

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

[Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. SKAGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SUPPORT AN ENLARGED NAFTA TO ENSURE COMPETITIVENESS OF AMERICAN EXPORTERS

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, today I want to continue the discussion which began in a joint subcommittee hearing of the House International Relations Committee on trade issues regarding Chile and other Latin American countries in light of the North American Free Trade Act [NAFTA] experience.

No doubt, we will continue to hear a plethora of statistics and anecdotes about the benefits and costs of NAFTA as well as increasing information about the benefits and costs of Chile's possible accession to that agreement. As a Member, I strongly supported NAFTA. Now, I strongly support Chile's accession to NAFTA. In fact, this Member said at the time, and will repeat it here today, that in a straightforward economic decision, it would have been more appropriate to accept Chile into a free-trade agreement with the United States even before Mexico because of Chile's dramatic economic progress and liberalization.

It is very easy to get lost in all the statistics about the benefits of NAFTA or Chile's accession. But those statistics don't reveal one thing. One should ask: "What would have happened if we had not passed NAFTA?"

There can be no doubt that many American companies have relocated to Mexico recently. Undoubtedly, many Americans have lost their jobs to

cheaper Mexican labor. But that does not mean that many Americans would have kept their jobs if we had not adopted NAFTA. No, instead, Americans would have lost many low-wage jobs to Southeast Asia, South Asia, and other parts of Central and South America. This situation has been greatly exacerbated by the peso crisis in Mexico which itself, this Member emphasizes, was in no way caused by the NAFTA agreement.

Mr. Speaker, when this body courageously adopted the Uruguay Round implementing legislation, this Member said that many opponents of that historic trade legislation were in essence saying, "Stop the world, I want to get off." Well, this Member stands by that comment and believes it still applies here today.

The simple truth is that the United States, and the American people, have no good economic choice but to push for expansion of NAFTA gradually and appropriately to the entire Western Hemisphere or risk being excluded from a rapidly liberalizing world economy. Economic integration and trade liberalization is occurring in nearly every part of the world including Europe, Asia, and South America.

For example, the European Union [EU] has already created the world's largest free-trade zone and has recently expanded this block by adding three members of the European Free Trade Association (Austria, Finland, and Sweden). The EU's single market includes 369 million consumers and a gross domestic product [GDP] of about \$6.3 trillion (1993). This "Fortress Europe," as some call it, is seeking to add the low-wage Eastern European economies of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia by the year 2000 and the North African and Middle Eastern countries of Morocco, Algeria, Libya, Tunisia, Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Israel by the year 2010. Together, this free-trade zone of low-wage labor Eastern European and Mediterranean countries and such high-tech, high-wage economies of the EU as the countries of Germany, France, and the United Kingdom represent a very formidable competitor to U.S. businesses and service industries which are attempting to compete in the new world economy.

Similarly, East Asian countries have begun the process of integrating their economies through such regional free-trade groups as the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation [APEC], which recently agreed to establish free trade in the region by 2020 for all of its 18 members, and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations [ASEAN], which currently has seven members but is seeking to incorporate other countries such as Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and Burma. ASEAN has rapidly become the world's largest regional trade area (with over 400 million people) and its members recently announced they would lower their tariffs from 0-5 percent shortly after the year 2000.

If the United States fails to continue to insist on its inclusion in these regional groups, supporters of the East Asia Economic Caucus (ASEAN plus China, Japan, and South Korea), which has been proposed by the outspoken Malaysian Prime Minister Mr. Mahathir, may be successful in excluding the United States from Asia and the Pacific region—the fastest growing market in the world.

Not to be left out of trade liberalization, South and Central America and the Caribbean have recently fragmented into several regional free-trade groups including:

Andean Pact: Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela.

Mercosur or Southern Common Market: Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay.

Central American Common Market: El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica.

Caricom: Antigua, Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent, the Grenadines, Trinidad, Tobago.

Clearly, the United States will suffer economically, politically, and strategically if it chooses to isolate itself from global and regional trade liberalization efforts. History is replete with examples of countries, like China, who turned inward instead of facing the difficult but necessary challenges of adapting to new circumstances, and therefore greatly suffered.

With only 250 million people, the United States cannot afford to refuse to trade with emerging markets in the world's developing countries. Through the year 2025, developing countries are expected to account for 95 percent of the world's population growth. More staggering is the fact that only 10 markets—those of Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Poland, Turkey, China, South Korea, Indonesia, India, and South Africa will produce one-half of the world's goods and services by the year 2010, but will account for \$1 trillion in incremental U.S. exports during that same period.

Mr. Speaker, this Member strongly believes Americans can compete to sell their innovative products and services anywhere in the world provided they are given a fair and equal opportunity without excessive Government interference. Consequently, I vigorously oppose unilaterally surrendering these future markets to our industrialized competitors in the Asia and Pacific region and in Western Europe by isolating ourselves from regional and global economic liberalization. Accordingly, this Member urges his colleagues to support free-trade agreements, such as an enlarged NAFTA, which help ensure that American exporters will be able to compete on a level playing field.

□ 1915

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Under a previous

order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. WISE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. KIM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. DORNAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. DOGGETT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. BROWNBACK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. SANDERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Committee on the Judiciary of this 104th Congress reported out, after extended hearings and even more extended markup, immigration reform legislation which for the very first time in modern times will in fact actually substantively and positively reform both the system of illegal immigration and our efforts by this Government to combat this tremendous drain on our national resources as well as legal immigration.

I am happy to have been a part of that process, but what makes me even happier is an event that happened in my own district in Smyrna, GA, this past Monday evening. This past Monday evening, State Representative Randy Sauder pulled together for the very first time in the district—and probably for the first time in the State of Georgia—a comprehensive task force to study the effects of illegal immigration and to develop solutions to the problem of illegal immigration in our district.

Representative Sauder pulled together as members of this task force, in addition to myself and representatives from other congressional and Senatorial offices, a vast array of local and State law enforcement officials, other State representatives, municipal authorities, police chiefs, other law enforcement officials, the regional director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, representatives of the Department of Labor, other agents and, perhaps most importantly of all, a number of private citizens who were involved with illegal immigration—combating illegal immigration—that is, in their communities and in their businesses.

And through the work of this task force, which began last Monday evening, on the eve of our historic action in the Committee on the Judiciary, passing this important legislation to be considered hopefully very soon by this very body, was a process of really coming to grips with and letting those of us in the Congress responsible for drafting the laws with regard to both legal and illegal immigration, a comprehensive look at how illegal immigration has affected and continues to adversely affect our communities in terms of the number of illegal aliens involved in criminal activity, in terms of the financial burdens placed on our communities, not just in the Seventh District of Georgia but indeed in many respects all across this country, the drain on the medical services, the drain on our welfare system and, indeed, other problems that are too lengthy to go into here this evening.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Representative Sauder for his foresightedness in recognizing this problem, in recognizing that its

solution goes far beyond the bounds of any one jurisdiction. It affects our homes, our schools, our businesses, our hospitals, our religious institutions, our local government, our State government and, indeed, all taxpayers of this country.

Through the work of Representative Sauder's task force, we hope over the next several months, Mr. Speaker, to really delve into the problem of illegal immigration and how it affects our communities. This work will be especially important to me as a Representative from the Seventh District to assist me in crafting the very best legislation possible, to identify those areas where additional work needs to be done, to helping direct precious taxpayer resources to combat the problem of illegal immigration in America. And I salute Representative Sauder for his work and look forward to working closely with him as an important part of the overall legislative effort of this Congress and future Congresses to come to grips with the crippling problem of illegal immigration in our country.

NURSING HOME STANDARDS PRESS CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it defies common sense that Republicans are stripping away basic protections for elderly residents of nursing homes, under the guise of cutting the bureaucracy. The fact of the matter is that quality standards for nursing homes are not bureaucratic and onerous, they are necessary. These regulations don't tie the hands of nursing homes, they keep nursing homes from tying the hands of seniors.

Now, I cannot believe that my Republican colleagues are deliberately trying to put nursing home residents at risk, so I must conclude that they simply don't understand how these regulations protect nursing home residents from neglect and abuse. So, let me explain, briefly, how they work in my home State of Connecticut.

As one Connecticut official comments in this article: "Without these standards and people to watch them, these situations will continue. That man might still be counting the dots on the ceiling."

The Republican Medicaid plan will mean the end of uniform safety standards for nursing home residents. It will create a patchwork of standards across the country. Some States may do a great job, others may not. For nursing home patients it will be a crap shoot. The quality of your care will depend on where you live. That's wrong. Our seniors deserve better.

Now, my Republican colleagues want the American people to believe that this budget package is about shared sacrifices for a noble purpose. But,