

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 New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### VOTE FOR THE BARTON VERSION OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, last November the people of the 3rd District of South Carolina sent me to Washington in hopes of changing the direction of the country. My constituents expect me to display courage in making tough decisions. I will not let them down. I will vote for the balanced budget amendment, the Barton version, with a tax limitation provision. Now I am going to put my speech up.

There has been a lot of talk tonight about what the consequences of a balanced budget would mean to different groups in this country. There is one thing I think we have in common, whether you are young or old, black or white, rich or poor. If we don't do it, it is a bad deal for everybody.

The thing that I think has been overlooked that I would like to comment on for a minute or two is what does it mean when you are \$4.5 trillion-plus in debt? The honest answer is I cannot even imagine that money in real terms. The real serious consequences of spending that much money more than you have is that over time you ruin the character of your people. Over time, everybody in the country begins to look to the Federal Government to solve every problem they have.

I am 39 years of age, and I would say that my generation always looks outward instead of inward; that there is somebody to blame, there is some Federal program, some State program, to make it right.

When you can be everything to everybody, in my opinion, eventually you will ruin everybody. The only way I know to change things, after a lot of thought and a lot of debate and a lot of reasoning, is to change the Constitution. Whether you are Republican or Democrat, I do not trust you enough to come sit in this body and spend money without a bad check law. And that is called the constitutional balanced budget amendment.

Whether you are a Republican or Democrat, I don't trust you enough to come into this body and balance the

budget without raising taxes to do it. That is way I will vote for the three-fifths provision requiring a supermajority not to raise taxes.

There is a lot at stake in this debate, and to me the real issue is: Are we going to try to be everything to everybody and ruin the next generation not yet born? Everybody talks about putting them in debt, but are we requesting to create a society where they look always outward and never inward?

There is a lot at stake, and I can't tell you exactly how we are going to balance the budget. I don't have a plan that, as some people from the Democrat Party will point out, that tells you exactly how we are going to get there. I just know we must. I know there are a lot of people in this building working on those plans, and I want to give them a shot. The consequences of not doing it is to continue to have a debt that goes beyond imagination.

I hope we will have the courage to say no to ourselves by a constitutional balanced budget amendment, and I hope we have the courage to cut spending and say no to a lot of people who have never been said no to by the Federal Government. If we don't start now, when will we start?

We are about to go into the 21st century, and I think the character of the American people has changed in the last 20 or 30 years, in many ways for the worse. And if you want to look at the reasons why, I think you can start here at the Federal Government. We have taken every function of our lives and centralized it in Washington, DC. If you want to change this country, change the way you spend money in this country.

Anybody have any questions?

I can't think of anything more important to talk about, and I am tired of talking about it. I have been here about 10 days now. I am a freshman in this body. I know why I got elected. I feel very frustrated not being able to get on with it.

□ 2000

I know Members on the other side and within my party have differences, and I respect their differences. I want them to have a chance to say what is on their mind and to advocate their side, but more than anything else, I want us to start voting in this body.

President Clinton made a speech last night, some of its sounded really good. I have heard a lot of great speeches in my small term of politics. Maybe I made a few that sounded pretty good. I am tired of you having to rely on what LINDSEY GRAHAM says, or Bill Clinton or anybody else in this body. I want us to vote and I want us to take tough votes.

The only hope we have of, in my opinion, changing this country is to take the balanced budget amendment that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has proposed with the tax limitation bill provision in it, get it out of the Committee of the Whole and make

us take tough votes and see who really is serious about changing the course of this country.

I will never disagree or take issue with somebody who is voting their conscience. I just expect you to do that. I expect no less of myself.

#### CONCERNS ABOUT THE PROPOSED MEXICAN BAILOUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEKAS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to express my concerns about the proposed Mexican bailout.

Proponents of NAFTA suggested that its passage would create jobs in America, promote free-market economics in Mexico, raise living standards in both countries, and encourage Mexico's move toward democracy. Those who thought that NAFTA would be a magical elixir were wrong. NAFTA has not fulfilled its promises because the current political and economic conditions in Mexico make that fulfillment impossible. The same conditions that existed in Mexico when we debated NAFTA exist today. Necessary changes can only happen one way—through the Mexican Government. But Salinas did not do it, and President Zedillo has given no indication that he will be any different from Salinas.

First, this bailout will not save NAFTA. Mexico's problems run far deeper than short-term debt.

Second, this bailout will not help restore international confidence in the Mexican economy.

Third, this bailout will not help Mexico's or our working and middle class.

The direct beneficiaries of this package will be members of the Mexican business and political elite seeking to protect their wealth against further devaluation of the peso.

When the taxpayers of the United States are asked continuously to prop up the Mexican economy—and with continued devaluation of the peso, there is no indication that this will be the last time—they deserve some accountability. While I do not believe this \$40 billion will be the last for Mexico, the way I see it, there is only two ways that this agreement is going to be palatable to the majority of Members.

First, stringent conditions need to be placed on the issuance of such a loan guarantee to ensure prompt repayment—and these conditions must be part of the legislative language. The generosity of the United States has often been our own worst enemy in getting repaid. We have consistently dealt with international debt owed to us through reduction or cancellation—ultimately to the detriment of our taxpayers. There must be guarantees that this loan will be repaid in full and in a timely manner.

Second, American taxpayers must get something genuine and tangible in return for our continued generosity. This can be best accomplished in the areas of law enforcement and environmental protection.

The United States is party to an extradition treaty with Mexico, which provides for extradition of Mexican nationals who cross the border and commit offenses. However, in practice, the Government of Mexico does not extradite its own nationals. According to article 9 of the Extradition Treaty Between the United States and Mexico (31 UST 5059; TIAS No. 9656), signed on May 4, 1978:

Neither Party shall be bound to deliver up its own nationals, by the executive authority of the requested Party shall, if not prevented by the laws of the Party, have the power to deliver them up if, in its discretion, it be deemed proper to do so.

The problem is that Mexico has a habit of not deeming it proper to extradite its citizens who commit crimes here in the United States. While under the treaty, at least four United States citizens have been extradited to Mexico for crimes committed there, no Mexican citizens have been extradited to the United States for crimes committed in this country.

As a member of Chairman CONDIT's Information Justice Subcommittee in the 103d Congress, I was present at a hearing regarding the extradition of one Serapio Rios. On September 14, 1992, Mr. Rios crossed into California, kidnapped and raped a 4¼-year-old girl, and fled back into Mexico to hide behind this so-called extradition treaty. As the distraught mother testified:

It took nine months to get extradition papers processed and served to the Mexican government. We have a treaty with Mexico, but Mexico has never extradited one of its citizens back to the U.S. for trial. My government should press for change.

If this mother were here today, she would say to you, three years later, that the Mexican Government did not find this violent felon extraditable. The Mexican Government knows where Rios is, but they refuse to extradite him, even after the Mexican Government promised a Member of this body in exchange for the Member's NAFTA vote, that Rios would be extradited.

I want to let this mother, and those that have similar stories, know that they are not forgotten. I feel that this proposed bailout presents us with a unique opportunity to press for change.

While it may not be feasible at this time to change the language of the 1978 treaty, President Zedillo needs to get the message that \$40 billion of U.S. cooperation demands reciprocity. The area of extradition is one place where the Mexican Government can show good faith by extraditing Rios and the Mexican perpetrators who are accused of committing 24 major crimes such as rape and murder, here in the United States, and then flee across the border to Mexico because they know Mexico will not extradite them under the 1978

treaty. There should be no U.S. loan guarantee until Rios and other indicted perpetrators are brought to justice in the United States.

In addition to the question of law enforcement, language protecting our natural resources must be included in the bailout language. NAFTA promotes free trade in resources by limiting the rights of a government to enact measures restricting such trade. Chapter 3 of NAFTA sets out blanket prohibitions against government regulation of natural resource trade. No Government is permitted to regulate or prohibit the flow of natural resources including water.

Specifically, Article 309 of NAFTA reads:

Parties may not adopt or maintain any prohibition or restriction on the importation of any good of another party, or the exportation of any good destined for another country.

There is no clause in NAFTA that exempts water exports from these provisions. Water is subject to the same requirements of goods as other goods described in Article 309. Water is listed as item 22.01 in the NAFTA tariff heading; it states in part:

Including natural waters not containing added sugar or other sweetening matter nor flavored, ice, and snow.

This could mean Great Lakes water. In addition, the national treatment provisions of NAFTA prohibit governments from according foreign investors any less favorable treatment than is provided domestic corporations. This provision could permit foreign corporations to demand the same access to water resources that domestic consumers have.

Several other features of NAFTA could directly influence existing protection against water diversion. Article 302 of NAFTA requires that parties not increase duties on items including resources, or adopt new ones, and Article 315 limits the right of parties to restrict trade through duties, taxes or other changes. All of these articles could be applicable to Great Lakes water. Again if our natural resources are not specifically excluded, they may as well be included.

In the simplest terms, NAFTA articulates rules of trade that will restrict the ability of sovereign governments, and the people who elect them, to regulate the export or diversion of fresh water resources. NAFTA facilitates the trade of water by making it virtually impossible, under a toothless dispute resolution process, to refuse water export proposals.

Is this diversion a legitimate possibility? It certainly is. It is already happening, albeit legally, on a small scale via the Chicago River diversion project and could easily happen on a larger scale.

No grand pipeline or huge engineering project is required to accomplish this. Currently, the Chicago Diversion project diverts 3,200 cubic feet per second to the Midwestern plains but the Army Corps of Engineers has calculated that the Chicago diversion could accommodate 8,700 cubic feet per second if necessary. Over a limited amount of time, such an increase could lower water levels on Lake Michigan-Huron by ½ foot. Should the Government of Mexico lay claim to Great Lakes water, increased diversion through Chicago would take Great Lakes water to the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers where it could meet up with engineering projects designed to take it over the border.

Lowered water levels can cause significant problems with drinking water intakes. Lowered water levels could affect hydro-electric power production. Lowered water levels could dramatically affect navigation in the Great Lakes and eventually Hudson Bay. Lowered water levels can damage the valuable coastal wetlands of the Great Lakes basin.

Mexico could increase its demand for fresh water. One in four Mexicans lack access to potable water and 55% of available water is being used for urban, industrial, and agricultural activities. As we see by this proposed bailout, Mexico is not afraid to come to the United States for help when their own policies begin to destroy the fabric of the country. Mexico is ripe to become a net importer of Great Lakes water. Two proposals were born out of the 1960's to accomplish just such a goal: the North American Water and Power Alliance, and the Great Replenishment and Northern Development Canal (the Grand Canal). In fact, the National Geographic magazine, November 1993, cites the real possibility of water diversion.

In putting protection against diversion in the loan guarantee legislation, we are not asking Mexico to do anything that United States State governments haven't already done. Since 1980's, Midwestern leaders have (1) signed a regional Great Lakes Charter—an agreement among Governors of 8 Great Lakes States and Canadian regional premiers to limit diversion, (2) enacted the United States Water Resources Act of 1986 which gives Governors of 8 Great Lakes States a veto over any proposed diversion of Great Lakes water, (3) they rejected a significant proposed increase in the existing Chicago diversion of Great Lakes water in 1988 when the Governor of Illinois proposed increased diversion, etc. Furthermore, the citizens of the Great Lakes region have supported the concept that Great Lakes water must remain in the Great Lakes 80% of the population opposes diversions of water. Great Lakes is one of our region's, and indeed our country's, greatest resources.

Congress should not continue this pattern of giving and giving without a hint of reciprocity from a Mexican Government that continues to artificially depress wages, that allows its banks to stack debt on borrowers, and that considers our extradition treaty a joke. This bailout, like NAFTA, is an opportunity to force change, but we must make the most of this opportunity. I call on my colleagues to demand change in Mexico. This bailout needs to be tied, inextricably to this change. I want to see some good faith moves on the part of the Mexican Government, or I intend to bail out on the bailout.

#### NFIB, SMALL BUSINESS AGENDA

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor here during special orders to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very important little pamphlet entitled "NFIB, Small Business Agenda." NFIB, of course, standing for the National Federation of Independent Businesses, which is the largest nationwide small business advocacy organization