

from a significant trade surplus with Mexico now to a very significant trade deficit.

What does that mean in terms of jobs? Mr. Scott's study shows what it means in terms of jobs.

What it shows is "The Promise." We have all kinds of studies ranging from 220,000 to 2.8 million new jobs if we would just pass NAFTA. That is "The Promise." The reality is last year we lost 17,000 net jobs in the United States as a result of NAFTA. This year we are going to lose about 220,000 jobs in the United States as a result of NAFTA.

If anyone has other figures and would like to debate these, I would love to do so on the Senate floor. I would be glad to take time to do it. These are the real numbers. Take all of the transshipments out, and take out all of the statistical nonsense and find out what the net effect of jobs is. The net effect of jobs is that in the United States we were promised massive new job creation. And what we have gotten is a massive loss of jobs as a result of the United States-Mexico trade agreement.

Mr. Scott's study also shows that the jobs that we have lost as a result of the imports coming into this country are good jobs, good-paying jobs.

What are we importing from Mexico? Is it items produced by unskilled workers? No. The top imports are electrical and electronic machinery, equipment and supplies, transportation equipment, automobiles, automobile supplies, and automobile parts. That is what is being shipped into this country from Mexico. Those kinds of products represent good, high-skill jobs. Those are the jobs this country is seeing displaced. Those are the jobs this country is losing.

We note that in Mexico there is an area along the border called maquiladora plants. The maquiladora plants are the creation of big companies, many of them United States companies, building manufacturing and processing plants just across the border to produce in Mexico and ship to the United States.

What have we seen along the border since NAFTA?

There were about 2,000 maquiladora plants in 1994, and recent news reports tell us that the Mexican authorities are approving applications for two to three new plants, new manufacturing plants, every single day. At this rate of approval, the number of factories in the maquiladora zone in Mexico will increase by 50 percent in 1995. These plants are not being built to produce for Mexico. These plants are being built to dramatically increase exports from Mexico to the United States and dramatically displace jobs in the United States.

Mr. President, I do not know how those who were paid for those elaborate NAFTA studies that predict massive numbers of new jobs for America can walk around holding their head up these days when they see what has happened with Mexico. Yes. Some of it is

because Mexico devalued the peso. I understand that. But we should never have a trade agreement with anybody under any condition that does not have an adjustment for currency fluctuations anyway.

But the point is, this country got with NAFTA what it got with the Canadian trade agreement, which is what it got with GATT—we lost in the trade negotiations; we lost in a way that hurts American workers and costs our country desperately needed good-paying jobs for the American people.

I hope that in the coming weeks, as a result of Mr. Scott's study, we can have a real debate again now about NAFTA and maybe renegotiate NAFTA. Maybe this trade agreement was not such a good idea. If "The Promise" was nirvana, massive numbers of new jobs and a bright promise for America, but the reality is massive loss of jobs, big corporations taking advantage of the American people under trade rules they wanted and they pushed for, going across the border to produce in Mexico and to ship back into this country, maybe, understanding all of that, it is time for our country to decide these trade agreements do not make so much sense after all.

Maybe our trade agreements ought to be trade agreements that represent the interests of our country, not just the interests of multinational companies who want to produce, yes, in Mexico, but also in Indonesia, Malaysia, and all around the world where they can get people to work for 12 cents an hour, 12-year-olds working 12 hours a day, to produce a product they can ship to Pittsburgh, Denver, or Detroit. That is not fair trade. That is not trade that helps our country. That is not trade that produces a vibrant, strong American economy.

Every time we have these debates, those who support these trade agreements that, in my judgment, have irreparably injured our economy and have put Americans into a circumstance where they are looking for good jobs and cannot find them. They say, "Well, the issue is we have to have competition. We have to compete. If American workers and American business cannot compete, then we are doomed in the international economy."

My response is: Compete with what? Do you really want the American people to have to compete with people working for 25 cents an hour or working in factories that are unsafe, working in factories that dump chemicals into the streets and pollution into the air? If that is what we should compete against, as far as I am concerned, count me out. That is not fair competition. It is not what we fought 50 years for in this country on the issue of decent living wages, good environmental standards, good work, and safety laws. That is not what we fought 50 years for in this country, to surrender all of that, to give all of that up, because the largest enterprises in the world want to construct an economic circumstance

where they can produce where it is cheap and sell into established marketplaces. Such a scheme consigns this country, in my judgment, to a future with fewer jobs, especially fewer good jobs and fewer good paying jobs.

I hope that soon we will see more aggressiveness and more activity on the issue of requiring fair trade.

Mickey Kantor and the President are confronting the Japanese on the trade issue, and it requires some strength and courage to do that. None of us want a trade war. We understand that. But this is the first time that an American President or a Trade Ambassador has stood up and said wait a second; there is a price to pay to trade with us and the price is fair trade. Our markets are open to you. You open your markets to us. That is what we call fairness in our country.

I support the President. I do not want a trade war. It will not serve anybody's interests. But I want all of our allies to understand this is no longer post-World War II economic aid we are talking about. That is what our trade policy was for 50 years. Our foreign competitors are now strong and tough. Now we want trade fairness, and we insist on it.

On the issue of NAFTA, let us keep score. I can understand missing the bull's-eye. I can even understand missing the target, we find a lot of folks do that around here, especially economists. But I cannot understand missing the bull's-eye, missing the target and shooting yourself in the leg instead and not have people in Congress decide maybe this was a bad decision. I hope all of us will rethink these issues and decide whether or not there is a different strategy or different approach that really supports good jobs in our country and does not give away our economic future with unfair trade strategies that do not work for the interests of America.

Mr. President, I intend to send to other Members of the Senate copies of Mr. Scott's work, which I think is original, interesting, and good work that ought to point us in a different direction on trade policy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PAYMENT OF BENEFITS TO ILLEGAL ALIENS

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I rise today to address the issue of payment of benefits to illegal aliens and how it relates to the welfare reform bill that

the Senate will be considering very shortly. As other Senators may know—and I hope that they all know—I have long had an interest in curtailing Federal benefits to illegal aliens as a matter of both sound immigration policy and sound fiscal policy. I have introduced that measure as either a stand-alone bill or an amendment in every Congress since 1989, long before measures like California's proposition 187 arrived on the scene.

In 1993, when we debated the comprehensive crime bill, the Senate overwhelmingly accepted my amendment to restrict the benefits, but unfortunately those provisions were dropped in conference with the House of Representatives. That happens all too often.

I need not remind the Senate of the growing concern for what the public considers a runaway immigration policy and porous borders. It is true that many Federal programs specifically exclude illegal aliens and their criteria for eligibility. But we now have the sorry condition of the money flowing out just the same due to expansive and misguided agency regulation and court interpretations.

We also now have large border States filing lawsuits against the Federal Government as a result of failures in our Federal immigration policy, with other States threatening to follow suit.

It should be noted that the long-awaited report from the U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform, headed by respected former Representative Barbara Jordan, has generally recommended that illegal aliens not—receive publicly funded services or assistance. I agree wholeheartedly with that recommendation.

I am hopeful that we will soon make significant progress in immigration reform and welfare reform. I am concerned, however, that meaningful measures to restrict Federal welfare benefits to only citizens and legal aliens will be lost in the shuffle.

I submit, that when we turn to welfare reform, we have a golden opportunity to create a new and more coherent policy and stop, once and for all, paying benefits to illegal aliens.

The Senate appears ready to give States more funding flexibility and responsibility to oversee our welfare programs. I think it is only fair that, in exchange for that high degree of flexibility, the Federal Government asks the States to stand with us in verifying immigrant status and identifying illegal aliens for speedy deportation. With the assistance of the States in the verification process, fewer illegal aliens will receive benefits and both Federal and State budgets will reflect those savings. It is a simple fact that a deported alien will not continue to collect welfare benefits for months and even years.

To this point, the Federal Government and the States have essentially been working at cross-purposes in enforcing the immigration law. The

States have decried the inability of the Federal Government to police its borders. But when Congress considers dropping benefits to illegal aliens, the States complain that they will be saddled with the full cost of providing these services. But aside from just a few exceptions, the point remains, and the point is this: Neither the Federal Government nor the States should be paying for those benefits to those here illegally.

Illegal alien means just that, illegal. That is why I believe the State agencies must help us identify illegal aliens so that they may be deported before they sap either the State or Federal budgets.

It is time for a whole new way of thinking about this subject. We must initiate a joint new State-Federal resolve—a new compact, if you will—to put an end to these abuses.

Call it a fully funded mandate, and a cost saver as well. I think it is only reasonable to require States to verify the status of applicants, provided we help them give the resources that they need to do the job. It is my opinion that this change in the compact between the States and the Federal Government would yield benefits for both. And this principle should apply to whatever welfare reform compromise eventually passes.

Believe me, Mr. President, I feel that we also need to do more spadework on immigration reform itself. I feel strongly that deportation proceedings should be expedited. I also feel that there needs to be greater enforcement in those many cases where holders of temporary visas intentionally overstay their visas. And I feel that there needs to be stricter enforcement of the sponsor affidavits, aimed at ensuring that immigrants will not be a burden on the taxpayers.

Efforts to provide better border patrol and to attack asylum abuse are also needed. The President has made tough, new proposals in this regard, and I also applied the results of the Immigration and Naturalization Service's Operation Hold the Line at El Paso.

The passage of a welfare reform bill this year is the perfect opportunity to take a step back to look at what has gone wrong in the past and to stop the robbery of the American taxpayers by illegal aliens.

America has a rich history of diversity. Most of our forebears came from abroad, but I do not know how anyone can justify payment of Federal benefits to illegal aliens.

So I put my colleagues on notice. I intend to pursue this matter to the end beginning anew on this year's welfare reform bill. We need teeth to back up our laws, not watered-down compromises. The time for action is now.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPETITION AND DEREGULATION ACT

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, today, and very probably tomorrow, almost definitely we will be back into debating a very important part, if not a critical part, of the rewrite of the telecommunications laws of our country. They obviously need rewriting because we have not done anything about it since 1934, and we all know what has happened to communications and the distribution of information since that time.

In the mind of this Senator from Nebraska, who has been involved in telecommunications and distributions of information for 17 years on the Commerce Committee, and before that in other pursuits, a very important part of that legislation, as reported out of the Commerce Committee, dealt directly with something that is sweeping this country, and that is pornography, directed at children primarily, on the information superhighway, generally called the Internet. Too many people are sweeping this aside and saying everything is constitutionally guaranteed, and there is nothing we can do without violating the Constitution. That is nonsense, Mr. President.

I am up this morning just briefly to address this matter and alert every Member of the U.S. Senate, all 100 Senators, to this growing peril in America that needs the direct attention and action, in a constitutional manner, by the U.S. Senate.

A measure cosponsored by Senator GORTON and myself was unanimously adopted in the committee and incorporated in the telecommunications bill before the body. At the time of that action, I said this was not a perfect piece of legislation. I felt it had to be very carefully drafted in great detail to make certain that we did not pass a piece of legislation that would almost immediately be ruled unconstitutional by the courts.

I had amendments to that measure that I was principal sponsor of, along with the Senator from Washington State, in the committee that will further clarify, further define, and further alleviate any legitimate concern for anyone about trampling on the Constitution.

I would simply recite once again the statement of presentation made at some point on this floor on Friday last. It is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, June 9, 1995, starting on page S8089 and running through page S8092. I would like my colleagues that are not on the floor at this particular moment, or their staffs, to take