

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

in the country, with over 600,000 members.

The NFIB, of course, with the transformation of the Congress and the ascendancy of the Republican Party and our opportunity to be in the majority and prove to our fellow Americans that we have the ability to govern and that we will, in fact, follow through on our commitments as expressed in the contract to perform and reform the way Washington does business, the NFIB has become a very important part, an integral part of our legislative efforts in Washington.

I just wanted to bring that to my colleagues, because I will take time on future occasions under special orders to go into more detail on each one of these points.

But I do want to stress to my colleagues the legislative priorities of the National Federation of Independent Businesses, as we proceed with the Contract with America for the first 100 days, and then as we develop and deliberate a legislative agenda for the second and third 100 days.

The pamphlet starts out by saying, "America's small business owners have heard enough talk about what is good for the country. Now they want results. And small business owners believe that what is good for Main Street will be good for America."

And that really is the fundamental purpose and mission of the NFIB. They represent Main Street, not Wall Street.

They represent the kind of mom and pop businesses and the small business owners who in fact really are the economic backbone of the communities that we are fortunate enough to represent here in the Congress.

As we know, small business owners last year said no to mandated health insurance. They played a very critical role in helping to defeat President Clinton's health care plan. They rose up from the grass roots and sent a message to Congress that mandates cost jobs. And as a result, they helped us stop the President's health care mandates dead in its tracks.

Again in November, small business owners rallied at the polls, and they turned out politicians who had supported anti-Main Street legislation—that is, in fact, one reason I am again serving in this body—and elected candidates who know the importance of small business to the American economy.

□ 2010

Small business owners sent the message that they want the security to pursue the American dream of entrepreneurship. Let me touch on that point for a moment, because I think that underscores how wrong things have become in America, because in the course of the election campaign I recall meeting with a small business owner, an expert machinist who employed about somewhere in the neighborhood of 6 or 7 people, which frankly

is the average size of the American small business.

He told me on that occasion, he said, "You know, Frank, things have really gone awry in this country, because for the first time in our history, the risks of owning your own small business actually outweigh the rewards." Again, small business ownership is a part of the American dream.

I think we need to change that equation, and when we do, we will know that our economy is moving in the right direction again. If we want to help grow our small businesses—and by the way, study after study has indicated that small and very small businesses give us most of our new job creation in the private sector—if we want to grow these type of businesses and create new jobs, then we need to support five actions:

One, we need a regulatory revolution here in Washington; two, we have to cut and simplify taxes, particularly on entrepreneurs and small business owners, the people who are taking the financial risks to create the jobs and to provide their fellow Americans with economic opportunity; three, we have to make health care available and affordable to small businesses; four, we have to end the legal nightmares and reduce and hopefully, to the extent possible, eliminate the regulatory maze that small business owners have to navigate.

Lastly, a very important subject that we are debating on this floor today, tonight, and tomorrow, we have to force the government to stop spending more of our tax dollars than it takes in. This, Mr. Speaker, is the small business agenda, and it dovetails very nicely, of course, with our Contract With America, which goes to the heart of the concerns of small business men and women across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this little pamphlet, which again I will be talking about on future occasions under Special Orders, to your consideration: the NFIB Small Business Agenda.

#### THE REFORM OF AMERICA'S WELFARE AND HUNGER PROGRAMS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in this hiatus in the debate for the Balanced Budget Amendment and the unfunded mandates to discuss something that I think is most appropriate. That is the reform of the welfare programs and the hunger programs in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not rise to say that the current system is perfect. There is a lot of need for improvement and reform. However, the question is, if we look at the Republican Contract for America and we look at their provisions regarding welfare reform and hunger programs, I am afraid

that in a rush to enact that contract, that the Republican leadership has targeted a powerless, pretty much nonvoting population: America's hunger, their children, their families.

What they are proposing is not a solution to hunger and poverty, or a better way to do it, but block grants that may ultimately expand hunger problems in America, and in fact shift costs to the States. This is not reform, this is denial. This is shifting responsibilities from the Federal Government to the State government, something I thought we were going to stop doing around here.

I challenge our new leadership to end hunger and poverty, not the programs that feed hungry families and their children. Republicans are passing the burden of responsibility and the price tag to the States. My State alone, Oregon, under their proposal would be handed the programs for poverty and hunger, currently federally assisted programs, with \$64 million less than in 1996 to solve the problem. How is that going to help the State of Oregon?

However, the Republicans have a solution for that, too. Their unfunded mandates legislation has an effective date of next October. You know why the effective date is next October? Because they know they have hidden bombs in the Contract for America, huge new unfunded mandates for the States, cuts in successful State programs.

However, they don't want to apply the unfunded mandates legislation before or during the adoption of the Contract on America, particularly those provisions that go to welfare and hunger, because they know this is their intention, to shift costs to the States, not to look at a way of improving these programs so we can better combat this problem.

In a nation number one in the industrialized nations in defense spending, national wealth, and the number of billionaires, I think it is a pretty sad commentary on our priorities that we are also number one in child and elderly poverty and hunger.

Many of our anti-hunger programs were enacted in the 1960's and 1970's in response to a documented wide range of problems of malnutrition. These programs have in good part worked. We have decreased the incidence of infant mortality and low birth weight babies. We have improved necessary nutrition food intake, both for our children and elderly, by 20 to 40 percent.

Mr. Chairman, if we want to take, say, the hardest-hearted green eyeshade view of this issue, there is another way to look at it. These programs save the American taxpayers money. They not only improve the quality of life for the next generation, but they save money. Every dollar that is invested in the WIC program saves up to \$4 in Medicaid savings, and a whole lot of other funds for the States in terms of special education programs