

MOVING GOODS AND PEOPLE IN INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE: REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE GENE MCNARY*

I welcome the opportunity to participate in this program, but in one sense it is curious that you invited me to serve as keynote speaker. Your program centers on negotiations that will lead to a North American free trade agreement, and my agency deals with immigration. As these discussions developed during the past year, one topic upon which all sides have agreed is that immigration is not on the table. So when it comes to North American free trade negotiations, I feel like the "little man who wasn't there," in the old rhyme:

As I was walking up the stair
I met a man who wasn't there
He wasn't there again today
Oh, I wish he'd go away.

And, if I can't be there, I am more than happy to be here. Moreover, I feel more than a bit confident in acknowledging that, if immigration is not formally on the table, someone at the table will sooner or later realize as a practical matter that moving goods and services in international commerce also involves moving the people who trade in those goods and services.

This nation's principles related to international trade and immigration have common roots. It is more than merely historical coincidence that the Declaration of Independence and Adam Smith's classic work of political economy, *The Wealth of Nations*, were both written in 1776. The Declaration asserted that two major principles of just government are the equal creation of all people, and the inclusion of liberty among inalienable rights. Not only did *The Wealth of Nations* argue forcefully for free markets as the most likely road to prosperity, but it concluded with a powerful case against colonial rule as damaging to commerce. In those days, the case was against mercantilism; today it's known as "managed trade."

The linkage between generous immigration policies and free trade has been the consistent policy of the past two administrations. In 1986, the *Economic Report of the President* opened its chapter entitled, "The Economic Effects of Immigration," by affirming:

* B.S., 1957, Indiana University; J.D., 1960, Indiana University. Mr. McNary is the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. This is a reprint of a speech delivered by Commissioner McNary on February 6, 1992, at Duke University School of Law, Durham, North Carolina. Many of the author's sources are unpublished INS materials. The author verifies the accuracy of the relevant factual assertions.

The movement of people between countries links national economies. Like international trade in goods, services, and financial claims, international migration connects domestic and international markets. The free flow of resources in response to market signals promotes efficiency and produces economic gains for both producers and consumers. The migration of labor, both domestically and internationally, represents such a flow of productive resources.¹

That point was reaffirmed in last year's *Economic Report*, as the opening lines of the chapter entitled "Trade Liberalization and Economic Growth" asserted:

The global trading system has been a driving force of economic growth and prosperity, with world trade increasing more than one and a half times as fast as world income since the early 1960s. The fraction of U.S. production sold abroad has more than doubled since then, and exports now account for about one-eighth of gross national product (GNP). As the world's largest economy, the United States has greatly benefited from the rapid growth of trade. By promoting innovation, flexibility, and competition, the expansion of trade and the globalization of markets and firms have stimulated economic growth and improved living standards.²

We live in exciting times. Even while we witness the collapse of managed economies and centralized governments around the world, we face a national mood that appears increasingly hostile to both free trade and generous immigration policies. As much as we applaud the liberation of former socialized economies, there is no reason to retreat from the courageous directions that enabled us to provide dynamic leadership to the world in recent years.

Today, I want to describe the course of recent policies that provide our foundation for international leadership on trade and immigration topics, and to describe steps that we are taking at the Immigration and Naturalization Service to ensure that our future policies remain consistent with our highest principles.

For nearly a century after the Constitution was adopted, the United States placed no limit on those who wished to come to our shores, but Americans soon developed a tradition of mixed emotions about immigration issues.

As a people, we often express strong opposition to immigration in general, but we regularly praise the particular immigrants and refugees whom we meet and know. On the one hand, we cherish the tradition represented by the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island; on the other hand,

1. ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT 213 (1986).
2. ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT 233 (1991).

surveys indicate that many Americans support reduced immigration because they are concerned about our ability to assimilate large numbers of additional people.

Immigrants who have been here a generation or more have good reputations — often being seen as hard-working people who used the opportunities provided here to overcome the restrictions experienced in their native countries. More recent immigrants, however, are viewed with less esteem — often because they are willing to work at dirty, dangerous, or low-paying jobs that the children of the previous immigrants no longer want.³

We can draw a parallel between our image and actions toward immigrants and our image and actions toward the Congress. In general, we accord both groups very low esteem, but we like the particular immigrants we know and we re-elect our members of Congress at rates that often astonish political observers.

Controversy is not something new to immigration policy. The nation's core immigration statute — The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1954⁴ — was adopted over President Harry Truman's veto, and is more commonly recorded in history books as the "McCarran-Walter Act." To the extent that it is a source of public discussion, officials tend to be praised for subsequent legislation that repealed that law's restrictive racial quotas or liberalized its exclusionary provisions. History, in that sense, tends to side with the generous sentiments reflected in the economic reports, rather than with the excessively restrictive sentiments that often creep into public controversy.

Controversy is inherent in our system of managing immigration. Precisely because of our economic prosperity and the tremendous opportunities that this nation provides even during times of economic troubles, each year more people want to come here than our laws authorize us to admit. Concerns about our efficiency in granting immigration benefits to eligible applicants, our effectiveness in denying benefits to those who are ineligible, and our fairness in distinguishing between them have long dominated immigration debates.

In recent years, administration immigration policies have been dominated by our more generous impulses. As President Bush reaffirmed on December 23, 1991, "immigrants have enriched the United States beyond measure. . . . [T]hey have shared eagerly in the hard work of freedom, helping to defend the ideals of liberty and self-government and helping to build our churches, schools, factories, farms, and railroads."⁵

3. Rita J. Simon, *Immigration and American Attitudes*, PUBLIC OPINION, July-Aug., 1987, at 47.

4. Immigration and Nationality Act, ch. 477, 66 Stat. 163 (1952) (current version at 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et seq.* (1988 & Supp. 1991)).

5. Proclamation No. 6398, 58 Fed. Reg. 66951 (1991).

The positive impressions generated by millions of legal immigrants, however, cannot account for the full impact that immigration has on our society today. In 1986, following fifteen years of intense deliberation, Congress adopted the Immigration Reform and Control Act⁶ (IRCA) to address major concerns about illegal immigration. IRCA provided a generous amnesty to people who had been in the United States illegally since 1982. More than three million people applied for lawful temporary resident status under either legalization or the law's special agricultural worker provisions.⁷ Most of those applicants are now permanent residents of the United States, and will become eligible for citizenship in a few years.

Just over a year ago, Congress completed the immigration policy reform process by adopting the Immigration Act of 1990.⁸ IMMACT, as we refer to it, increased the number of employment-based immigrant visas issued each year from 54,000 to 140,000, including 10,000 visas available to investors who create ten or more jobs for authorized workers in the United States. IMMACT retained the 270,000 visas for immigrant visas based on family relationships, with immediate relatives excluded from that cap.⁹ The combined effects of the benefits created by IRCA and IMMACT and the Bush administration's consistent support for more than 100,000 refugee admissions each year, ensure that the number of people who will be admitted to the United States as permanent residents will remain at historically high levels throughout this decade. The INS Statistics Division projects that, where nearly 6 million immigrants entered the United States during the 1980s, our laws allow more than 8.8 million immigrants during the 1990s.¹⁰

Those immigrants are likely to maintain the demographic patterns of recent years. Slightly more than 1 million Mexicans will enter this country as legal immigrants during the 1990s, where 692,000 entered legally during the 1980s.¹¹ At the same time, Soviet refugees who have been coming to the United States in recent years will become eligible to sponsor their families during the 1990s. As a result, the former Soviet Union will be the source of our greatest growth in legal immigration during this decade — with an estimated 560,000 former Soviets eligible

6. Pub. L. No. 99-603, §§ 201, 302, 100 Stat. 3359 (1986) (codified in scattered sections of 8 U.S.C.).

7. IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, 1990 STATISTICAL YEARBOOK OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE 91 (1991) [hereinafter STATISTICAL YEARBOOK].

8. Immigration Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-649, 104 Stat. 4978 (codified in scattered sections of 8 U.S.C.) [hereinafter IA 90].

9. *Id.* §101(a) (adding INA § 201(e)(1)(B)(ii)).

10. Memorandum from the Demographic Statistics Branch of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to Lisa Roney, Planning Staff (May 28, 1991) (on file with Immigration and Naturalization Service) [hereinafter Memorandum].

11. M. Hoefler & R. Warren, Projected Mexican Immigration 1991-2000 (May 10, 1991) (on file with Immigration and Naturalization Service).

for admission, where those countries were the source of only 83,000 immigrants during the 1980s.¹²

These immigrants will not be spread evenly across their new nation. In recent years, California, Texas, Florida, New York, and Illinois have gained about 80 percent of new legal immigrants.¹³ Those people had an impact on the recent congressional apportionment, and — as they become citizens who gain eligibility to vote — they are likely to have a serious impact on our politics. This nation can benefit substantially from new arrivals who have witnessed first-hand the failures of centralized socialism in their native lands, and bring with them a firm commitment to help us avoid the evils that they experienced.

In recent years, critics of our immigration policies have advanced a variety of arguments that question our ability to absorb the people who want to come to our shores. George Borjas, in his book *Friends or Strangers*, concluded that the "skill composition of the immigrant flow . . . has deteriorated significantly in the past two or three decades."¹⁴ Moreover, Borjas worries, "immigrants who are not well integrated [into] the American economy may form a permanent underclass, further straining the provision of public services and exacerbating social problems in the United States."¹⁵

Borjas' is only one voice giving sophisticated rationale to reversing policies that we only last year enacted into law. In a January column in *The Washington Post*, Lawrence E. Harrison asserted, "No immigration policy can remedy the failures of other nations to meet the needs of their poor, so it is both sensible and moral to base our policies primarily on the needs of our own society, particularly economic revival and raising the standard of living of our poorer citizens."¹⁶ Shorn of the academic trimmings, such sentiments are finding voice in current campaign proposals, such as Patrick Buchanan's recommendations for greater barriers along the Mexican border. Buchanan, however, rightly focuses on the serious problems that illegal immigration presents to our society. Harrison's recommendations would result in a reduction even of legal immigration.

Before considering such drastic steps, the country should examine carefully the record of contributions that legal immigrants make to our society. Most observers have learned from INS data that in recent years, where the population legalized by IRCA has had such a profound effect on our numbers, the average education of new permanent residents has

12. See Memorandum, *supra* note 10.

13. *Id.*

14. GEORGE J. BORJAS, *FRIENDS OR STRANGERS: THE IMPACT OF IMMIGRANTS ON THE U.S. ECONOMY* 8 (1990).

15. *Id.* at 4.

16. Lawrence E. Harrison, *Those Huddled, Unskilled Masses: Is Our Immigration Policy Contributing to Our Economic Undoing?*, WASH. POST, Jan. 12, 1992, at C2.

declined.¹⁷ Moreover, observers rightly note that the employment based categories of immigrants account for only 54,000 per year of the more than 600,000 that we admitted on average during each year of the 1980s.¹⁸

I must urge caution upon anyone using recent immigration data to project drastic impacts on the aggregate population. People living in the United States but born elsewhere constitute barely 6 percent of our population.¹⁹ Immigrants generally are young, with a median age nearly two years less than the rest of the United States population.²⁰ Moreover, recent INS data are influenced heavily by the population legalized by IRCA. These people entered the United States at very young ages, and many came with few of the skills and education that we treat as basic to our society.²¹ As a condition of legalization, however, they have had to learn English, and the history and principles of United States government. Their education, in short, continues in the United States, and what they have learned since their arrival will enhance their future contributions to our society.

Analysts reviewing data about immigrants frequently overlook another complexity of our numbers. Although we recognize that more immigrants each year will be admitted on the basis of family connections than employment skills, that is not the same thing as to say that those family members do not have valuable skills. Indeed, simply on the basis of the superior numbers, the family members who immigrate to the United States each year provide more talented people than arrive because of their skills. Let me give you some specific numbers from our 1989 cohort of immigrants. Of the 612,110 immigrants admitted that year, 46,365 had professional or technical skills.²² Only 10,250 of those professionals, however, were admitted on the basis of their skills.²³ Refugees and asylees accounted for 2,439 of the professionals admitted that year, and other immigration — predominantly people admitted because of family relationships — accounted for 33,676 (or nearly three quarters) of the skilled immigrants admitted during 1989.²⁴

In short, the evidence that we have to date provides substantial reason to believe that immigrants are, and will continue to be, major contributors to our society. Even George Borjas has conceded, "The

17. IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION REFORM AND CONTROL ACT: REPORT ON THE LEGALIZED ALIEN POPULATION 27 (1992) [hereinafter REPORT ON THE LEGALIZED ALIEN POPULATION].

18. See generally Edward J. Lynch & Robert Warren, Planning and Policy for a Changing World 8 (1990) (INS Internal Working Document).

19. See STATISTICAL YEARBOOK, *supra* note 7, at 23.

20. *Id.* at 45.

21. See REPORT ON THE LEGALIZED ALIEN POPULATION, *supra* note 17.

22. See Lynch & Warren, *supra* note 18, at 8.

23. *Id.*

24. *Id.*

methodological arsenal of modern econometrics cannot [find] a single shred of evidence that immigrants have a [major] adverse impact on the earnings and employment opportunities of natives in the United States."²⁵ The additional skills-based visa numbers authorized by IMMACT will enhance this nation's opportunities to attract skilled immigrants in the coming years.

Legal immigration, however, is only part of the challenge that we face in administering our laws. Much of the national debate that preceded IRCA was concerned with developing an effective means of addressing the complicated challenges posed by illegal immigration. In 1976, the Domestic Council Committee on Illegal Aliens recognized that migration to the United States was often inspired by the wide differences between earning capacity in the "sending" countries and opportunities in the United States.²⁶

The Domestic Council urged, "Illegal immigration must be studied in the context of migration incentives and the law governing legal entry . . . economic opportunity and kinship and culture ties in the U.S. combine with migration pressures to create potent push-pull forces which the INA [Immigration and Nationality Act] was not designed to check."²⁷

While the United States addressed the problems of illegal immigration, those problems became more complicated. During the 1980s, forces leading to liberalization in the Soviet Union, several revolutions in the less developed world, and more diverse patterns of lawful migration provided greater opportunities for people from other lands to seek admission to the United States.

IRCA created a Commission for the Study of International Migration and Cooperative Economic Development, which reported in 1990 that progress had brought about unanticipated effects in many nations.²⁸ Rather than people simply coming to seek new opportunities in the United States, the Commission saw international migration as a response to a variety of forces, such as trade restrictions in the United States having adverse effects on opportunities in other lands.²⁹ Although calling for a comprehensive, positive approach to international development — which would provide the only long-term route to economic progress — the Commission recognized that a long-term

25. See BORJAS, *supra* note 14, at 81.

26. Preliminary Report of the Domestic Council Committee on Illegal Aliens (Dec. 1976), reprinted in STAFF OF SENATE COMM. ON JUDICIARY, 96TH CONG., 2D SESS., SELECTED READINGS ON U.S. IMMIGRATION POLICY & LAW 104 (Comm. Print 1980).

27. *Id.*

28. See *id.*

29. COMMISSION FOR THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION AND COOPERATIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, UNAUTHORIZED MIGRATION: AN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RESPONSE, REPORT OF THE COMMISSION FOR THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION AND COOPERATIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT 14-27 (July 1990).

development strategy would require nearly thirty years, and would involve many short-term difficulties. The Commission concluded:

There are no short-term solutions to the problem of undocumented migration. Regardless of our efforts and those of the countries themselves, the United States will continue to be a magnet so long as our wages are many times more attractive than theirs. Moreover, the major paradox of our study is the conclusion that economic development in the short-term stimulates migration by raising expectations and enhancing people's ability to migrate. It takes many years — even generations — for sustained growth to achieve the desired effect.³⁰

Economic development must, in the long-term, provide the firmest foundation for economic and political stability. Anticipating negotiations toward a North American Free Trade Agreement, the United States International Trade Commission reported in February of 1991 that increased trade with Mexico has been a substantial success in recent years. Not only have reforms in Mexico provided for economic development and reduced inflation, the strengthened Mexican economy has provided new markets for U.S. goods and services.

The International Trade Commission recognized that Mexico's economy is much smaller than ours, and that the impact on this country would be limited because many goods and services already trade between our nations with relatively few barriers. Nonetheless, the ITC concluded that a Free Trade Agreement:

would probably increase Mexico's rate of growth and thereby increase the benefits to the United States over time. . . . By codifying liberal trade and investment policies in an international agreement . . . a United States-Mexico F[ree] T[rade] A[greement] would increase the confidence of investors in Mexico's economy. . . . In so doing, it would increase Mexico's demand for U.S. exports and benefit the United States.³¹

A strengthened Mexican economy, then, should help the United States first of all by creating another market for goods and services that we produce, and then by fostering the investment essential to develop jobs that rising generations of Mexicans will need. Although Mexico is a country of 88 million people — one-third the size of the United States — its economy is less than 4 percent the size of ours, and more than half of that population is less than sixteen years old.³²

30. *Id.* at v.

31. UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION, THE LIKELY IMPACT ON THE UNITED STATES OF A FREE TRADE AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO viii (Feb. 1991).

32. *See generally id.* at vii.

As the Mexican economy has strengthened in recent years, we have seen solid increases in the number of Mexicans admitted to the United States with H-1 visas — that is, as professional employees. Since 1987, the number of H-1 visa holders admitted from Mexico has increased from 4,064 to 5,648 — not dramatic numbers, but a steady incremental increase that now amounts to nearly a forty percent gain over those five years.³³ Current rules already provide for a twenty-five mile commercial trucking zone on both sides of the border to facilitate commerce in the *maquiladoras* — the “twin plants” that are the vehicle for much of our recent trade gains with Mexico.

Trade agreements are reached because both sides stand to gain from them. The Department of Commerce has reported that the Canadian Free Trade Agreement,³⁴ officially implemented January 1, 1989, contributed to an 18 percent growth in trade between our nations during its first two years — a period of slow economic growth in both countries.³⁵ Bilateral trade between the two countries reached \$195 billion in 1990, including \$83 billion worth of U.S. merchandise sold in Canada.³⁶ We must emphasize that international trade is a two-way street. Anyone concerned about the level of imports from Mexico rising under liberalized trade should also recognize that, since Mexico's economic expansion began in 1986, our merchandise sales to our southern neighbor have increased from \$12.4 billion to \$28.4 billion.³⁷ Both nations can benefit substantially from a better system of legal trade.

Our generosity in fostering both development and trade with Mexico, however, should not be a basis for anyone to believe that we can or should tolerate illegal immigration from Mexico, any more than we should tolerate it from anywhere else. Patrick Buchanan and some others might believe that better fencing along the Mexican border will make better neighbors. The INS has been strengthening the fence there, and we have achieved some very positive results.

During the past two years, we have made many improvements to our border enforcement practices. We have made extensive use of better technology — including sensors, infrared cameras, low-light level

33. See Hoefer & Warren, *supra* note 11.

34. Canada-United States Free Trade Agreement, Jan. 1, 1989, 27 I.L.M. 281 (1988). See UNITED STATES — CANADA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT: COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING THE FINAL LEGAL TEXT OF THE U.S. — CANADA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT, THE PROPOSED U.S. — CANADA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 1988 AND A STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION, PURSUANT TO 19 U.S.C. 2112(e)(2), 2212(a), H.R. DOC. NO. 216, 100th Cong., 2d Sess. (1988). The U.S. implementing legislation is located at United States-Canada Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act of 1988, Pub. L. No. 100-449, 102 Stat. 1851.

35. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT: GENERATING JOBS FOR AMERICANS 4 (March 1991).

36. *Id.*

37. *Id.* at 5.

television, and secure radio communications — to monitor the movements of people sneaking across our border. We have dedicated major portions of our new Border Patrol staffing to the San Diego Border Patrol Sector, where nearly half of all illegal entrants are apprehended. We installed lighting along the Tijuana River levee so that people sneaking into the country would not have the benefit of darkness. In addition to channeling the flow of illegal aliens, and easing the task of apprehension, these lights have contributed substantially to better crowd control. In fiscal year 1990, 252 assaults were reported along the levee; that number fell to 135 in 1991, a 35 percent drop.³⁸ In fiscal year 1990, Border Patrol officers reported being targets of rock throwers 120 times, a number that was reduced to 26 in 1991.³⁹ Most important, armed encounters dropped 25 percent — from 100 to 75 — over the course of the two years.⁴⁰ The fencing that we already have in place has made the border a less violent place, and we will do our best to continue that course of improvement. A better fence, however, is only one small step toward a better answer to the problems of illegal immigration.

Better enforcement techniques are not a complete answer to the challenges that we face from illegal immigration. As our techniques become more effective along the border and outside of ports of entry, those who seek illegal entry often attempt new ways to enter the United States. When IRCA was passed in 1986, we saw a new market created in fraudulent documents. People at first sought to develop — or counterfeit — documents to qualify for the benefits of legalization. Since then, we have encountered severe problems with fraudulent documents that provide passage into the United States, and, too frequently, enable work authorization after arrival.

We now find that the most sophisticated attempts at illegal entry take place at airports rather than along our land borders. In many cases, passengers board airplanes outside the United States using identification documents of questionable validity, then dispose of them in flight. When they land, they present themselves to immigration inspectors without documentation, claim an identity which we cannot verify, then apply for political asylum in the United States.

In many major cities, such aliens have learned that we do not have the detention capacity to hold them until an immigration court can hear their petition for asylum. As a result, they are often released until their case can be heard. Only as a condition of releasing them will the INS provide a document affirming that the person's true identity is the one presented to us when the asylum application was filed. And, until the asylum hearing is conducted, these aliens are granted permission to

38. Internal INS document.

39. Internal INS document.

40. Internal INS document.

work in the United States — an alternative preferable to allowing them to sustain themselves on welfare until their claim is adjudicated.

No fence can be stronger than its weakest link, and the fraud so commonly used to violate our immigration laws is clearly a cause of major concern to the United States today. We are examining alternatives that will enable us to continue generous policies toward those who have a legal basis for admission to the United States. At the same time, fairness under our laws requires that we treat with much greater severity those who seek the benefits of our society after entering in violation of our laws.

Effective enforcement of immigration laws must extend beyond our borders and ports of entry into the interior of the country. We cannot effectively be in control of our immigration laws unless the guards whom we post at entry are supported by comparable interior enforcement, and a citizenry that will not tolerate violation of the law.

Last April, I directed that the INS become much more serious about its enforcement of employer sanctions. During the last six months of fiscal year 1991, our apprehensions of aliens in the course of employer sanctions enforcement increased by 48 percent over the previous year,⁴¹ and we will sustain that level of enforcement this year. The statute has now been on the books for more than five years, and, unfortunately, penalties will be the only way to convince some people that we mean business.

We still prefer compliance with the law to punitive enforcement. In our two reports to Congress, we showed that more than 81 percent of employers are complying with prohibitions upon hiring aliens who are not authorized to work in the United States.⁴² Nonetheless, we continue to hear accounts of employers who use the excuse of available foreign-born labor as a rationale to avoid paying their employees in accord with the law. Together with the Department of Labor, we have found a high correlation between those who violate our immigration laws, and exploitative employers who violate minimum wage and hour laws, occupational health and safety laws, and tax laws. We are exploring additional opportunities for interagency cooperation to ensure that all violators can be brought to justice.

Immigration provides tremendous benefits to our society. Regardless of public moods about immigration, we have provided new opportunities for more people with each generation. We face major problems in creating the physical and environmental conditions for greater trade along the Mexican border. As the General Accounting

41. Internal INS report.

42. THE PRESIDENT'S SECOND REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EMPLOYER SANCTIONS 7 (July 1991). See also THE PRESIDENT'S FIRST REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPACT OF EMPLOYER SANCTIONS 74 (July 1991) (based on preliminary data for August-November 1989, the INS determined that 74 percent of employers complied with IRCA).

Office reported to the Senate Finance Committee last May, there are tremendous requirements for additional roads, bridges, and inspection infrastructure if we are to facilitate the exchange of goods and services contemplated by this treaty.⁴³

We cannot afford to see such concerns become obstacles to the treaty. Instead, we should look upon these support requirements as opportunities for still greater progress. To cite only one example, at the Immigration and Naturalization Service, our immigration inspectors stand in booths alongside lines of cars for long hours every day. In many places, the exhaust from the cars could be viewed solely as an environmental hazard.

At our San Ysidro Port of Entry, near San Diego, we are installing new underground exhaust systems to draw the fumes away from the inspection booths and divert them to places where they can inflict less damage on our employees. In November, the British magazine *The Economist* observed that California firms are leading the way with innovative technology that can address our environmental problems.⁴⁴ Clearly, the United States leads the world in modern environmental technology, and this technology not only can enhance our exports, but can help to resolve some of the environmental issues that now appear as stumbling blocks to negotiation.

The spirit that sees new opportunities in such challenges and harnesses the ingenuity of free people to work toward continuous improvements is the link that has forged a bond between free people and prosperity throughout our history. It provides us a unique experience that has changed the face of the world. Only by maintaining that confident spirit can we sustain the course that we have charted for the world in this last challenging generation.

Thank you.

43. U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, U.S.-MEXICO TRADE: CONCERNS ABOUT THE ADEQUACY OF BORDER INFRASTRUCTURE (May 1991).

44. *California Cashes in on Cleaning Up*, THE ECONOMIST, Nov. 16-22, 1991, at 79.