory. They sent dozens of

managers to Japanese companies, including their affiliate Fuji Xerox, to study how Japanese firms improve quality and work closely with suppliers to reduce the number of defective parts.

The efforts paid off. In 1980, the firm found 97 defects for every 100 copiers rolling off its assembly line. Now it finds only 12. In one piece of the market for copiers used in small businesses, it has built back its share of the market to 20 percent from berely 1 percent in the mid-1980s.

"It's a new Xerox today," said industry expert Lynn Ritter of Dataquest Inc., a research firm in San Jose.

In other sectors of the economy, some of the toughest critics acknowledge that Ameican firms have improved quality.

During a 1985 interview. Tadashi Sasaki, then a high-ranking official of Japan's Sharp Corp., had a low opinion of American-made silicon chips, the tiny circuits at the heart of Sharp's computers, calculators and other electronic products. "When we take components from a U.S. company, we are very nervous," he said.

Sasaki acknowledged recently that U.S. firms are doing better. "The quality, delivery, service and price [have] been improved," he wrote in response to questions. Last year, foreign chips, mostly ones made by U.S. companies, accounted for 17.6 percent of all semiconductors Sharp bought, up nearly 5 percentage points in a year.

When Motorola Inc. decided to redesign its assembly line in Boynton Beach, Fla., where it makes pocket pagers, it sent teams all over the world looking for good ideas. The revamped operation has reduced the time between the placing of an order and shipment from the factory to two hours from three weeks.

Motorola believes the efficiency gains have helped keep it in the pager market despite tough competition from Japan. The company won a contract to be the first U.S. firm supplying pagers to Japanese telecommunications giant Nippon Telegraph & Telephone Corp.

Other companies have succeeded by improving technology. In the bleak years for American industry in the early 1980s, General Electric's power-generation business withered, forcing it to close factories.

The company used the slack period to develop new "combined cycle" turbine technology that attracted orders from utility companies in Japan and enabled G.E. to keep a strong global position despite stronger competition from overseas. It has been doing similarly well in many other product lines.

In 1990 the U.S. firm's exports of turbines, aircraft engines, refrigerators, light bulbs, X-ray equipment and other items rose to $6 billion, a $1.1 billion gain in two years.

Across many industries, productivity—the measure of the value of goods turned out per hour by one worker—improved dramatically in the past decade, as old plants were closed and others were modernized or built from scratch.

From 1981 to 1990, manufacturing productivity grew at an average 3.5 percent a year, compared with 2.3 percent a year in the 1970s. At the close of the decade, productivity in U.S. factories remained 30 percent higher than the average productivity of eight other industrialized nations, including West Germany and Japan, according to an estimate by Federal Reserve Board economist Peter Hooper.

At the same time that U.S. workers were turning out more goods per hour, labor costs were being held down through the introduction of new labor-saving technology, layoffs and wage restraint by industry and labor unions.

This sweeping undertaking has caused pain. Since 1980, 2 million workers have been cut from the U.S. manufacturing payroll. Millions more have accepted—or been forced to accept—reductions in earnings. Yet because of productivity gains, manufacturing today accounts for a slightly larger share of total U.S. economic output than it did a decade ago.

Improvements in productivity reduced the costs of making goods in the United States. Since 1985, for example, Cummins Engine has shaved 22 percent off the cost of producing and delivering an engine.

The pretax costs of producing cold-rolled sheet steel in the United States in March of this year was $507 a metric ton—$30 a ton less than in Japan, according to Paine Webber Inc.

The dollar's decline provided U.S. firms with a strong competitive advantage. Beginning early in 1985 and accelerated by the "Plaza" agreement among the five major industrial nations meeting at Manhattan's Plaza Hotel, the currency shift cut the value of the dollar against the yen in half.

The impact on Japanese labor costs illustrates the effect. From 1982 to 1989, the labor cost in yen to a Japanese firm to produce a typical product went down by almost 11 percent. But when those "unit labor costs" are expressed in dollars, they rose 61 percent, because of changes in the yen-dollar exchange rate after 1985.

Another positive note is the ability of a number of U.S. industries to arrest or reverse earlier declines in their shares of worldwide markets for their products, according to government and industry analysts.

For example, the U.S. steel industry, which lost billions of dollars in the early 1980s, returned to profitability in 1987. Last year, mills in the United States produced an estimated 11.5 percent of the world's steel, up from 10.3 percent in 1986, the low point.

Other evidence of a modest industrial rebound is the fact that the nation now exports more nonelectrical machinery than it imports—including construction equipment; machinery for food-processing, paper, textile and bookbinding factories; and heating and air conditioning systems.

Caterpillar Inc. of Peoria, Ill., is a giant in this field. The company lost $1 billion in the early 1980s as it faced relentless worldwide competition from Japan's Komatsu Ltd.

Caterpillar closed nine plants, cut salaries, turned to outside suppliers for parts it once made itself and doubled the size of its product line. In 1987 it embarked on a six-year, $1.4 billion plan to modernize its factories. Though its sales have grown 33 percent since 1980, Caterpillar employs 30,000 fewer workers today.

Still the world's leading maker of construction machinery, the firm has regained 8 percentage points of market share in North America in the past two years, according to one analysis. (Its current business is weak because of the recession, however.)

The picture is also brighter in high technology. Last year the country registered a record $34 billion surplus in the trade of what the Census Bureau classifies as "advanced technology" products, up 34 percent from 1989 and double the 1986 surplus.

Although the Census Bureau calculation is skewed by the inclusion of aircraft—which accounted for $26 billion of the surplus and reflects the global orders of Boeing Co., the world's leading aircraft manufacturer—a different measure that excludes aerospace and covers broader products also showed promising trends. The American Electronics Association reported that the nation's trade deficit in electronic-based goods shrunk 70 percent last year to $2.7 billion, with improvements registered in seven of nine product categories.

Perhaps most unexpected, the U.S. shifted from a deficit to a surplus in the trade of semiconductors, the tiny circuits at the heart of all electronic equipment.

Still outdistanced in the $58 billion worldwide market by Japanese firms, U.S. chipmakers eked out a 1.6 percentage-point gain in global market share last year, their first improvement in a decade.

U.S. computer companies, while losing some ground overall in recent years, remain strong leaders in two important parts of the business—supercomputers and workstations, the fast desktop computers favored by scientists.

Whether the gains by American manufacturers will slow down is a matter for debate among exports. Some worry that the U.S. export boom will fizzle as economies in Europe and Japan cool off.

"The bottom line is that the outlook for further improvement in manufacturing [exports] is not too great," said C. Fred Bergsten, director of the Institute for International Economics in Washington.

But many U.S. companies that have had a taste of success say they realize they have no alternative but to keep trying to improve. In a speech two years ago, David Kearns, the former Xerox president who launched the firm's quality campaign after an eye-opening visit to Japan, spoke for much of American industry when he said, "We are in a race with no finish line."

---

[From the New York Times, April 21, 1991]

BOOM IN MANUFACTURED EXPORTS PROVIDES HOPE FOR U.S. ECONOMY—LOW COSTS AND WEAK DOLLAR CONTRIBUTE TO GAINS

(By Sylvia Nasar)

In a quiet revolution, the United States, long derided as an industrial has-been, has become one of the world's low-cost manufacturers—lower in many industries than Canada, Europe and Japan.

American factories now ship steel to Seoul, transistors to Tokyo, cars to Cologne and bicycle pants to Bologna. Exports ranging from beer and boards to carpets and computer chips have surged by 76 percent since 1986. At home, domestically made machine tools, electronics gear and cars—some turned out in factories with foreign owners—are muscling aside imports.

As a result, foreign trade is likely to power the economy for years to come. "Export-led growth may be the only feasible strategy for the United States," said C. Fred Bergsten, director of the Institute for International Economics in Washington. Indeed, the shrinking trade deficit, now at a seven-year low, is offsetting some of spending lost in the recession.

GROWTH MAY CONTINUE

Though exports have lately leveled off as growth overseas has slowed, forecasters at DRI/McGraw-Hill expect exports to grow 50 percent faster than imports during the rest of the 1990's.

What is behind the resurgence of American cost-competitiveness? Partly, of course, it is the dollar, higher-flying in the mid-80's, returned to earth. Despite the dollar's recent bounce, its value is still a third below its 1985 level.

More enduring are the sweeping and painful changes undertaken by American managers and workers, which have revived flagging factory productivity. These changes have ended some of the worst excesses of the 70's, including pay increases that helped to price many United States products out of overseas markets while encouraging lower-price imports.

For decades, American companies acted as though higher costs could always be passed on. The new attitude is captured by companies like the Cross & Trecker Corporation, a maker of machine tools based in Bloomfield Hills, Mich., which intends to cut the cost of its products by 5 percent a year.

How durable are the American gains? Certainly, an unexpected return to the overvalued dollar would wipe them out. So would slipping back into the sloppy habits of the past.

And low costs by themselves cannot guarantee global competitiveness in a world of increasingly well-heeled, choosy customers who, more often than not, care as much about quality, style, service and technical razzle-dazzle as they do about price. Buyers—domestic and foreign—are not likely to abandon superbly engineered German machine tools or reliable Japanese cars for cheaper but shoddier alternatives.

BEYOND BURGERS AND JUNK BONDS

Those who still think of the United States as a good place to make burgers, "junk bonds" and Boeing aircraft, and little else, ignore a vast terrain friendly to the manufacture of old-fashioned goods like nails and light bulbs.

Illinois Tool Works Inc., based in Glenview, Ill., recently scrapped its plans to build another nail factory in Germany. And Osram Inc., a subsidiary of Siemens A.G., the German electronics giant, recently poured $3 million into a plant in Maybrook, N.Y., that produces light bulbs and auto headlamps.

These decisions partly reflect the favorable American manufacturing climate. In Illinois Tool's case, it costs the company about 20 percent more to make a nail in Germany than in the United States and twice as much to add capacity in Germany. Not only are bricks and mortar more expensive there, but companies are required to take on more commitments, in benefits and job guarantees, for their workers.

"We can produce nails here with less overhead and fewer social costs," said W. James Farrell, an executive vice president of Illinois Tool.

In Osram's case, most customers are in the United States, but the company expects to ship about a fifth of its products to European and Asian automakers. "From an efficiency standpoint, we stack up very well to our German counterparts, sometimes to their surprise," said Paul Caramagna, Osram's vice president.

COSTS LOWER IN UNITED STATES

Though none should be taken literally, broad statistical yardsticks tell the same story. Estimates by Peter Hooper and Karen Larin, economists at the Federal Reserve in Washington, suggest that unit costs in the United States are 60 percent of those in Germany and 80 percent of those in Japan. DRI/McGraw-Hill, using different data and methods, estimates that American factory costs are about 10 percent below those of Europe and Japan.

And the United States is almost certainly among the lower cost producers of basic commodities. Take the raw material for those ubiquitous plastic detergent bottles with hourglass shapes. It costs 25 percent less to produce high-density polyethylene pellets in the United States than in Europe, and 15 percent less than in Japan, according to Chem Systems a consulting firm in Tarrytown, N.Y. Back in 1985, when the dollar peaked, costs in the United States were no lower than in Europe and Japan.

The United States can make steel more cheaply than Germany or Japan, although Britain can make it more cheaply yet. Indeed, USS-Posco Industries now makes money shipping 5 percent to 10 percent of the cold-rolled steel from its plant in Pittsburg, Calif., to the Pacific Rim. The average cost of producing a ton of steel in the United States is now about $535, as against $542 in Germany and $614 in Japan, according to the WEFA Group, an economics consulting firm in Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.

PANELLING TAILORED TO JAPANESE

Another successful export to the Pacific—specifically to Japan—is boards, by the boatload. The Louisiana-Pacific Corporation, based in Portland, Ore., exports so much wood to Japan these days that is making, in addition to its standard 4-by-8-foot paneling, a 3-by-6-foot version that the Japanese prefer. "Our costs are very competitive with Canada and Scandinavia," said Barry Lacter, the company's vice president for public relations.

The United States also seems to have regained ground in industries that many people had written off. American textile mills, it turns out, are very competitive in products for industry and the home, Judging by exports last year, Greeks like to sleep between American designer sheets and Saudis prefer to walk on American wall-to-wall shag carpets in their homes.

The new cost competitiveness varies from product, but what is striking is the huge across-the-board swing since the mid-80's. Indeed, the United States is even more competitive in manufacturing costs than it was in the late 70's, when its trade in factory goods was balanced and exports were booming.

LOW DOLLAR WORKED WONDERS

Consider how the dollar helped to create the shift. The dollar's value against other currencies is back where it was in the late 70's and early 80's. Even after a recent surge against the German mark and the Japanese yen, the dollar is worth about what it was last spring and about 30 percent less than in February 1985.

The lower dollar has done wonders for American industry, particularly machine tools. Exports last year jumped 23 percent while imports sank 5 percent. "The primary reason for that significant swing is manufacturing costs," said Norman J. Ryker, chief executive of Cross & Trecker. The company has recently expanded its sales force in Germany and Japan to sell its top export, the Sheffield machine, which is used to measure machined parts precisely.

At the same time, Cross & Trecker, which used to import some smaller tools from Japan, has not done so in six months. "It cost too much," Mr. Ryker said.

American factory productivity—which has remained the highest in the world—has been jack-rabbiting along in the 80's. Rising at an average rate of 3.6 percent a year, output per hour in American factories has been advancing faster than in the 60's and nearly three times as fast as in the 70's.

Efficiency gains in the American auto industry rose about 4 percent a year in the 1980's, thanks partly to the Japanese companies that build cars in United States plants known as transplants. "The transplants are close in efficiency to the best plants in Japan, and many Ford plants are as efficient as the transplants," said James P. Womack, an automotive expert at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. These days, Detroit is sending American-made models around the world.

Not all of the productivity gains resulted from shutting inefficient plants or slashing payrolls. Some reflect efforts to do things right the first time, an effort that almost by definition bolsters output per worker.

Take Motorola Inc., the nation's largest maker of computer chips, which has raised its productivity in part by reducing costly defects. After an intense five-year campaign, Motorola now measures defects in its popular microcontrollers—chips that show up in everything from cameras to cars—not in percentage points, but in parts per million.

"Our goal for mistakes is 3.4 parts per million—not just in products themselves, but in sales and service," said Kenneth C. Phillips, a company spokesman.

More than half of Motorola's sales in 1990 were overseas. That is one reason, no doubt, that the United States recorded a trade surplus in semiconductors last year, after years of deficits.

Finally, United States manufacturing workers are no longer the world's fat cats in terms of pay and benefits. At current exchange rates, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Americans earn $14.31 an hour in pay and benefits. German workers, in comparison, earn $17.58. In Japan, where pay has more than doubled in dollar terms since 1979, workers now earn the equivalent of $12.63 an hour.

Thus, part of the price of greater American competitiveness has been paid by American factory workers. Their purchasing power has been squeezed as blue-collar pay rose at a slower pace in the United States than almost anywhere else.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the House has a historic choice to make. We can choose to move forward into the real world of international competition, or we can bury our heads in the sands of the past, the quicksand of protectionism. Prosperity through protectionism is an illusion; it is a prescription for quick disaster. It is a quick fix, a false hope.

Did protectionism bring prosperity to China, the Soviet Union, or to Mexico? Absolutely not. It brought stagnation and poverty.

Mr. Speaker, the time is now to tear down the outdated barriers of the past. By pursuing fast track and free trade with Mexico, we can travel down the road of mutual respect and economic opportunity with our neighbors to the south. Prosperity versus protectionism, competition versus isolationism, the choice is ours to make.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE].

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, as a supporter of the Dorgan amendment, I reluctantly rise to endorse and support

the Gephardt amendment. It is only a sense of Congress and does not mandate the President of the United States to do anything, but it does offer some protective guidelines which I think will be of use. Perhaps we should not be micromanaging trade policy on the floor of the House of Representatives.

But, ladies and gentlemen, the administration's track record on trade stinks. American workers and businesses are being fast-tracked out of this country on a passenger train, and they are going on the endangered species list.

We are losing our jobs. Please do not tell me we are not losing our jobs. We are losing our pottery workers, we are losing our steel workers, we are losing our coal miners. You think we do not import coal? We are losing textile workers.

I will show you plenty of unemployed people back in my home area because of bad trade policy.

Now they have run out of unemployment compensation.

Then what happens? We decide we are going to be the good guy and we loan them billions of dollars, taxpayer dollars, to the very people who are taking their jobs away from them, to improve their trading postures. Then what happens is we forgive the moneys. We do not ask them to pay it back.

My God, I have dozens of villages and towns in my area that need compassion and money. It seems to me that if you do not start supporting the American workers, you are going to get fast-tracked out of here yourselves.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SARPALIUS].

Mr. SARPALIUS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that there are a lot of people who do not know what fast track represents. I had one constituent tell me he thought it was a bullet train they were going to build between Mexico City and San Antonio. But fast track is indeed an important future to this country.

I struggled with trying to make that decision of how I would vote on this piece of legislation. I talked to producers in my district, I talked to agricultural groups, I talked to labor groups. I visited with people who were vitally interested, such as Lee Iacocca. Yes, the other day I visited with President Bush. I heard President Bush make that statement; he said that those people who were out of work will be accommodated.

I wondered how will they be accommodated and how much will it cost? I too am concerned about the Japanese using Mexico as a back door to bring in goods. But we must give them the opportunity to negotiate and bring us an agreement to look at.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the final minute simply to say that what we have debated today is not an agreement.

Constitutionally the President cannot negotiate a trade agreement without authority given to him by the Congress. We have given him that authority through fast track. The major determination for our body, constitutionally, would be to determine whether we approve or disapprove the ultimate agreement. That will be the tough vote.

One might have thought today we were debating the agreement. Not so. We did the right thing to give the negotiating power; we will now have the opportunity constitutionally when the agreement is reached to determine whether we support it or not.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 146. This resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that existing fast-track procedures for approving trade agreements should be extended.

The President has made a commitment to address potential problems such as environmental protection, worker health and safety and adjustment mechanisms for adversely affected sectors.

The resolution reinforces those commitments and establishes specific criteria by which trade agreements will be judged when completed and brought back for congressional approval.

By adopting this resolution, we will be affirming a comprehensive statement of U.S. negotiating goals and objectives that will signal a unity of purposes to our trading partners.

Hopefully, our actions today will revitalize the Uruguay round negotiations and guide them to a successful conclusion—as well as provide a strong foundation for the historic task of creating a North American free-trade area.

This resolution also demonstrates the extensive participation by Congress in the formulation of trade policy and implementation of trade agreements.

It is patently false to say that fast track undermines the constitutional role of Congress in international trade.

If anything, that role is enhanced because of the statutory requirements for extensive consultations at every level, constant monitoring of the progress of negotiations, and final accountability in the implementing process.

The resolution merely restates our constitutional prerogatives and defines our ambitions for future negotiations.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on House Resolution 146.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, export expansion has been an extraordinarily vital source of economic growth for the U.S. economy. Last year, United States exports, led in no small measure by exports to Mexico, contributed a full 88 percent of the increase in our GNP. Our exports this March amounted to $34.5 billion, their third highest monthly showing. This flow of goods and services to global markets must be maintained and expanded lest American economic growth and job creation run afoul of the dangerous shoals of protectionism.

The greatest opportunity we have to maximize the American exports are to complete a comprehensive agreement in the Uruguay round of the GATT talks and to negotiate a North American Free-Trade Agreement. Fast tract authority is the linchpin of the administration's efforts to negotiate these market-opening and job-creating agreements.

Let me turn to the proposed North American Free Trade Agreement.

The successful conclusion of this proposed agreement would accelerate trade with Mexico and reduce Mexican tariffs on United States imports by $3 for every $1 reduction of United States tariffs on Mexican imports. While some jobs may be jeopardized, a lot more will be created on both sides of the border.

One of the classic principles of American foreign policy, forged through the joint efforts of Congress and the Executive, symbolized by the personal exertions of John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay, is Pan Americanism. In Latin America, in particular, this policy implied evolution toward an inter-American treaty structure, respect for the integrity of borders, and the development of cordial relations based on the principle of the good neighbor. To paraphrase the late diplomatic historian Samuel Flagg Bemis, Pan Americanism is the tendency of the republics of the New World—forged in the crucible of revolution against monarchical domination and for human freedom—to associate together in a neighborly way for mutual understanding of common aspirations and interests and their realization.

We have seen two attempts by two Democratic Presidents to translate this aspiration into the foreign policy of the United States. Under Franklin Roosevelt, we had the policy of the good neighbor. Under John F. Kennedy, we had the Alliance for Progress. Now, under President Bush, who is building on the progressive internationalist legacy that underlay American foreign policy consensus through the cold war, the United States has moved even more boldly to embrace our neighbors in Latin America and integrate their economies, societies, and cultures in the Pan American spirit of equality and respect with that of the United States.

Lest there be any doubt, this is the best Mexican Government in a generation. I visited Mexico this spring and met with President Salinas and many of the members of his Cabinet. President Salinas has moved with impressive vision and skill to reverse Mexico's formerly autarchic economic policies and embrace free market principles. He has also broken with another historic tendency in Mexican politics: visceral antipathy toward the United States. After a decade of conflict, Mexico is now cooperating with the United States in the economic rehabilitation of Nicaragua, and is working as one of the friends of the U.N. Secretary General to end the long tragic conflict in El Salvador.

If the U.S. Congress wants to take advantage of a unique opportunity to lock in market-oriented reforms before President Salinas

leaves office in 1994; if the U.S. Congress wants to help build a lasting foundation of cooperation, friendship and growth with Mexico, then vote for the fast-track authority that is crucial to our trade negotiators.

One of the lessons of the 1930's was that protectionism lengthened and deepened the Depression. By reverse logic, in tough times, free trade is likely to serve as an economic stimulant.

Protectionism belies its name. It provides job security for candidates, not workers.

Open borders have been the primary objective of U.S. trade strategy since the end of the Great Depression and World War II. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was created to encourage trade and prevent the "beggar thy neighbor" policies of the early century. Free trade has served this country well; it has been one of the most important tenents of United States development philosophy facilitating the reconstruction of postwar Europe and Japan and sparking economic progress in developing countries.

Politicians too frequently assume that a bettering of world relations is likely to stem primarily from government-to-government ties. Actually businessmen and women, private people of private commerce, are bringing the world closer together than public officials and stand a better chance to defend the sanity of peace from the insanity of war than any President or commissar.

With regard to the North American Free-Trade Agreement, the administration has shown great leadership in forging a new and productive relationship with Latin America and the Caribbean. The Brady plan for commercial debt relief and the President's Enterprise for the Americas all evidence a progressive approach to economic development and cooperation within this hemisphere.

The idea of free-trade agreements, which the United States has already established with Canada and Israel, makes particularly good sense with Mexico. For Mexicans it provides assured market access to the United States and thus stands as beckoning incentive for American as well as European and Japanese investment. The policies set forward by President Salinas represent the type of rapprochement with nations that economists have prescribed for Mexico for many years. Corruption, one of the primary obstacles to attracting foreign investment in Mexico, would be greatly decreased if the Government were to move toward more liberal licensing agreements and easing of tariffs. It might also help undermine certain Western European reluctance to widen the Common Market. A coalition of American nations, beginning with Mexico and the United States, increases our competitiveness in the global marketplace.

If the United States is to compete effectively with Japan and Germany, it is to our advantage to have an integrated North American market to rival the new Western European union symbolized by 1992 and the growing bloc of Asian tigers.

An economically healthy Mexican economy, fortified by a trade agreement saves American tax dollars. That is because the American taxpayer is on the line for the contingent liabilities of the United States Government to Mexico—whether it be in the form of Government loans or loan guarantees or insurance of deposits in commercial banks doing business in Mexico. Strengthening Mexico's economic performance obviates potential domestic costs to American society and our financial system in particular.

More importantly, greater United States-Mexican friendship helps prevent wars, instability, and human suffering south of the border and stabilizes population flows. When opportunity and hope are lacking at home, individuals make the obvious decision. They vote with their feet for a better life. President Salinas is neither exaggerating or threatening when he suggests the choice for America is whether we want more Mexican products or more Mexican people.

Finally, in the context of recent trends in international relations, the consummation of a North American Free-Trade Agreement—fully consonant with the free and fair trade principles embodied in GATT—will strengthen the ongoing paradigm shift in the world affairs toward the classically liberal vision of a peaceful world order based upon free peoples, free markets, and collective security, in short the President's bold vision of a new world order.

With regard to continuing negotiations for the Uruguay round of GATT, the United States has put forward an ambitious agenda. The administration has made reducing trade and price distorting subsidies for agriculture products one of its primary goals. U.S. farmers have been put in a competitive disadvantage in world markets because of the European Community's lucrative farm supports. Congress should not impede this worthy trade objective by denying fast track authority.

Here, one final comment about the American constitutional experience is in order. The United States under our original Articles of Confederation experimented with a weak executive and weak central government. It didn't work. We righted, amidst much controversy, the balance and in so doing implanted in the Constitution itself a free-trade agreement between our States. The constitutional prohibition on States taxing products of other States has been a linchpin not only for economic purposes for America as a whole, but for ironing out regional disequilibriums. In an American context open markets produced a wider sharing of wealth; free trade became fair trade because reciprocity of rules became ensconced in an internal customs union.

Political stability and economic progress go hand in hand. Vote for a more peaceful as well as more prosperous world. Vote for fast track. Big fences don't make good neighbors.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat proud this afternoon about the way the debate on this issue was conducted. I think the House has done itself proud.

I am also proud, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to have had the cooperation of my committee.

I think the debate in both the Committee on Ways and Means and in the Chamber has been at a high level. There are differences of opinion. All I can suggest, Mr. speaker, is that we will have another look at this, we will be here in another year or two after agreements have been negotiated, and I hope at that time we are going to allay many of the fears that some of the ladies and gentlemen expressed here today.

Let me just say that I am pleased that the House has just approved the President's request for an extension of fast-track authority. I now rise in support of House Resolution 146.

This resolution expresses the sense of the House of Representatives on the objectives the United States should achieve in the negotiation of future trade agreements. In particular, the resolution memorializes the specific commitments made by the President in his action plan of May 1 to address various labor and environmental issues in negotiations of a North American free trade agreement. These commitments also include the adequate funding of an effective worker adjustment assistance program—to be developed with the Congress—for any workers dislocated by the free trade agreement.

The resolution also expresses the expectations of the House for close consultations with the Congress and the private sector throughout the negotiations. It also requires substantial reporting by the executive branch and private sector advisers on the progress made in achieving the negotiating objectives.

House Resolution 146 also recognizes that the fast track procedures are part of the rules of the House and, as such, are subject to change if the commitments and expectations set forth in this resolution are not fulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope and expect that it will not be necessary to revisit the issue of fast track. The commitments made by the President give me sufficient assurances that the concerns that I and other Members have raised will be fully addressed in trade negotiations under the fast track authority. However, I joined with the majority leader in introducing this resolution to give assurances to all Members of the House that U.S. negotiators would pursue agreements in the Nation's best economic interest.

I also give my assurances as chairman that the Committee on Ways and Means will closely monitor the progress of these negotiations in fulfilling the commitments memorialized in House Resolution 146. We will ensure that the congressional consultation requirements under the fast track process are fully met.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 146 provides a delicate balance which ensures that Congress will be an equal partner in the negotiations, while at the same time, not undermining the administration's ability to achieve optimum results in such negotiations.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Missouri

[Mr. GEPHARDT], the majority leader, who I was pleased to work with in crafting this legislation. Without his leadership, I am sure we would have a great deal more difficulty in moving this issue forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The distinguished majority leader [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, this House—like this Nation—faces a fundamental choice. If you believe in your heart that no matter what our negotiators do, it is simply impossible to negotiate a trade treaty with Mexico that would be in America's economic interests, you have to vote to reject the President's request for fast track authority.

But if you believe, as I do, that if we open closed markets today we can open closed factories tomorrow; if you think the right kind of treaty can be strong enough to create new American jobs, and tough enough to protect the environment and Mexican workers; if you think more trade can mean more jobs and better wages, then I urge you to allow this negotiation to go forward. Vote yes. All we are saying is give trade a chance.

The President would like everyone to believe that support for fast track is synonymous with support for a North American Free-Trade Agreement. That simply is not the case. But, the President indicates that neither he nor the Mexican Government is prepared to proceed with negotiations without fast track. He has chosen the vote today on fast track as a symbol of support for these negotiations.

The resolution which Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI and I have introduced presents another course—conditional fast track. Our resolution conditions the continuation of fast track authority on the President living up to commitments: commitments to develop strong rules of origin, enhanced environmental protection, enforcement of worker rights, transition mechanisms for workers and businesses and other important provisions.

If the President presents us with a perfect agreement, he deserves not only an up or down vote, but our support. But, if he presents us with an imperfect agreement, Congress has two choices—either defeat it or amend it.

My willingness to support the request for fast-track is based on the strongly held view that if the President sends to this Congress a trade treaty that trades away American jobs; or tolerates pollution of the environment or abuse of workers, we can and will amend it or reject it. I am serving notice both to the Bush administration and to the Mexican Government: I intend to do just that.

But, I think the potential is there—that the rewards are worth the risk. But we'll never know unless we try. I think we should try to gain greater access to the Mexican market. There is a $30 billion traffic in commerce already between our two countries; it is relatively balanced. We have reason to belive that with the lowering of the 10 percent tariff Mexico places on American goods, there will be room to send more American goods—more manufactured, high-valued goods—to that nation. And we must look at the composition of trade, not only its aggregates.

With the right kind of treaty, we'll end discriminatory practices which prevent us from increasing our export opportunities with Mexico. The car manufacturers say that under a free trade agreement with Mexico we would be able to boost exports of American-made Jeeps, vans, cars and trucks. It stands to reason that we would, because the Mexican Government has a balance of trade requirement for certain sectors. That is, for every dollar of exports sold to Mexico, a dollar of Mexican exports must be shipped to America. Another example of trade restrictions is the Mexican Government's 10 percent average tariff on American goods, while the United States charges only 4 percent on Mexican goods. Add to those obstructions the barriers of infrastructure, transportation and the differences in culture and legal systems, and there is ample room for improvement.

The right kind of free trade treaty with Mexico could create more than a quarter-million new American jobs, reduce our global trade deficit by $8 to $9 billion, and help stem the flood of illegal workers streaming into the United States from Mexico.

But the right kind of treaty requires closer scrutiny. Under the maquiladora, the Japanese and other Pacific Rim nations currently locate screwdriver plants on the United States-Mexican border and enjoy duty-free importation of their products into the United States. a properly negotiated treaty would limit the ability of other countries to use Mexico as an export platform.

What's more, a properly drawn treaty will ensure that there are good jobs, on both sides of the border and thereby reduce the incentive that Mexicans have to cross the border illegally into the United States in search of work.

Finally, a properly drawn treaty will improve the quality of life for workers and citizens on both sides of the border. Environmental laws and worker rights, properly enforced, can mean everything to the people who live there; cause should be our cause, and we can best represent their cause by pursuing this kind of treaty.

I understand those who are concerned that we will not get the right kind of treaty. The working men and women in my hometown of St. Louis are greatly concerned—as are the loyal, patriotic Americans who organize and represent them in the labor movement. I understand their concern and I frankly share their skepticism. After 10 years of relentless assault on family incomes—higher taxes and lower wages for middle-class families, while the wealthy have gotten lower taxes and higher incomes—I'm angry too. We've seen too many attacks on the right to organize, a misguided trade policy, yanking the rugs out from under an entire community overnight, and too many negotiations which cost hard-won health benefits.

Of course, people are scared, and they know the last two administrations have done nothing to stop the flood of jobs from the United States. So uppermost in our minds must be playing the kind of constructive role, the oversight role, that Congress can and should play to ensure the goals of this negotiation are carried out.

But the answer is not to kill a treaty that hasn't even been written—or even negotiated yet. The answer is to keep the pressure on. I am serving notice today that Congress will do that. Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI, Senator BENTSEN, and I will sound like the song by the police that goes, "Every breath you take, every step you take, every move you make, we'll be watching you." Trust but verify: that will be our policy.

And if the President brings back a treaty that fails to match assurances he provided in the action plan, we're going to amend it, or reject, and I will help lead the fight to do that.

One of the most important victories to emerge from this issue is that from it we are having the beginnings of a long-overdue national debate on trade. What a contrast with the almost nonexistent public debate on the United States-Canada Free Trade Agreement. During this debate, the treaty was front page news in Canada and was the centerpiece issue in a national election campaign. In our country, it was hard to find anyone who even knew we were negotiating.

There is no more vital issue than developing good paying jobs for our families, Because this issue is about jobs, it is about our national destiny. This is about the productive capacity of the Nation to employ people, boost their standards of living, raise their expectations, and compete with their rivals in the international marketplace.

In democracies we need these kinds of rational debates on so many issues, and we have them on so few of them. This is the issue of the future, this is our future. I say let's pass fast track, let's keep careful watch on our negotiators, and let's bring back a treaty that will ensure that there's room at the table for labor, Mexico, and all of us. And that we will have the high-skill, high-paying jobs that will put more bread on the table for families on both sides of the Rio Grande.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, given the defeat of the Dorgan disapproval resolution, which I supported because of my concern for the fate of our country's glassware industry, I now rise in support of the resolution offered by the majority leader and distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Though the approval of this resolution will not prevent the Mexico free trade negotiations from going forward, it will at least convey to the President and his negotiators the concerns many of us in the Congress have with respect to these negotiations. I supported the United States-Canada Free Trade Agreement, because I believed that agreement was constructed to benefit both countries, but the agreement being negotiated with our southern neighbor will displace many more American workers than it will help. Our trade negotiators have made it clear that they will not exclude import sensitive industries like the domestic glassware industry from a United States-Mexico Free Trade Agreement. Even with the existing tariff structure, Mexican exports of household glassware to the United States have increased 67 percent since 1984. You can see that Mexican exports already compete effectively in the United States market with the current tariff rates. If these rates are reduced the playing field will further tilt toward Mexican glassware products.

Since 1978, more than half of the glass manufacturing plants in the United States have closed, resulting in the loss of more than 21,000 jobs. Since 1985, my district has lost over 1,700 glass industry jobs and I have witnessed first hand the problems this has created for my hometown of Lancaster, OH and for the surrounding area. I don't want to see the rest of the Nation have to go through what Lancaster has been going through; I don't want to see an industry as significant as America's glass industry go the way of the dinosaur. We all remember what happened to our country's pottery industry when the crush of cheap pottery from the orient hit our shores shortly after World War II. What once was a thriving industry is no more. Let's not let history repeat itself with respect to glass.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of fast-track and in support of H. Res. 146, the Rostenkowski-Gephardt resolution.

Many participants in today's debate—those opposed to fast-track and this resolution—have missed the point. They have argued that granting this authority to the President would be devastating to U.S. labor and industry and to the environment.

Such devastation will come, Mr. Speaker, not with fast-track authority, but from the failure of this Congress to give the administration and our trade negotiators the authority to negotiate with Mexico, something we are not now doing. And devastation is more likely if we fail to reach a free trade agreement with Mexico.

We want to preserve and increase the number of American jobs; we want to foster American industrial development; we want to expand markets for agriculture; we want to create a better global environment. A free trade agreement with Mexico could very well encompass all of those goals, but we first have to get negotiations underway, and fast-track authority is the green light to make that happen.

During this debate, we've also heard warnings that granting fast-track will cut us on out of the negotiations. I disagree.

I'm confident that once we give the President the flexibility to respond and pursue various proposals that Congress will be kept informed as to the progress on the agreement. After all, it would be politically dangerous, if not impossible, for the administration to go through the lengthy and exacting negotiating process, without consulting us during the process, and then expect Congress to ratify a free trade agreement with Mexico.

The administration already has gone an extra mile to meet the concerns that have been expressed by some of my colleagues. In fact, the administration's response has gone further to accommodate fast-track opponents than on any other trade negotiations.

The administration's action plans commitments of May 1, 1991, include the appointment of environmentalists to the trade policy committee; undertaking joint cooperation with Mexico on health, safety, and labor concerns; and insisting on strong rules of origin to ensure that Mexican goods really come from Mexico.

Moreover, should the administration or the negotiations proceed in a direction that raises concerns in Congress, we, as the law-making body in this country, can change the rules, albeit in the middle of the game, and debate and amend line-by-line a trade agreement.

The vote today on fast-track really comes down to this: Either one supports fair and forward-looking trade policies or one supports protectionist and isolationist trade policies.

Congress has been forward-looking before, and we should be today with a positive vote for fast-track and in support of the Rostenkowski-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, some consider fast-track provisions to negotiate trade agreements a blank check for the administration. It is wrong to assume that Congress would give any administration a free ride to set U.S. trade policy. Congress will be, and always has been, involved every step of the way in the negotiation of foreign trade agreements. Congress will still have the final decision whether to approve or reject any trade agreement signed by the administration.

The U.S. House of Representatives is now considering the administration's proposal to continue the current Uruguay round of GATT negotiations, to initiate talks with Mexico and Canada on a North American Free-Trade Agreement, and to pursue United States trade objectives in the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative. On March 1, 1991, the administration made a formal request for fast-track authority to pursue these trade talks over the next 2 years. Under House and Senate rules, fast-track authority provides for expedited consideration of trade agreements.

The United States has a vital interest in promoting free trade and the success of U.S. exports in the global marketplace. Our country also has a vital interest in protecting our environment and economic opportunities for American workers.

These interests are not inevitably in conflict with each other. What is at conflict is our hopes of realizing the benefits of job-creating exports against our fears of a changing domestic and international economy.

I share the belief of most Americans that the United States must not agree to any free-trade agreement that leads to significant job loss or endangers our country's environment. For this reason, I support efforts to make protection of U.S. workers and the environment priorities during the proposed trade talks.

Congressional involvement in a North American Free-Trade Agreement has already begun, even though formal talks have yet to begin. Recently, House Ways and Means Chairman DAN ROSTENKOWSKI and Senate Finance Committee Chairman LLOYD BENTSEN wrote President Bush to let him know that a North American Free-Trade Agreement with Mexico and Canada would not survive congressional debate unless clear answers were provided on questions of jobs, economic disparities, and environmental protection.

On May 1, 1991, President Bush responded with a series of commitments to protect U.S. interests in these areas and to consult with Congress each step of the way during planned trade talks. These commitments have been incorporated into legislation specifying the objectives that should be achieved in the negotiation of future trade agreements. This measure, House Resolution 146, also reiterates the authority of the House or Senate to revise existing fast-trade rules which provide for debate of trade negotiations without amendment.

The Ways and Means Committee, in adopting House Resolution 146, is putting the administration on notice. If it fails to incorporate these objectives into the final agreement, then hopes for congressional approval will be in serious jeopardy.

Final approval of a North American free-trade agreement will depend upon the administration honoring fully these commitments. Specifically, Congress must reject any trade agreement which fails to: First, maintain strict U.S. health and safety standards; second, provide for transition periods and safeguards to minimize industry, agricultural, and worker dislocation, or third, maintain U.S. laws against dumping or other unfair trade practices. Implementation of a trade agreement will also require the provision of effective and adequately funded services for any workers who are injured as a result of changing trade relations. Also, strict rules of origin will be required to ensure that Mexico does not become a way station for European or Japanese exports to the United States. Finally, a joint program would be established to address border environmental problems.

Negotiation of a free-trade agreement with Mexico and Canada will not be easy, but this opportunity should not be dismissed out of hand. The potential benefits for the United States and the American people of opening these markets to U.S. exports are significant. From 1986 to 1990, as Mexico reduced import barriers, U.S. exports more than doubled from $12.4 billion to $28.4 billion, generating 264,000 additional jobs.

Expanding U.S. exports have been one of the great strengths of the American economy over the past several years. The role of exports is all the more important during the current recession; for example, during 1990, 84

percent of U.S. economic growth was attributed to exports.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has a major stake in protecting and expanding U.S. export opportunities. Among the 50 States, in 1989, the Commonwealth ranked thirteenth in exports. During fiscal year 1989, Commonwealth exports were valued at over $8.5 billion, and provided 164,000 jobs in Pennsylvania. Over $2.3 billion, or 27 percent, of the Commonwealth's exports went to the European Community.

The facts are clear. Exports create jobs for American workers. These exports, and the jobs exports provide, will be put at risk if Congress denies the administration an opportunity to pursue fast-track completion of the Uruguay round of trade talks with Europe and our other major trading partners. Rejection of fast track authority could also close the door to a continued opening of the Mexico economy to U.S. exports.

There are no guarantees that Congress will approve the final results of either the Uruguay round GATT talks or North American Free-Trade Agreement talks. What is guaranteed is that denying the administration fast-track negotiating authority will stop these talks before they begin.

I believe that elected officials should have an opportunity to consider the results of a North American free-trade agreement. We should not reject these talks because of our anxiety over what they may produce. We should judge these talks on the merits on what they produce.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a no vote on the resolution denying fast-track authority and approval of House Resolution 146, the Gephardt-Rostenkowski.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today we address the issue of meeting the challenge of international trade in the 1990's. Today we have the potential to expedite the creation of a vast marketplace of 360 million consumers. Most importantly, today we have the opportunity to buoy the American economy and remain economically competitive into the next century, thereby ensuring not only the prosperity of American business, but of the American worker as well.

Mexico currently ranks third among U.S. trading partners, trailing only Canada and Japan in annual volume. In 1990, Mexico shipped 28.4 billion dollars' worth of goods to the United States—65 percent of its total exports. Mexico has also bought $30.2 billion worth of American products, roughly 60 percent of its total imports. Many sectors of the American economy have benefited: in the past 4 years exports of automobiles and auto parts have quadrupled; exports of corn have tripled, and exports of telecommunications have doubled. Exports of iron and steel, which were running a $12 million deficit 4 years ago now are showing a $300 million surplus. In 1986, we had a $90 million trade deficit in textiles and apparel with Mexico. Today we are running a surplus.

Despite all the potential that a North American Free-Trade Agreement holds, there has been much debate over whether to extend the fast-track procedures. In particular, labor has voiced some very valid concerns. It is true that some low paying jobs will go south. However, the jobs that will be created as a result of a free-trade agreement will, in my opinion, far exceed the job losses. The Mexicans will need our high-technology products, heavy machinery, and R&D. Generally increased export demand will also create jobs. Finally, the administration's plan of action has convinced me that the administration is serious about a worker readjustment program and, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I will personally work to ensure that a responsive program is set up when our committee drafts the blueprint for the program.

I am also concerned with safeguards for intellectual property, maintaining the integrity of environmental standards and protecting our more stringent pesticide, health and safety laws vis-a-vis international standards. I have received assurances from the administration that these and other issues will be carefully monitored and protected by our negotiators.

The bottom line here is that fast track will be good for America and good for the North American continent. In addition, with the consolidation of the European bloc fast approaching, fast track means even more to us. Not only will it help us to compete with EC 1992, but it may also pave the way for future consolidation with the Pacific Rim.

I must note, however, that being an international player and being competitive is something that starts at home and emanates therefrom. We must take care to strengthen our educational commitment for our children and our workers, fortify our crumbling infrastructure and encourage research, experimentation, and excellence in technology. Improving these aspects of our domestic life will improve our trading ability. Interestingly enough, entering trade agreements such as those contemplated with Mexico and GATT is another way to indirectly improve our infrastructure and individual prosperity, which in turn helps us to be better international players.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important vote by anyone's standards, but it is critical to me as a Representative from the State of California. Because of the sheer size of the California economy and our proximity to Mexico, I believe that Californians have more to gain, and more to lose, from a Mexican free-trade agreement than any other State. Such an agreement is bound to affect nearly every segment of the State's economy. Admittedly, some industries will suffer from a Mexican free-trade agreement, but others will gain. Balancing competing interests is never easy when the final determination may cause injury to even one industry or individual, but in the final analysis, I am casting my vote for Californians, as well as for the country, and I believe that the overall effect of a Mexican, and North American, free-trade agreement will be positive for our State and for America.

As a final note, I believe that Congress must grant the President's request for an extension of the procedure of fast track because his negotiators must be given the freedom and the chance to properly negotiate. Extending fast track does not exclude Congress from the negotiating process. On the contrary, in the past we have been so informed and updated on trade negotiations that members have had trouble attending the numerous briefing sessions.

If the administration can reach a trade agreement with Mexico that does not sacrifice United States standards or principles, such an agreement should be pursued. Without fast-track authority, prospects for a trade pact vanish before negotiations even begin. I believe that the administration should have the opportunity to try, and that Congress should leave protectionism for another day.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of House Resolution 146 and in equal opposition to House Resolution 101. I would also like to dispel some myths that are associated with fast track.

The first myth I want to dispel is that fast track gives the President greater power than the Congress in entering into trade agreements. Fast track simply clarifies each branch's role in the negotiation and ratification of those agreements. It requires cooperation during the negotiation process. Before fast track, cooperation was not required. Does this give the President more power? Certainly not.

Another myth states that a vote in favor of fast track is an automatic vote in favor of a United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement. That's impossible because an agreement has not even been written. In fact, fast track ensures that Congress will not consider an agreement which does not conform closely to congressional guidelines, and even then ratification is not guaranteed.

Mr. Speaker, the rest of the world is realizing that economic viability depends on lowering restrictions on trade. In 1992, the European Community will become a common market, free of all trade barriers. The Pacific Rim nations are becoming more competitive each day. We should be cultivating our trade opportunities. In my home State of Tennessee, exports to Mexico increased 142 percent between 1987 and 1989. I want to explore avenues to ensure that the opportunity for continued growth exists.

While so many nations are doing something to improve their trade posture, we're debating over a procedure that will determine the future of American trade, a procedure that will ensure that the President negotiates trade agreements according to our guidelines rather than his. There are some who say this is bad for America and bad for the Congress. That is simply not true.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all of my colleagues carefully consider the facts about fast track and not the myths. If so, we can reapprove fast track and get on to the important business of keeping America globally competitive. I urge my colleagues to vote no on House Resolution 101, and yes on House Resolution 146.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution expressing support for fast-trade negotiating authority on the expectation that the President will fulfill his commitments regarding labor, environmental, and health concerns in a potential United States-Mexico Free-Trade Agreement. I support the resolution, and I also believe that the President will honor his commitment to the Congress and the American people by addressing these concerns.

Fast-track authority is crucial if our trade negotiators are to enter into meaningful negotiations with Mexico as well as develop a suc-

cessful conclusion to the Uruguay round of the GATT. At that time, the Congress will look closely at the agreements, weigh the pros and cons of any agreements, and vote accordingly on approval or disapproval of the agreements.

It is important to note that the Congress is engaged and will continue to be engaged in the trade negotiating process. One merely has to look at the detailed action plan that the President presented to the Congress and the commitments he has made to continue this dialog on trade. The Gephardt-Rostenkowski resolution reiterates the importance of continuing the dialog that has begun between the Congress and the White House on these crucial trade issues.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 146, and in doing so, I support the President's request for a 2-year extension of fast-track congressional procedures for two major international trade agreements—the Uruguay round of GATT, and a North American Free-Trade Agreement to include Mexico.

I support the extension for two reasons. First, the President has made a strong case to me that our Nation can reap substantial economic benefits if successful negotiations are concluded both in the Uruguay round and as part of a new free-trade pact with Mexico. Most promising is the chance to expand exports by removing unfair foreign barriers to markets where U.S. companies can aggressively compete. Exports have been critical to the success of our Nation's economy. Over the past 4 years, increases in U.S. exports have comprised nearly half of the total growth in our economy. For the first time since 1983, U.S. exports entering Europe have exceeded those imported from Europe. United States exports to Mexico have jumped from $12 billion to almost $29 billion in the last 4 years. The United States must be a world leader economically if our farmers, manufacturers, and small businesses are going to prosper in international markets. I am persuaded that if the United States is not active and influential in major multilateral trade agreements, we will lose out economically by default.

Second, a fast-track process is probably the best one available for pursuing our goals and gaining success at the negotiating tables. The President has said he needs this authority if he has any chance of success, and we should give him that chance. Fast-track authority does not abdicate the Congress' role in the trade agreement process. Under fast-track procedures, the President must notify the Congress 90 days prior to entering an agreement, and the Congress will be consulted even prior to that time as negotiations continue. In short, the Congress retains the right to reject the results of these two trade agreements, if they are submitted.

While I support this extension and hold hopes for successful results that will help our economy, I must express my reservations about the potential impact of the Uruguay round and an agreement with Mexico on several products important to the economy in my district.

In particular, my dairy and tobacco farmers have raised very legitimate concerns about the Uruguay round. Kentucky tobacco farmers fear that, under the current U.S. proposal, our domestic tobacco program would be eliminated. Although recent projections from the U.S. Department of Agriculture indicate that no change in our domestic program will be necessary, I caution our negotiators that I will vehemently oppose any attempt to eliminate our domestic tobacco program.

I am troubled by the potential impact of the Uruguay round on my small dairy farms. Currently, low milk prices are jeopardizing our smaller dairy farmers. The survival of our family farmers will depend on our negotiators' ability to reach an agreement which provides adequate safeguards to maintain a fair and stable price for milk in both domestic and international dairy markets. I will carefully weigh the dairy impact of any international consensus reached on agricultural reform before deciding whether to support a GATT agreement. At this time, I would like to include a letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture on International Affairs and Commodities regarding the above concerns.

My district is home to some 15,000 apparel workers who rely on these jobs just to make ends meet. Under discussion as part of the Uruguay round is a proposal to phase out a longstanding international framework for controlling the flow of textile and apparel imports. The Department of Commerce has provided estimates on potential U.S. textile and apparel imports as a result of phasing out the multifiber arrangement, and they show significant import growth. Therefore, I will also carefully weigh the treatment of the MFA in the Uruguay round in view of the impact that phase out could have on the jobs of clothing workers in my district.

My vote today, Mr. Speaker, is a vote of confidence in the administration's ability to address these concerns. However, I will reserve final judgment on GATT and North American Free Trade until satisfied that these bilateral and multilateral agreements are in the best interests of my constituents, my State, and the Nation.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, DC, May 20, 1991.*

Hon. HAROLD ROGERS,
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: Thank you for meeting with Deputy Assistant Secretary Sumner and me on Wednesday, May 1, to discuss the Uruguay Round negotiations on agriculture and the importance of extending fast track negotiating authority.

A key element in the strength of the United States economy is American agriculture. It is more competitive, diverse and productive than any other agricultural system in the world. However, other countries are heavily subsidizing exports, causing U.S. farmers to lose their traditional overseas markets, and using import restrictions to shut out U.S. agricultural products from foreign markets. The Uruguay Round negotiations are a unique opportunity to negotiate a comprehensive multilateral agreement to reduce export subsidies, to lower trade-distorting internal support measures, and to improve market access.

I understand your concerns about the tobacco and dairy industries in Kentucky. We have worked closely with the private sector and with Congress to formulate a proposal for comprehensive reform of agricultural trade that will substantially benefit all sectors. We intend to continue collaborating with industry groups as the negotiations progress to ensure the best possible agreement for American agriculture. The tobacco industry clearly would be a major beneficiary of reducing subsidies and trade barriers. I understand Dr. Sumner has provided materials to you and to some of your constituents describing how U.S. agriculture and particularly the U.S. tobacco industry would gain from the Uruguay Round.

Of course, certain sectors, such as dairy, that are more protected under current policies may face some adjustments under a move to freer trade. However, as we discussed in our meeting, we intend to ensure that any Uruguay Round agreement includes provisions that will allow us to address the needs of such sectors through minimally trade-distorting support policies. We will work closely with you and the industry to develop the appropriate programs.

Thank you again for taking the time to meet with us and share your thoughts regarding the negotiations and fast track. We value your input and hope you will continue to work with us during the next few months.

Sincerely,

RICHARD T. CROWDER,
*Under Secretary, International Affairs and Commodity Programs.*

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Pursuant to House Resolution 158, the previous question is considered as ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 329, noes 85, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—329

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allard | Brown | de la Garza |
| Anderson | Bruce | DeFazio |
| Andrews (NJ) | Bryant | DeLauro |
| Andrews (TX) | Burton | DeLay |
| Anthony | Bustamante | Derrick |
| Applegate | Byron | Dickinson |
| Archer | Callahan | Dicks |
| Armey | Camp | Dixon |
| Atkins | Campbell (CA) | Donnelly |
| AuCoin | Campbell (CO) | Dooley |
| Bacchus | Cardin | Doolittle |
| Baker | Carper | Dornan (CA) |
| Ballenger | Carr | Downey |
| Barnard | Chandler | Dreier |
| Barrett | Chapman | Duncan |
| Barton | Clement | Eckart |
| Bateman | Clinger | Edwards (OK) |
| Beilenson | Coble | Edwards (TX) |
| Bennett | Coleman (MO) | Emerson |
| Bereuter | Coleman (TX) | Engel |
| Berman | Combest | English |
| Bevill | Condit | Erdreich |
| Bilbray | Cooper | Espy |
| Bilirakis | Coughlin | Fascell |
| Bliley | Cox (CA) | Fawell |
| Boehlert | Cox (IL) | Fazio |
| Boehner | Coyne | Feighan |
| Bonior | Cramer | Fields |
| Borski | Crane | Fish |
| Boucher | Cunningham | Flake |
| Boxer | Dannemeyer | Foglietta |
| Brewster | Darden | Franks (CT) |
| Broomfield | Davis | Frost |

Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grandy
Gray
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (TX)
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nussle
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Price
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Sabo
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torricelli
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—85

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Andrews (ME)
Annunzio
Aspin
Bentley
Brooks
Clay
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Dellums
Dingell
Dorgan (ND)
Durbin
Dymally
Early
Edwards (CA)
Evans
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Gilman
Gonzalez
Hayes (IL)
Hertel
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jontz
Kaptur
Kildee
Kleczka
LaFalce
Levin (MI)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Mavroules
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Moody
Murtha
Neal (MA)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Owens (NY)
Pallone
Parker
Payne (NJ)
Pease
Perkins
Peterson (MN)
Poshard
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Roe
Rose
Russo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Savage
Scheuer
Serrano
Sikorski
Snowe
Stallings
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Taylor (MS)
Torres
Traficant
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Yates
Yatron

NOT VOTING—17

Browder
Bunning
Dwyer
Gaydos
Gradison
Hopkins
Lehman (FL)
Levine (CA)
Martinez
Matsui
McCollum
Montgomery
Pursell
Synar
Towns
Waxman
Williams

□ 1629

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Browder against.

Mr. Synar for, with Mr. Towns against.

Messrs. LIPINSKI, STUDDS, JOHNSON of South Dakota, DINGELL, and ALEXANDER, and Mrs. LLOYD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. NICHOLS, BEVILL, and DERRICK changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2426, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1992

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102–78) on the resolution (H. Res. 159) waiving certain points of order during consideration of the bill (H.R. 2426) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2427, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1992

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102–79) on the resolution (H. Res. 160) waiving certain points of order during consideration of the bill (H.R. 2427) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask to proceed so that I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program for the balance of this week and next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the minority leader. I would say we are finished for the day and there will be no more votes today and there will not be any votes tomorrow either.

On Monday, obviously we will not be in session as that is Memorial Day, and we will be on a short Memorial Day district work period.

On Tuesday, again the House will not be in session because of the Memorial Day district work period.

On Wednesday, May 29, we will meet at noon, and we will take up H.R. 2427, the energy and water development appropriations for fiscal year 1991, subject to a rule.

On Thursday, May 30, the House will meet at 10 a.m. and we will consider the rule and have general debate only on H.R. 1, the Civil Rights Act of 1991, subject to a rule. Again, that will be the rule and the general debate only, and no other votes on the civil rights bill.

On Friday, May 31, the House will meet at 10 a.m., and we will take up H.R. 2426, the military construction appropriations for fiscal year 1991, subject to a rule.

Conference reports can be brought up at any time. Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. MICHEL. Might I inquire about No. 1, Wednesday. That is the day when a lot of Members are just coming back from their extended district work period and Memorial Day proceedings and all of that. A number of Members have been inquiring as to how early we would be having votes on Wednesday afternoon. We are not coming in until noon, and I see that the energy and water appropriations bill is subject to a rule. I do not know how controversial it may or may not be, and usually appropriations bills have no more than an hour of general debate, and then we are on the amendments.

So Members have been asking me if there is some sense by which we might not have any rollcall votes here until beyond say 3 o'clock or something like that. I have not been able to give them that assurance, but I would at least and I think they beseech the distinguished gentleman too as to whether

there is any kind of a timeframe here that we could alert our Members so that it might be of help to them in their travel plans or whatever.

Mr. GEPHARDT. The gentleman is correct that there is a lot of interest in this vote time. I think we will try as best we can to not have a vote on the rule, but we cannot guarantee that there will not be a vote on the rule. That would happen after 1 minute and after an hour of debate, so at worst it would be at 2 o'clock or 2:30 by the time that vote occurred. If there is no vote on the rule, then there is another hour of general debate, and then we move to the amendments. So without a vote on the rule Members could expect votes mid to late afternoon. If there is a rule vote, it will be around 2 or 2:30.

Mr. MICHEL. One other question as far as the gentleman from Illinois is concerned. On the civil rights bill, so far as general debate, does the gentleman have any idea how much time we are thinking about in terms of general debate?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I would say that all of the general debate would probably not be finished next week. We might split the general debate time, do part of it, an hour or two next week, and then finish it up in the following week before we move into the amendments.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather strange procedure we are adopting for the civil rights bill, and we just have a couple of questions about it.

Is the substitute to H.R. 1 going to be available to the Rules Committee when they act?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield, the committee will meet on Wednesday and the language of that substitute will be available obviously in the Rules Committee before a rule is granted.

Mr. WALKER. There seems to be developing a pattern where we debate things at one point and then vote on them at another point. Can we get some idea as to when we are actually going to have votes on the civil rights bill?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Probably on Tuesday of the following week. It may go into Wednesday, but I would think Tuesday of the following week we could bring it back up and work on it, maybe finish it.

Mr. WALKER. Does the gentleman have any idea how much time for debate we are looking at having on the civil rights bill?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I think probably an hour or two of general debate, followed by another hour or two of general debate the next week, and then we will have the substitutes with adequate time for both sides on those.

Mr. WALKER. So other than a potential vote on the rule, the schedule on Thursday will be a fairly light schedule?

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is correct.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MICHEL. That concludes the questions on our side, and we thank the majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM THURSDAY MAY 23, 1991, TO WEDNESDAY MAY 29, 1991, AND ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE FROM THURSDAY MAY 23 OR FRIDAY MAY 24, 1991, TO MONDAY JUNE 3, 1991

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 157), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLEMENT). The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 157

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That when the House adjourns on Thursday, May 23, 1991, it stand adjourned until noon on Wednesday, May 29, 1991, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, May 23, or Friday, May 24, 1991, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 3, 1991, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House, after consultation with the Majority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the House to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

SEC. 3. The Majority Leader of the Senate, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. GEPHARDT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY MAY 29, 1991

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, May 29, 1991.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

## SALUTE TO JIMMY HERMAN AND CURTIS McCLAIN OF THE ILWU

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute two champions of the trade union movement in America, Jimmy Herman and Curtis McClain of the ILWU, president and secretary-treasurer respectively, who have served in those capacities since 1977, and who will be retiring in June.

Jimmy Herman is a hero to all of us who know him in San Francisco and really across the country. He settled his first trade negotiations when he was but a teenager for five cents an hour additional, and ever since then he has been working to advance the cause of working people in America.

□ 1640

Curtis McClain was in the front rank of that generation of African-Americans who broke into the leadership of the labor movement in our country.

By their commitment to their union, their commitment to working people, their commitment to our country, they have advanced the cause of human rights, of workers' rights, and of a better America.

It is with great pride, Mr. Speaker, that I call to the attention of our colleagues and of our country the accomplishments and the good works of my friends from San Francisco, Mr. Jimmy Herman and Mr. Curtis McClain.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to encompass in 1 minute the essence of a man whose life has been dedicated to improving the lives of working men and women; who carries out in deed the ideals of compassion and justice; who makes headlines throughout the Nation and the world yet who is humble to a fault; who is also a dear and close personal friend.

In the weeks to follow, many will extoll the virtues and works of a man named James "Jimmy" Herman, president of the International Longshoreman's and Warehouseman's Union. In scant weeks, Jimmy will retire from the union he has known since he set foot on the docks of San Francisco in the early 1950's. He will retire from the office of ILWU President he has held since 1977, an office in which he has committed his life and soul, bone and blood. But we are fortunate, for somehow, as he has magnificently fought for and defended a union and a membership that

has seen turbulent and changing times in its industry, he has managed to devote himself to a community that he loves and which loves him with equal intensity. We are fortunate, and perhaps a little selfish, because we know that retirement does not mean an end to the good works he brings to San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, this is but an overture to the coming symphony of voices that will ring with praise to this giant, including mine, to this hero of the working man and woman, Jimmy Herman.

CURTIS MCCLAIN

Curtis McClain has been International Secretary-Treasurer of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union since 1977.

Born and raised in Akron, Ohio, he came to the San Francisco Bay Area after World War II where he joined ILWU warehouse Local 6 and went to work at Schmidt Lithograph. During his 16 years at Schmidt he became increasingly active in union affairs, serving as a steward, as a member of the negotiating committee, and in other capacities.

He was also active in African-American community affairs, and was part of the first generation of rank and file leaders who scored major breakthroughs in opening up leadership in the trade union movement to people of all races. Over the years he has remained active in this area, as well as in movements for peace, disarmament and international trade union solidarity.

He was elected Local 6 Business Agent in 1960, as a member of the International Executive Board in 1971 and as International Secretary-Treasurer in 1977, a position he has held to this day.

McClain was appointed to the San Francisco Human Rights Commission by Mayor Jack Shelley and then to the San Francisco Fire Commission by Mayor George Moscone, where he served for twelve years.

## VOTE FOR MICHEL SUBSTITUTE AND AGAINST H.R. 1

(Mr. IRELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, small-business jobs could be lost for all Americans under yet another so-called fix to H.R. 1, the quota bill.

Proponents of this fix apparently have finally recognized that H.R. 1 will force our Nation's small businesses to adopt quotas in order to protect themselves from costly lawsuits and huge damage claims.

Their proposed solution—outlawing quotas—places our Nation's smaller firms in an impossible, catch-22 situation:

If small business owners adopt quotas, they break the law. If they don't, they face the prospect of damage awards that could lead to bankruptcy.

It is a "lose-lose" proposition for small businesses. And those who support it are jeopardizing the livelihoods of American small business owners and employees.

Saying you're for small business is easy. It is how you vote that counts. Do not sell out the small business jobs in your district to this phony fix. Vote for the Michel substitute, and against H.R. 1.

## HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MY SON

(Mr. SARPALIUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow my son David will turn 18 years old, and next week he will graduate from high school.

Like any father, I am very proud of him, but tomorrow when he becomes a legal adult, I pass on to him a country that is still free, a country that believes in peace but believes in protecting its freedom, a country where he can still use God as his guide, and a country where, if you fail, you still have the right to try again, a country where you achieve all that is possible by having the right to attempt the impossible, a country where we dream of being as much as we can be but dream of being more, a country that is respected around the world but has compassion for the rest of the world, a country that believes in preserving its heritage and its environment, a country that has a vision of hopes and dreams of a better way of life.

Mr. Speaker, my hope and prayer is when the day comes when his child becomes a legal adult that he will pass on to them a better America than what it is today.

Happy birthday, my son.

## A TRIBUTE TO MCPHERSON, KS

(Mr. NICHOLS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today, bursting with pride for my hometown of McPherson, KS.

This past weekend McPherson took center stage in honoring the veterans of Operation Desert Storm.

A 12-year-old California girl, the daughter of "Operation Welcome Home" organizer John Ford, chose McPherson to serve as the geographical center of the country for this celebration.

People like City Commissioner Tony Fiedler, and members of different veterans' organizations rose to the occasion in splendid fashion to show the rest of the world the right way to welcome home the men and women who served in the Persian Gulf.

The people who lined the streets of McPherson were welcomed in spirit by people from around the world as this celebration was broadcast into Kuwait and Saudi Arabia by Armed Forces Radio.

My thanks and congratulations to the people of McPherson for a celebration all Americans can be proud of, and one the returning troops will never forget.

## IN OPPOSITION TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION: RUST VERSUS SULLIVAN

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn this morning's Supreme Court ruling in Rust versus Sullivan. This decision bans federally funded family planning clinics from discussing abortion with pregnant women and from telling them where they can get one.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about abortion. This is about free speech, this is about the health and well-being of the over 4 million low-income women who use these clinics each year. Women do not have to choose abortion, but they have a right to know what all of their options are.

Let's look at the following situation which might occur as a result of this unconscionable decision:

Jane Smith must use a federally funded family planning clinic because she cannot afford a private doctor. She is pregnant and she is delighted. Dr. Big Brother examines Jane Smith and discovers that if she carries her baby to term she may encounter health risks. Dr. Big Brother may be afraid to tell Jane Smith about an abortion option because of today's Supreme Court ruling. Nine months later, Jane Smith dies. Who will be held liable?

Mr. Speaker, this case originated in Bronx, NY, my hometown. Many people are categorized as low-income. It is not fair to deny these people complete medical information just because they do not have a large bank account. It is not the Government's right to step in between a patient and her physician. How far are we going to let it go?

Mr. Speaker, when this issue is revisited on the House floor, I urge my colleagues to vote for free speech, for all women's health and well-being, and for a woman's right to complete medical information.

## SUPPORT AMERICA 2000 EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT

(Mr. RIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the one bill that is probably going to be the most important one that the 102d Congress entertains, and that is the President's education package submitted today for our consideration.

My fellow Americans and colleagues, there is no better way to empower our fellow Americans than to provide equal

access for all Americans, but particularly those who come from disadvantaged or poverty circumstances, to a quality education.

The President's educational package, known as America 2000 Excellence in Education Act, would do just that. It is a bill crafted with tremendous input from all sectors of our Nation, particularly the private sector, and it sets out some very realistic but important goals for educational reform in this country.

First of all, it would provide incentives for voluntary testing standards that would assess the skills of our Nation's students in the areas of math and science as well as their critical reasoning and literacy skills. It would restore a motion of accountability and choice in competition to our public schools, and it would accomplish true reform by emphasizing local control through site-based decisionmaking at American schools.

I urge my colleagues in the House to give this most important piece of legislation their serious consideration. Let us be the Congress known as making tremendous strides in educational improvement in America.

□ 1650

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, May 21, 1991.*

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am transmitting herewith copies of the resolutions approved today by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, as follows:

Committee survey resolutions authorizing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to study the following potential water resources projects: Calleguas Creek, California; Mission Bay, San Diego County, California; Ponce De Leon Inlet, Volusia County, Florida; Washoe Valley, Nevada; and Silver Strand Shoreline, San Diego, California; and

A Committee resolution authorizing the Soil Conservation Service to undertake a small watershed project for the South Fork of Little River, Kentucky.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. ROE,
*Chairman.*

There was no objection.

## ANNUAL REPORT OF CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990 AND INVENTORY OF FEDERAL FUND DISTRIBUTED TO PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS ENTITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and ordered to be printed:

(For message see proceedings of the Senate of today, Thursday, May 23, 1991.)

## REPORT REGARDING ADMINISTRATION OF THE RADIATION CONTROL FOR HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1968 DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1990—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Thursday, May 23, 1991.)

## WELCOME TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Missisippi). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask, what is your first impression when you visit another country? Is that first impression important?

Last week I had a conversation with my friend, well-known songwriter and entertainer Lee Greenwood. As a frequent international traveler he is accustomed to less-than-pleasant experiences and rather intimidating treatment at customs checkpoints. Lee recounted a recent example where he was searched, asked intimidating questions and treated very rudely, almost like a suspect in a criminal investigation.

Would you care to guess in which country this incident occurred? It happened at a customs checkpoint right here in the United States of America.

Visitors to the United States often form their first impression of America at the customs checkpoint where they enter our country—based on the demeanor of customs officials they encounter. As a member of the Steering Committee of the Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus, I am very aware of the tremendous tourism revenue generated by our visitors. It only makes common sense to make a conscious effort to treat our visitors in the most courteous manner possible.

And, our citizens returning home from abroad deserve a friendly welcome home from the public servants whose salaries are funded by public tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, today I sent a letter to U.S. Customs Service Commissioner Carol B. Hallett asking that a new agency policy be established. Customs officials should be required to display a warm attitude and friendly persona. A visitor's first impression of America will be greatly enhanced if customs officials simply say, "Thank you for your time—and, welcome to America!" And our returning U.S. citizens certainly deserve to be accorded such respect and consideration.

I share the sentiments of Lee Greenwood, who wrote and sings "I'm proud to be an American," in his song "God Bless the U.S.A." Let us share our pride in our Nation—pride in a country that was born from the blood of our forefathers, who when they came here more than 200 years ago to found our country, were all immigrants themselves.

To all our visitors and every returning U.S. citizen I say, "Welcome to America."

## LANDSAT CONTINUITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation aimed at helping maintain the U.S. Landsat Program, which represents one of the Nation's most important spacecraft systems. Joining me as original cosponsors of the Landsat Continuity Act are Representatives DAVE MCCURDY, BOB WALKER, JAMES SCHEUER, RALPH HALL, and RON PACKARD.

The purpose of this legislation is to initiate procurement on the next in the series of U.S. civilian Earth observation satellites—Landsat 7—through the authorization of $20 million for long-lead procurement items. The legislation also provides $5 million for the preservation of early Landsat data, which will soon be lost unless converted to a stable medium.

Landsat images of the Earth are used for such purposes as environmental management, oil and gas exploration, crop forecasting, and cartography. Landsat data were used extensively during Operation Desert Storm, providing data not available from any other national system. The Department of Defense considers Landsat data to be mission essential for many of its tasks. Similarly, NASA and the scientific

community regard Landsat imagery as being vital for global change research.

I could go on at length about the importance of the Landsat Program for global monitoring, mapping, and management applications, but that is not the purpose of my remarks today. The case has already been made within the U.S. Government that Landsat is a vital program, and the administration has reached a decision to continue the program, as reflected by White House press releases dated June 1 and November 16, 1989.

The earlier of these press releases described the President's approval of the National Space Council's recommendations concerning Landsat, which included ensuring the continuity of Landsat-type remote sensing data through the 1990's. The second release announced the President's approval of a new national space policy which commits the Nation to the continuation of Landsat and to the encouragement of U.S. leadership in this field through the development of future systems "competitive with, or superior to, foreign-operated civil or commercial systems."

I commend the administration for recognizing the broad national and international value of Landsat and for its commitment to the continuation of this program. However, I must point out that there exists a major discrepancy between the President's established commitment to continuity for Landsat and the reality of achieving that continuity. That is what I wish to address in these remarks, and it is that discrepancy that has led me and a number of my distinguished colleagues to introduce the Landsat Continuity Act.

The first Landsat spacecraft was launched in 1972 and Landsats have operated continuously for the past 19 years. This unbroken record of information about the Earth represents an invaluable data base, and the longer it remains an unbroken record the more valuable it will be for assessing long-term changes on the surface of the planet. This data base represents the fundamental baseline for global change research and for overall management of the resources of our planet.

At the present time, we have two aging Landsat spacecraft in orbit. Landsat 4, the older of the two, could cease operations at any time. Landsat 5 is expected to remain operational until the launch of Landsat 6, scheduled for mid-1992. Landsat 6 will have a 5-year design life, and given the time it takes to construct a follow-on, we should already be planning for the construction of that follow-on spacecraft to have it ready for a mid-1997 launch. But we are not doing so.

In order to accomplish the two stated goals of U.S. Landsat policy which I mentioned above—data continuity and competitiveness with international systems—the initiation of funding for Landsat 7 probably should have been reflected in the fiscal year 1990 budget. It wasn't. The administration did not request Landsat 7 money in its fiscal year 1990, fiscal year 1991, or fiscal year 1992 budgets. This is a serious problem, as I will explain.

The contracting and construction process for a follow-on to Landsat 6 could take anywhere from 6 to 8 years, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA], which prepared a series of Landsat 7 procurement schedules for the administration last September.

The quickest option for construction of Landsat 7 would be to build a spacecraft identical to Landsat 6, and to do so with a sole source contract to the companies which built Landsat 6. Under this scenario, according to NOAA, the launch of Landsat 7 would occur in February 1998. This would mean an 8-month data gap between the projected end of Landsat 6 and the initial operation of Landsat 7.

A second option would be to construct a follow-on spacecraft identical to Landsat 6, but recompete the contract. This option might lower the Government's costs, yet would likely add 12 to 18 months in additional procurement activities to the spacecraft contracting and development schedule. As a result, the launch date for Landsat 7 would be pushed off until early 1999. This would mean a 20-month data gap between the end of operations for Landsat 6 and the arrival of Landsat 7.

A final option would be to build an advanced Landsat 7, with a state-of-the-art capability such as a sensor that provides five-meter stereo imagery. Such a spacecraft would help satisfy a broad array of national security, scientific, and commercial needs—and would clearly meet the goal of achieving a U.S. remote sensing capability competitive with or superior to any foreign-operated system. However, this option could add even more time to the spacecraft development process, leading to a launch date that might not be until the year 2000. If that were the case, there would be a 3-year data gap between the expected end of Landsat 6 and the operation of Landsat 7.

These procurement schedules were based on the assumption that NOAA—the Federal agency which has managed Landsat—receives a go-ahead from the Office of Management and Budget in the fall of 1991 and initial funding in the fiscal year 1993 budget.

These three procurement options suggest that we will experience a data gap in the program ranging from a minimum of 8 months to as long as 3 years, assuming that we make a fiscal year 1992 decision to proceed with Landsat 7. Thus, it may already be too late to achieve the U.S. policy goal of data continuity for this program. While one might hope that Landsat 6 has a longer operational life than 5 years, that should not be the basis for our program plans since the opposite could happen as well: Landsat 6 could have technical problems that shorten its operational life or it could even be destroyed during launch as the result of a launch vehicle failure.

Shortening the construction time for Landsat 7 could be accomplished by paying a premium to the subcontractors to accelerate development of the sensor and spacecraft components, yet this would increase the cost and risk associated with the program. The procurement schedule for Landsat 7 could also be shortened through an abbreviated contracting process. The original Landsat contract between the United States and EOSAT was written to cover the construction costs of two spacecraft—Landsat 6 and Landsat 7. In April 1988, that contract was modified and a "stop work" order was placed on Landsat 7. By simply lifting that "stop work" order, the Government could cut the development time for Landsat 7 by 6 months by avoiding a full new contracting process.

The best way of accelerating the development of Landsat 7, however, would be through the initiation of long-lead procurement for the spacecraft—and to do so immediately. That is the objective of the Landsat Continuity Act, which could trim an additional 6 months from the development schedule for Landsat 7 by starting the procurement of the spacecraft and sensor components which take the longest time to manufacture.

Through these two approaches—lifting the stop work order on Landsat 7 and initiating long-lead procurement during fiscal year 1992—there is a reasonable chance of having Landsat 7 built and ready for launch by mid—1997.

This plan would achieve the U.S. policy objective of ensuring continuity of Landsat data. Any other plan—such as putting the Landsat 7 funding decision off until fiscal year 1993—would essentially guarantee a damaging data gap in the program. Yet the administration's position seems to be precisely that—to delay making a decision on Landsat 7 for yet another year.

Mr. Speaker, for the record, I think it is important for my colleagues to know the extent to which the decision on Landsat 7 already has been postponed.

In March 1989, Vice President QUAYLE addressed the issue of continuation of the Landsat Program as the first item taken up by the newly formed National Space Council. The crisis of that time was whether the United States would cease operation of Landsat 4 and Landsat 5 for lack of $9.4 million in operating funds. The Space Council, with the Vice President's leadership, successfully resolved the matter by rais-

ing the necessary funding from the Departments of Defense, Agriculture, and Interior, and he initiated a full interagency review of the Landsat Program and the options for Landsat 7.

In response to a letter signed by more than 100 Members of Congress expressing opposition to the planned termination of Landsat 4 and Landsat 5, the Vice President wrote on March 27, 1989, that the National Space Council staff, in conjunction with all affected Government agencies, was conducting a "fast-paced policy review" of Landsat which would lead to a review of options within the next several months.

In response to repeated contacts with the National Space Council throughout the summer and fall of 1989, members of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee were informed that a decision on Landsat 7 would be made in time to affect the administration's fiscal year 1991 budget.

In late 1989, I wrote the Vice President again to express my concern that it did not seem that the Landsat 7 issue was being addressed in a timely fashion. I also expressed my deep concern about rumors that the Office of Management and Budget had recommended that the Department of Defense take control of the program. The response from the Vice President, dated December 20, 1989, said that the Space Council was still reviewing the issue and that "we plan to replace Landsat 6 in about 1996."

When the fiscal year 1991 budget was submitted to Congress in February 1990, no money was requested for Landsat 7, although articles in the trade press indicated that the administration was considering a supplemental request for the program.

Another year passed, and still no action on Landsat 7. In November 1990, 25 Members of Congress, including myself, wrote OMB Director Richard Darman stating that the time had come to initiate funding for Landsat 7 and to urge that the necessary funding be provided in the President's fiscal year 1992 budget.

A few months later, on February 26, 1991, my distinguished colleague and ranking minority member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, BOB WALKER, and I wrote the Vice President again. Landsat 7 funding was not contained in the President's fiscal year 1992 budget request, which led us to write that we were "particularly concerned about the delay in implementing the President's commitment to maintaining the continuity of Landsat-type data" and that we felt the Nation "must ensure that adequate planning takes place this year" to initiate a successor to Landsat 6.

On March 21, 1991, the Vice President replied that the National Space Council was planning to initiate two additional studies "to provide data in support of the Landsat follow-on decision." The letter stated further that a decision on the "post-1997 Landsat capability will be made concurrent with the President's fiscal year 1993 budget."

While this sounds like a specific commitment to request funding for Landsat 7 in next year's budget, I have to emphasize that I have heard this commitment before—many times—and have yet to see it honored. I have also seen at least a dozen different studies that were intended to support the nation's decision about Landsat 7. The time has come to stop studying Landsat 7 and start building it. We have postponed this decision for so long that we are jeopardizing the investments we have made in the program over the past 20 years and our position as a world leader in this technology.

The single most important concern expressed by military and civilian users of Landsat is data continuity; people who have invested in the image processing systems for this data and who have developed a reliance on Landsat for their research, national security planning, commercial activities, and resource management purposes want to know that the system will still be around 5, 10, and 15 years from now. They want to know that the continuous record of Landsat data—which represents a chronicle of change on the planet—will remain an unbroken data archive. That is why these users were greatly relieved by the President's commitment to continuity of Landsat data, and why they are deeply concerned about the repeated delays in making a commitment to Landsat 7.

While I will be the first to admit that there remain significant policy and management decisions to be made concerning this program—such as the extent to which we continue the commercialization effort and the division of responsibilities among the Federal agencies with an interest in the program—I do not feel that these issues should serve as justification for adding further delay to the initiation of Landsat 7.

Within the Science, Space, and Technology Committtee I have initiatied a Landsat Task Force to address and to resolve to the extent possible these outstanding policy and management issues. My intention is to work closely with the National Space Council, as well as with other major committees in the House and with the other body, to forge a new policy consensus on how to regain U.S. leadership in this important technology.

I recognize that the National Space Council has other items on its plate, such as security funding for the Space Station Freedom. So, too, do I. But this issue is a very important one and cannot be put off any longer. Landsat may not be as visible a program as is the Space Station or the Space Exploration Initiative, but it is a program of great importance to our Nation and the world.

We are moving into an information era in which knowledge about our planet will be increasingly important for our Nation's economic competitiveness, national security, environmental management, and quality of life. Other nations recognize that remote sensing satellites can contribute substantially toward these goals, which is why France, Japan, Canada, the European Space Agency, India, and Brazil are all planning Earth observation satellites for operation during the 1990's. France, of course, already operates a system called SPOT, which is competing against Landsat for the global commercial market for satellite imagery. The French understand the importance of data continuity, as shown by the fact that they launched SPOT 1 in 1986, SPOT 2 in 1990, are building SPOT 3 for a mid-1990's launch, and have already paid for SPOT 4, scheduled for a late-1990's launch.

The U.S. pioneered this technology and was the unchallenged world leader until 5 years ago, but our position has eroded substantially and is now seriously in question. Although we are pressing forward with the Earth Observing System [EOS] as part of the U.S. Global Change Program, no sensor aboard EOS will provide high resolution, multispectral data analogous to what is generated from Landsat. Indeed, the design of EOS was predicated on the assumption that Landsat would continue.

We should not postpone the decision on Landsat 7 any further. We should make the commitment this year to initiate long-lead procurement for Landsat 7, with the goal of having the spacecraft built and ready for launch before Landsat 6 reaches the end of its design life.

The Landsat Continuity Act would authorize $20 million in long-lead funding for Landsat 7—$10 million from the Department of Defense, and $5 million each from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This 50:50 military-civilian split in funding responsibility for the program seems like a logical way to proceed, given the broad national security and civilian applications of the program. The original cosponsors of this legislation, including myself, are already working to incorporate the $20 million long-lead procurement package into the relevant fiscal year 1992 authorization and appropriation bills.

We are also working to secure $5 million for the preservation of aging Landsat data that could soon be permanently lost. A report completed last year—but not yet officially released—by the administration's Committee on Earth and Environmental Sciences concluded that as much as one-fourth

of the Landsat data collected in the first few years of the program will be lost in the next several years unless action is taken to accelerate a program to convert this aging data to a stable medium. The continuous Landsat data archive dating back to the program's beginning in 1972 represents the fruits of our investment in remote sensing. Because the preservation of this archive will be so important for global change research, we should move promptly to appropriate the $5 million necessary to protect this old, yet still valuable data.

I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring the Landsat Continuity Act, and I urge the administration to work with the Congress to take the necessary steps to fulfill the Nation's policy commitment to continuation of the Landsat Program.

□ 1700

## THE SPREADING EPIDEMIC OF AIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the staff that I will not take the full 60 minutes. I will probably be here about 10 minutes, so that as the last Member with a special order, we should not be here too long.

Mr. Speaker, today the New England Journal of Medicine published an editorial which is very significant. About 5 years ago, I and a number of my colleagues started talking about the AIDS epidemic. We started talking about the spread of this terrible disease and what it means for the health of this Nation. We talked about the possibility that millions of Americans could become ill from the AIDS virus and die if we did not take some positive action.

In 1985, when we started, 20,000 Americans were either dead or dying of the AIDS virus. That was about 5 years ago. At the end of 1991, 205,000 Americans, one-fifth of a million, will be dead or dying of the AIDS virus and the pandemic has been spreading and expanding each year.

In 1985, 1986, and 1987, they estimated that for each one of those years there were 1½ to 2 million people infected and they estimated that the virus was spreading at a rate of doubling every year to 18 months.

The CDC in Atlanta now tells us we still have 1½ to 2 million people infected and that the pandemic is under control.

The facts do not bear that out. The virus is now being spread in ways that we did not believe was possible just a few short years ago.

Dr. Everett Koop a few years ago indicated some things in a publication that was sent to every household in America. I would like to just read a little bit of some of the things that he said. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 25, 1987. In it I quoted the Koop report. Dr. Koop at that time was the Surgeon General of the United States. He said:

> There is no danger of AIDS virus infection from visiting a doctor, a dentist, a hairdresser, a hospital or a beautician. You may have wondered why your dentist wears gloves and perhaps a mask when treating you. This does not mean that he has AIDS or that he thinks you do. He is simply protecting himself from hepatitis, common colds and so forth.

Well, we know that Dr. Koop was wrong, because in Florida several patients obtained the terrible virus of AIDS from a dentist who was infected with it. We did not know that until the dentist was dead, or about to die, and he sent letters to many of his patients telling them he was infected with the AIDS virus. Several of those patients have contracted AIDS, even though the dentist wore gloves, a mask and other protective paraphernalia that Dr. Koop said only intended to protect himself from hepatitis back in 1987.

The fact of the matter is that we did not know then all the ways that AIDS could be transmitted and we do not know yet all the ways that AIDS can be transmitted, but what we do know is that there is a long latency period between the time a person contracts AIDS and when he manifests the disease in his physical being.

□ 1710

Sometimes doctors estimate that people could carry the disease, the virus, for as many as 5 to 10 years without any manifestation of actually having AIDS.

In all that time they are healthy, at least, cheerleaders, business people, all that time there would be no manifestation of the disease whatsoever in their physical being. During that time, unless they have been tested, had a blood test, they would be running on their merry way, conducting themselves in a manner to which they are accustomed, without any regard for themselves or their fellow men. They are a walking epidemic if they have sexual contact with people outside the AIDS community.

Thus we have, according to CDC, probably 2 million infected with the AIDS virus.

Many of us, myself included, believe we have more like 5 million to 6 million or more. We have no way of knowing for sure, but based on the information we received years ago that it was doubling every year to 18 months, we should have at least 5 million people infected.

Ninety-five percent of those people do not know they have the virus, and those people are out day in and day out conducting themselves in a manner that may or may not be conducive to good public health.

The fact of the matter is the AIDS virus is being spread on a daily basis to many unsuspecting people because the person giving it to them does not know they have AIDS and the person involved in the sexual contact with them certainly does not know that as well.

The answer to the problem: We suggested back in 1987 a multifaceted plan to deal with the health of this Nation. We talked about education. Dr. Koop said we needed education. I agree with that.

But beyond that, he said, there was not much you could do other than use condoms or other devices to protect yourself or your partner from getting the AIDS virus.

But there are other things we can do. In addition to education, we should have testing. Every person in this country could be tested at a cost of about $5 per person or less. We know this to be a fact because the U.S. Army, the military, has been doing this for years, and they have had a very, very successful rate of discovery as far as people having AIDS. They did that because they wanted to protect the defense apparatus of this Nation. But we know we could test everybody in this country annually or every 18 months for about $5 on average. That would do a number of things. It would let people know they have the AIDS virus and it would let them know they have to do something to protect their fellow man, their loved ones from this virus being spread to them.

In addition, it would be a very useful tool in controlling this terrible epidemic that we do not know how bad it is.

I would like to say that we also suggested back in 1987, in addition to education and testing, that there be contact tracing so that we could find out who was being responsible or not being responsible in conducting themselves in a proper manner after they discovered they had the AIDS virus. There should be a penalty for someone who has AIDS going out and knowingly communicating that to another human being. We have people who are irresponsible in that regard.

So we need education, we need testing, we need contact tracing to find out if those who have been notified they have AIDS continue to act in an irresponsible manner and spread that disease to other human beings. And if they do that, there needs to be penalties.

If you go into a bank and shoot somebody or murder your wife, you are subject to the dealth penalty. I am not suggesting that about those who knowingly communicate AIDS to someone else, but they ought to be constricted from that type of activity, restricted from doing that. So we need education, testing, contact tracing and, for those

who act irresponsibly and continue to spread that disease, there needs to be some kind of constraints put upon them.

Now, to get to the article in the New England Journal of Medicine, and editorial written by Dr. Marcia Angell, here we are 5 years later and they said:

Testing health care providers and hospitalized patients is also controversial. Although it makes sense from several standpoints, screening patients on admission would identify those with whom health care providers must be most alert. It is unrealistic to expect them to maintain the highest level of vigilance continuously.

Similarly, because it is remotely possible that there could be an exchange of blood in a medical procedure, patients have a right to know, patients have a right to know whether a doctor or a nurse who performs invasive procedures in infected with HIV.

Now, I would like to tell my colleagues that last year we passed a piece of legislation which mandates that if a person has active AIDS and is a health-care worker in a hospital, let us say they are cleaning the wounds of somebody who has had open-heart surgery, under the Americans with Disabilities Act, if a person has active AIDS and they are a health-care worker working with someone who just had major surgery, we cannot move them out of that function without fear of the hospital or the doctor being sued and held liable. The Americans with Disabilities Act allows that type of litigation. So a doctor or a hospital is going to be in a very serious situation if a person who has AIDS and knowingly has AIDS, is working on a person who just had surgery, they could infect that person just as the dentist or a doctor did down in Florida. And they could so it with impugnity. And if the doctor or the hospital moves that person, that person with AIDS can sue the hospital and collect because that is the law of the Nation, according to the Americans With Disabilities Act which we passed last year.

But we now know that health care workers can communicate it to a patient, we now know that doctors and dentists can communicate it to a patient.

So in this editorial, Dr. Angell said, and I quote;

Patients have a right to know if their doctor or the nurses working on them have the AIDS virsus.

Further:

If necessary, retraining in noninvasive areas or early retirement could be provided by special insurance programs for health care professionals.

I agree with that. If a person has the AIDS virus, we do not want to take away their ability to earn a living, but at the same time we want to protect the health of this Nation and the patient who may be in that hospital from being exposed to the AIDS virus by a person who has been infected.

So there should be, we should look into a program, a special insurance program for health care professionals who may have the AIDS virus who may want to retire or put in another position.

Screening health care providers would also, of course, identify those for whom treatment could be begun early and whose sexual partners could be protected.

She goes on:

I believe systematic tracing and notification of the sexual partners of HIV-infected persons and screening of pregnant women, newborns, hospitalized patients and health care professionals are warranted. Notification of the partners are warranted.

Now, in California, in the State of California, if you have a veneral disease and your doctor knows about it, he has to notify the State health agency that you have a communicable disease, that is, syphilis or gonorrhea or some other sexually transmitted disease.

But if you have the AIDS virus in California the doctor cannot even notify your wife without being guilty of a felony or charged with a felony. This is a sexually transmitted disease which cannot be cured but will ultimately end up in the death of the person getting it.

So she says, and I will read this one more time.

I believe, on balance, systematic tracing and notification of sexual partners of HIV-infected persons, screening of pregnant women, newborns, hospitalized patients are warranted. These populations are, after all, relatively accessible to the health care system and at some special risk. Attempting to screen the entire population would simply be impractical.

I disagree with her there. I think ultimately that is going to be the only solution.

Five years ago nobody talked about health care workers, doctors, dentists, communicating this disease to their patients. They said it was not possible. Dr. Koop said unequivocally you cannot get it that way. We now know Dr. Koop is incorrect.

Here we are 5 years later finding out that doctors all across this country are starting to say that we need to screen patients and the doctors themselves need to be tested. This doctor says that the patients need to be notified if the doctor or dentist or whoever they are working with, a health-care worker, has the virus, so that they could protect themselves. I think ultimately we are going to have to go where I thought we were going to go 5 years ago, and that is to a national testing program, a routine testing program, not unlike what we faced when we had the tuberculosis pandemic many, many years ago, generations ago. We had everybody tested for tuberculosis. I had a patch test when I was in school. It was a routine thing. Nobody complained about that; nobody complained about the civil rights being violated, because they knew that we were trying to protect the health of this Nation.

So I think ultimately we are going to have to test everybody and get on with the other facets of the program I talked about, in that we are going to have contact tracing, education and penalties for those who knowingly spread the disease.

□ 1720

She goes on to say,

These populations are, after all, relatively accessible to the health care system at some special risk. Attempting to screen.

I will pass over that because we just covered screening the entire population.

On the other hand she says:

Targeting only high-risk groups would be unworkable in part because it would entail making distinctions that are often impossible as well as insidious. With any increase in screening, however, the specter of discrimination arises once a person is known to be infected. Only if such discrimination, at least in its more tangible expressions, is countered by statute and if those HIV infections are assured of receiving all the medical care they need can we pursue the basic elements of infection control more routinely and so spare others the tragedy of this disease.

I agree with that. I think we need to do something to protect those who are already infected, protect their rights, their civil rights, their health care benefits, but we must get on with the task in my opinion of protecting the population of this country from a disease that is so insidious that it is being spread without people even knowing they are getting it. They do not know the person they are coming in contact with has it, and so they get it, and then they go out, and maybe they spread it to someone else unknowingly, and, as a result, there is an exponential possibility of spreading this disease to every single person in this country ultimately.

Now we have got to get on with the program to deal with that.

I see my colleague from California who has been one of the leaders in the fight for coming up with a positive program to deal with AIDS is here, and, if he would like to, I yield to him at this time.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], for yielding, and I want to thank him for taking this special order to bring to the Members of the House a significant development in the struggle to treat the AIDS epidemic in America as a public health issue rather than as a civil rights issue, which sadly for all of us is still being pursued in 10 of the States of this Union that have better than three-fourths of the cases, including my State of California which has the second highest total and New York

State which has the highest total of any cases in the country.

I say to the gentleman,

Your State of Indiana is bothered by a very small number of infected carriers, and to the credit of the people of the great State of Indiana, but my State of California is not in that category. We have a population that has witnessed better than 20,000 deaths so far. Across this land we've witnessed over a hundred thousand deaths so far.

Mr. Speaker, this article in the New England Journal of Medicine is one of the most significant steps that have come out of the medical establishment in dealing with this epidemic since December 1989, and the reason I make reference to December 1989, is because in that year and month the American Medical Association at its annual convention in Hawaii, through the leadership of the immediate past president of the Arkansas State Medical Society, Dr. Billy Jones, who was not a delegate to the convention; Dr. Jones went to that convention, and cajoled and in effect caused the American Medical Association to say, as the official voice of medicine in America, that it was the policy of the AMA that every State should have in place reportability for HIV carriers in contact tracing. That was a significant step, December 1989.

Now the AMA reaffirmed that position in December 1990, but what this article in the New England Journal of Medicine signifies to the medical establishment and to we citizens in America is what cannot be underestimated because this is the beginning of the breaking of the logjam that currently exists in this Nation because the New England Journal of Medicine—I am a lawyer, not a doctor, but my medical friends tell me that the New England Journal of Medicine is one of the premier medical publications in the country dealing with issues relating to health.

Mr. Speaker, when that august publication came out with this statement, it says that the establishment is beginning to see the policy of treating the AIDS epidemic as a civil rights issue rather than a public health issue has got to stop, and what this article says is in effect that every State should have reportability and contact tracing as a means of controlling the epidemic, which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and I have been talking about for over 5 years. It also talks about testing routinely people coming into hospitals and doctors offices without the written consent of the patient.

No one is suggesting here that the test results are going to be posted on a bulletin board or shared with anybody except the people in the health care business who have a right to know who they are treating, and I think that point should be made very clear because one thing I have noticed in this whole political struggle that has been going on for the last 5 years is that anytime the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], or I, or other Members in the House—the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], our colleague, has been one of us, and he is helping us in the struggle; he has come forward and said, "As a policy we should be implementing what the AMA says."

Immediately the people on the political left, led by the homosexual activist community, came out of the woodwork and said, "You can't do that because that's a violation of our civil rights."

But now, as I say, that argument has been put to rest when the august New England Journal of Medicine says we should be implementing this policy.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I might interrupt my colleague, one of the things that I feel is very important is to put everything in perspective. The health of the Nation should come first, but that does not mean we should circumvent the civil rights of the people who do contract the AIDS virus. Their civil rights can be protected, and at the same time we can deal with this pandemic in a rational way. The idea that, if we have testing, or contact tracing, or a well-thought-out program to deal with the virus that it is going to stop this epidemic from spreading, the idea that that automatically precludes the possibility of a person keeping their civil rights is crazy. A person can have their civil rights. We can respect their civil rights and at the same time protect the health of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, what we have to do is just put things in perspective, and that is the program to deal with this pandemic should be first because, if we do not have the health of the Nation, if we have another bubonic plague that wipes out 5 or 10 million people, the civil rights issue becomes an academic question.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. There are a number of State health officers around American who should be ashamed of themselves for their failure to take action to treat this as a public health issue, and they are still treating it as a civil rights issue.

I am thinking now of Dr. Axelrod, the health officer of New York State, the State with the largest number of cases. In my State of California the previous health officer is a man named Kaiser. He just recently resigned, and he was replaced. Kaiser and Axelrod have been attempting to defend treating this as a civil rights issue. They should be ashamed of themselves for their failure to exercise the leadership which they in the profession of public health should be asserting.

Similar with Dr. Koop. I have the greatest admiration for some of the policy options that Dr. Koop gave us as Surgeon General of the United States in his capacity, for instance, as affirming the pro-life position which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and I share. But in the response that Dr. Koop directed as Surgeon General of the United States in developing a public health policy to control the AIDS epidemic he was a tragic failure. He was the one that came out a few years back and suggested—he did not say this, but what his comments caused others to interpret what he meant was that, if we only arm ourselves with condoms in America, we can be safe from the AIDS epidemic. That is nonsense. I want to emphasize again that Dr. Koop did not say that, but what he did say caused others to observe that that could be interpreted by what he said.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] arrived, I read part of the report that Dr. Koop wrote dealing with the AIDS pandemic, and one of the things he said, just for the gentleman's edification here, and I am sure he is aware of this: He said, "There's no danger of AIDS virus infection from visiting a doctor, a hospital, a hairdresser, or beautician," and that was a categorical statement. The fact of the matter is we know that there is a danger even when they wear gloves and masks, and we do not know all the ways this virus can be transmitted, and that is why I continue to maintain that the only way to get a handle on where it is spreading, and how it is spreading and how fast it is spreading is to have some kind of a national routine testing program so we can find out.

□ 1730

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I also observed that in 1990, last year, in the closing days of the 101st Congress, I offered an amendment to a bill going through the House that would have implemented the policy of requiring that any State in the Union that received funds had to have reportability and contact tracing, which is the cornerstone step that our society should be adopting.

In 1990, as I recall, we got a little over about 125 votes for that amendment, not enough for passage, but it was progress from the votes that we got back in 1988, when we only got around in the low seventies for that position.

I thank my colleague for the help in supporting that amendment in both instances. Now with the American Medical Association saying it should be the policy and now the New England Journal of Medicine saying it should be the policy, and I would commend the leaders of the New York State Medical Society and of the New Jersey State Medical Society and the Massachusetts State Medical Society.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me pose a rhetorical question to my colleague: Why has not the Center for Disease Control, that has some of the finest scientific minds in the country, taken the lead in doing this? Why should it be the New England Journal of Medicine

rather than the CDC, who has a full-time staff dealing with this problem?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Well, let me observe the rationale that would be forthcoming from the CDC people in Atlanta, Georgia and from the Health and Human Services Agency here in Washington headed by Dr. Sullivan. They would say to all of us, "Well, now, wait a minute, Congressman. It has been the policy of the CEC for at least the last 5 or 6 years that every State should have in place reportability and contact tracing. We have advocated that."

But then if one asks Dr. Mason, for instance, at HHS or if one asks Dr. Sullivan, or Dr. Roper in charge of CDC in Atlantic GA, "Do you believe that we should change public policy in America so that as a condition of receiving Federal funds, every State should have in place reportability and contact tracing for HIV carriers?" At that time, I would still think at this late day they would say "no." No, that is a matter for state option. We do not want to impose our views on State public health officials because that is an option which they should have.

Given the fact that we have witnessed the death of over 100,000 lives tragically that have died from this epidemic so far.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And there is going to be another 100,000 dead or dying very shortly. We have 235,000 that actually have the disease.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. And we have expended untold billions of dollars in health care costs, taking care of these tragic victims. I believe we have a national epidemic on our hands. For the CDC in Atlanta, GA, to attempt to defend this respect for States rights at this late date in the epidemic reminds me of a policy that, had it been pursued in the Second World War, for instance, that Governors of the States would have an option as to whether or not they wanted to send their sons to defend the central government, that is absurd.

Similarly, I think the policy being pursued by Dr. Sullivan and Dr. Mason at HHS and Dr. Roper at CDC is just plain nonsense.

I also want to add that notwithstanding the AMA official position that every State should have in place reportability and contact tracing, when my amendment came to the floor last fall to have that done, what did we hear from the staff of the American Medical Association here in Washington? The staff here in Washington was opposed to my amendment, mandating reportability and contact tracing on the States, because it was, well, in their view, a violation of States rights.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I might interject a comment here, I am a firm believer in States rights, but when you have a disease, a pandemic of this magnitude possibly facing this country, it transcends State lines, State boundaries, country lines, and country boundaries. I think that we as a government, a Federal Government, have to come up with a policy to deal with that.

I would like to add a couple of comments. Several major studies have been done in this area. Masters, Johnson & Kolodny came out with a report that pretty much parallels what the gentleman from California and I have been working on. The highly respected Hudson Institute concurs with what we have been trying to do. I think very highly regarded doctors, Dr. Day, Lorraine Day of California, this doctor that just wrote this report for the New England Medical Journal of Medicine, they have come out heading in the direction that we have been talking about.

I would just like to ask the gentleman a question on another subject. Before we came down to the floor, I was talking about the Americans With Disabilities Act. The gentleman will recall last year one of the real bones of contention on this floor was that health care workers who had the AIDS virus, even active AIDS with lesions on their arms, could not be removed from working with a patient who just came out of surgery because they thought that was a violation of their civil rights, and that if a doctor or a hospital mandated that this person who had active AIDS was forced out of caring for this patient who just had major surgery, the hospital, and the doctor would be liable.

Does the gentleman not believe that in view of the fact that we now know that health care workers are communicating this disease through medical contact, that we ought to reevaluate this position and amend the Americans With Disabilities Act?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. No question about it. Most people in this country have no idea that as a result of the Americans With Disabilities Act, which was adopted in the last Congress, every HIV carrier in America fits within the definition of a disabled person and is entitled to all of the protection of a person who achieves that status or is suffering under that status, would be a better phrase, and is entitled to certain protections.

I draw a distinction between how we should define people that are disabled. People who intentionally engage in conduct which acquires a status, in this instance a disease, should be distinguished from people who have a tragedy in their life, an accident or as the result of industrial injury, where they are truly disabled. As I say, I think the gentleman makes a very good point. We should amend that act so as to make clear that somebody who is an HIV carrier is not going to, as a result of that act, be entitled to go to court to have a court order that that person who is carrying an infectious disease can still take care of people coming into the health care system.

It is a tragedy that we even have to talk about doing this, but it is another illustration of how politicized our treatment of this disease has become in America.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The thing that concerns me so much is that we have been told that if certain precautions were taken, that is, wearing gloves, masks, and hospital paraphenalia, that the disease cannot be transmitted to another person. We now know that that is not the case. We now know there are doctors, we know there are dentists, health care workers that have communicated this disease while wearing this paraphenalia and have obtained this disease.

The fact of the matter is, 230 million AIDS viruses will fit on a period at the end of a sentence, and gloves and hospital paraphenalia, the pores in those rubber gloves are much bigger, microscopic, if you look at them through a microscope, they are much bigger than the virus and the virus can very easily go through the paraphenalia, the gloves, and so forth that the hospital health care workers have to wear. So even if a person wears all this paraphenalia and has the AIDS virus, and they are working on a patient in a dentists's office or a doctor's office or a hospital, they can communicate to them and that patient has a right to know that their life may be in jeopardy because an AIDS-infected person is working on them.

We need to amend the Americans With Disabilities Act this year, and I hope my colleagues will assist us.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank my colleague for yielding this time and I thank the gentleman again for this special order.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for participating. I think at some point in the future the people of this Nation will realize the service that he has performed in trying to bring to the attention of this Nation the problem of AIDS and how we are dealing with it, the ineffective way we are dealing with it.

Let me conclude by saying that we now are seeing a progression toward the realization that there are many ways to get AIDS that we did not believe were possible just a few short years ago. Because of that, we have to start doing things to protect this population. A lot of people have been sentenced to death, if you will, because we have not taken this action before now.

□ 1740

But it is not too late for many millions of other human beings in this country who have not yet contracted this AIDS virus, but who very well may, if we do not start taking steps to protect them. Those steps should include a comprehensive program to deal

with the AIDS virus; education, to be sure; blood testing, routine testing, to be sure; contact tracing, to find out if a person who has been discovered to have AIDS is not spreading it to another person after being told they have that virus. We need to find out how and to whom they are spreading it. We need to have psychological help for those who have AIDS, because it is a tremendous burden for a person to carry.

Finally, for those who continue to spread the AIDS virus, knowing they have it, it is as bad, or maybe even worse, than shooting someone with a gun. They need to be constrained in some way. We need to have laws to protect the public from people who want to go out and say, "Because I have AIDS and know I am going to die in a few short years, I am going to take as many of you with me as I possibly can." There are those that have that attitude. Just like a person with a gun who goes to shoot someone, the population needs to be protected from them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by saying this is just another episode or chapter in the ongoing debate on how to deal with the AIDS pandemic. You may rest assured, as long as I am in Congress, I will be back periodically to talk about this problem.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. HALLEN, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title.

H. Con. Res. 157. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from May 23, 1991 to May 29, 1991, and an adjournment of the Senate from May 23 or May 24, 1991 to June 3, 1991.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BROWDER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MCCOLLUM (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of attending the Base Closing Commission meeting in Jacksonville, FL.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on May 30.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes each day, on June 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, and 13.

Mr. GUNDERSON, for 60 minutes each day, on May 29 and 30.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CLEMENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN, for 60 minutes, on May 30.

Mr. EDWARDS of California, for 60 minutes, on May 28.

Ms. COLLINS of Illinois, for 60 minutes each day, on May 28, 29, 30, 31, and June 1 and 2.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. WELDON.
Mr. VANDER JAGT.
Mr. MICHEL.
Mr. OXLEY.
Mr. CAMP.
Mr. RAMSTAD.
Mr. RHODES.
Mr. STUMP.
Mr. LIVINGSTON.
Mr. BLILEY.
Mr. HASTERT.
Mr. MCEWEN.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. GRANDY in two instances.
Mr. BALLENGER.
Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mr. GALLO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VENTO.
Mr. MATSUI in two instances.
Mr. REED.
Mr. HARRIS.
Mr. BEILENSON.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. MURTHA.
Mr. PEASE in two instances.
Mr. DELLUMS.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. ROSE.
Mr. TALLON.
Mr. TRAXLER.
Mr. FAZIO.
Mr. DELUGO.
Mr. GUARINI.
Mr. SLATTERY.
Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
Mr. WOLPE.
Mrs. LOWEY of New York in four instances.
Mr. STUDDS.
Mr. KOLTER.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. MOODY.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 929. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake interpretive and other programs on public lands and lands withdrawn from the public domain under their jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Agriculture, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to designate 1991 as the "Year of Public Health" and to recognize the 75th anniversary of the founding of the John Hopkins School of Public Health; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution marking the 75th anniversary of chartering by Act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 157, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 157, the House stands adjourned until 12 noon, Wednesday, May 29, 1991.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 157, the House adjourned until Wednesday, May 29, 1991, at 12 noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1359. A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Technical Assistance Revolving Fund"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1360. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1361. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the financial audit for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1990, together with the auditor's opinion, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(47), 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1362. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 26. A bill to require the Federal depository institution regulatory agencies to take additional enforcement actions against depository institutions engaging in money laundering, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-28, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORD of Michigan: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 2312. A bill to make certain technical and conforming amendments to the Follow Through Act and the Head Start Transition Project Act. (Rept. 102-76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORD of Michigan: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 2313. A bill to amend the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act of 1988 to extend authorization of appropriations through fiscal year 1993 and for other purposes (Rept. 102-77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALL of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 159. Resolution waiving certain points of order during consideration of H.R. 2426. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-78). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 160. Resolution waiving points of order during consideration of H.R. 2427, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-79). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1006. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1992 for the Federal Maritime Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of Rule X, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 26. The Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration of H.R. 26; H.R. 26 referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PURSELL (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. STOKES, Ms. OAKAR, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WEBER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. ROYBAL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. CLINGER, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2447. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to redesignate the National Center for Nursing Research as the National Institute of Nursing Research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELDON (for himself, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LENT, Ms. LONG, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MINETA, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. TANNER, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. WEBER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. JAMES, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. RITTER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HENRY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 2448. A bill to provide for the minting of coins in commemoration of Benjamin Franklin and to enact a fire service bill of rights; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Science, Space and Technology.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. PACKARD):

H.R. 2449. A bill to encourage the uninterrupted continuation of the Landsat remote-sensing satellite program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 2450. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for Federal jurisdiction of certain multiparty, multiforum, civil actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 2451. A bill to provide for energy conservation standards for certain lamps, showerheads, faucets, and commercial and industrial heating and cooling equipment and electric motors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. SYNAR, and Mr. FAZIO):

H.R. 2452. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to provide for additional energy conservation measures at all Federal agencies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHANDLER (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. ROBERTS):

H.R. 2453. A bill to exempt certain small employer purchasing groups from certain requirements of State laws relating to health benefit plans and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to equalize tax benefits for self-employed persons participating in such groups; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. BILLEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ECKART, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. SHARP):

H.R. 2454. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to impose debarments and other penalties for illegal activities involving the approval of abbreviated drug applications under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2455. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to strengthen the United States' ability to respond to foreign trade practices that threaten U.S. commerce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of New York:

H.R. 2456. A bill to prohibit government-to-government and commercial arms sales to any country that is participating in or cooperating with the economic boycott of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2457. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require that persons comply with State and local firearms licensing laws before receiving a Federal license to deal in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H.R. 2458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that certain indebtedness will not be treated as home equity indebtedness for purposes of the limitations on the deductibility of personal interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 2459. A bill to amend the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Planning Act of 1974 to provide for the salvage of catastrophically damaged National Forest System timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. EDWARDS of

Oklahoma, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WEBER, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. REGULA, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. KASICH, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. BAKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KYL, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. GRADISON, and Mr. MILLER of Washington):

H.R. 2460. A bill to help the Nation achieve the National Education Goals by supporting the creation of a new generation of American Schools in communities across the country; rewarding schools that demonstrate outstanding gains in student performance and other progress toward the National Education Goals; creating academies to improve leadership and core-course teaching in schools nationwide; supporting State and local efforts to attract qualified individuals to teaching and educational administration; providing States and localities with statutory and regulatory flexibility in exchange for greater accountability for student learning; encouraging, testing, and evaluating educational choice programs; increasing the potential usefulness of the National Assessment of Education Progress to State and local decision-makers; expanding Federal support for literacy improvements; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER:

H.R. 2461. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to conduct a study of the feasibility of modifying the project for navigation located at Lake Montauk Harbor, NY, for the purpose of making navigation improvements to that project; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HOLLOWAY (for himself, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. HAYES of Louisiana):

H.R. 2462. A bill to facilitate the employment of certain Public Health Service employees by the Bureau of Prisons at the Gillis W. Long Hansen's Disease Center, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUCKABY (for himself, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. HOLLOWAY):

H.R. 2463. A bill to provide for the protection and management of ecologically-significant old growth forest on certain national forest lands and public domain lands in the State of Washington, Oregon, and California; to ensure the conservation of the Northern Spotted Owl and protection of other species associated with old growth forest on such lands; to provide economic adjustment grants and benefit payments to communities and workers economically dependent on such lands; to facilitate the implementation of land management plans for such lands and Federal lands elsewhere; to ensure a stable and predictable supply of commodity resources from, and the stability of communities dependent on, Federal lands; and, for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JENKINS (for himself, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KYL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. HOLLOWAY):

H.R. 2464. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that certain activities of a charitable organization in operating an amateur athletic event do not constitute unrelated trade or business activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 2465. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a highway bridge demonstration project in the Vermillion, SD-Newcastle, NE area to improve the flow of traffic between the States of Nebraska and South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LAUGHLIN:

H.R. 2466. A bill to ratify a memorandum of agreement concerning the cooperative management of public lands included within the National Wildlife Refuge System on Matagorda Island, TX and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OWENS of New York:

H.R. 2467. A bill to establish the National Institute for the Education of At-Risk Students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEASE:

H.R. 2468. A bill regarding the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 2469. A bill to require a study relating to the decennial census of population; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2470. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for rollover of gain from sale of farm assets into an individual retirement account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina:

H.R. 2471. A bill entitled "Craggy Mountain Wilderness Act of 1991"; jointly, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 2472. A bill to require an investigation of Internal Revenue Service abuse of taxpayer's rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WISE (for himself and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.R. 2473. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to maintain the Federal percentage of funding, to limit the use of discretionary grant funds and to establish Bureau advisory committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. FISH, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. TRAXLER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CARR, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PRICE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. REED, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. ROE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MAVROULES, and Mr. EMERSON):

H.J. Res. 260. Joint resolution designating October 1991 as "Italian-American Heritage and Culture Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOODY (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BEILENSON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Ms. LONG, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MRAZEK, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WYDEN):

H.J. Res. 261. Joint resolution designating the week beginning October 20, 1991, as "World Population Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H. Con. Res. 157. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from May 23, 1991 to May 29, 1991, and an adjournment of the Senate from May 23 or May 24, 1991 to June 3, 1991; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. SOLARZ):

H. Con. Res. 158. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol by the National League of POW/MIA Families for a ceremony to honor the mem-

bers of the Armed Services and civilians still imprisoned, missing, and unaccounted for as a result of the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself and Mr. RICHARDSON):

H. Con. Res. 159. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding further democratic reforms in Nicaragua; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SWIFT (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. SYNAR):

H. Res. 161. Resolution relating to unfair practices in international trade resulting from differing national environmental policies, standards, and controls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

136. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the Whidbey Island Naval Air Station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

137. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to prisoners of war; to the Committee on Government Operations.

138. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the Hawaiian Home Lands Trust and the Public Lands Trust; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

139. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, relative to the insurance business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

140. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to urging the Congress to reject H.R. 9 and S. 430; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

141. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Florida, relative to the Surface Transportation Assistance Act; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

142. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to the Congress providing funding to the Alliance for Coastal Engineering at Stevens Institute of Technology; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

143. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to civil rights; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

144. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to providing tax credits to motorists who use liquefied petroleum gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

145. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to civil rights; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and Labor.

146. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to civil rights; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and Labor.

147. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Nebraska, relative to wetlands; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 98: Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. KYL, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. MCEWEN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. TORRES, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 114: Mr. ECKART and Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 118: Mr. MACHTLEY and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

H.R. 124: Mr. ROWLAND.

H.R. 127: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 179: Mr. PICKETT and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 300: Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 303: Mr. MARLENEE.

H.R. 306: Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 310: Mr. LEWIS of Florida and Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 316: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 317: Mr. UPTON and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 331: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 371: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 392: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 394: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. BRUCE, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 413: Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 430: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. BROOMFIELD.

H.R. 461: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SANGMEISTER, and Mr. RHODES.

H.R. 516: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 524: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 565: Mr. WYLIE, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. KLUG, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 617: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 709: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. BLAZ.

H.R. 747: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HASTERT, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WISE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. OLIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CLINGER, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. HENRY.

H.R. 774: Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 791: Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 802: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 821: Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. DELLUMS, and Ms. COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 830: Mr. BRUCE and Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 849: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 917: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 951: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 954: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 955: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 956: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mr. GREEN of New York.

H.R. 958: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. GREEN of New York, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 967: Mr. SCHULZE and Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

H.R. 977: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 999: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1064: Mr. LUKEN.

H.R. 1077: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1084: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1112: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1113: Mr. PRICE.

H.R. 1115: Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 1135: Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1145: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1147: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 1149: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 1287: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1325: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1346: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 1348: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. RAY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 1360: Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 1364: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. REED, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 1365: Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 1408: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1413: Mr. ARCHER and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 1414: Mr. GUARINI and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

H.R. 1418: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1422: Mr. MILLER of Ohio Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FROST, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 1426: Mr. LANCASTER and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 1432: Mr. FROST, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 1456: Mr. COX of California, Mr. RHODES, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PETERSON of Flordia, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. KLUG, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. ROEMER.

H.R. 1466: Mr. FUSTER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 1467: Mr. VENTO, Mr. HUCKABY, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 1478: Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

H.R. 1495: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. BARNARD, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 1524: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ROE, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LONG, Mr. YATES, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, and Mr. NAGLE.

H.R. 1531: Mr. BLAZ, Mr. FROST, and Mr. MYERS of Indiana.

H.R. 1544: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1570: Mr. CARPER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1599: Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HERTEL, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1605: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. GREEN of New York, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1649: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1652: Mr. Kolbe.

H.R. 1662: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. WAXMAN

H.R. 1669: Mr. RUSSO.

H.R. 1771: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. PERKINS.

H.R. 1774: Mr. WALSH and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 1782: Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. RAY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. FROST, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 1800: Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 1856: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1890: Mr. KOPETSKI and Mr. LAROCCO.

H.R. 1970: Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1992: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 2011: Mr. RITTER, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 2012: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ROSE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 2017: Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 2027: Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2031: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 2049: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 2072: Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 2099: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LENT, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2149: Mr. FIELDS and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 2177: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 2179: Mr. JENKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. HUCKABY.

H.R. 2185: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ROE, and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 2201: Mr. ROE and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 2231: Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 2232: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 2236: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 2238: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 2248: Mr. APPLEGATE.

H.R. 2257: Mr. PACKARD, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 2258: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MORRISON, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2279: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 2291: Ms. NORTON and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 2298: Mr. MINETA, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCURDY, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2329: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MINK, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2357: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2363: Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2378: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 2404: Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 2415: Mr. JACOBS.

H.J. Res. 72: Mr. REGULA, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.J. Res. 101: Mr. RHODES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.J. Res. 138: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NOWAK, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. STARK, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. REED, Mr. BREWSTER, Mrs. MINK, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. BEILENSON.

H.J. Res. 143: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.J. Res. 172: Mr. SKAGGS.

H.J. Res. 177: Mr. MARTIN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.J. Res. 181: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.J. Res. 228: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. LONG, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. LUKEN.

H.J. Res. 232: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.J. Res. 241: Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MINETA, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CAMP, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.J. Res. 254: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. UPTON and Mr. HOAGLAND.

H. Con. Res. 96: Mr. WALSH and Mr. HAYES of Louisiana.

H. Con. Res. 144: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. COYNE.

H. Res. 64: Mr. DORNAN of California.

H. Res. 141: Mr. SANTORUM.

H. Res. 142: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. PORTER.

## DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

**Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:**

H.J. Res 143: Mr. PAXON.