

who are transiting and dealing in drugs in the high seas.

In addition, we asked Mexico to arm our DEA agents. They still have not allowed our DEA agents to protect themselves. My colleagues may say, why? Why? Because Enrique Camarena, one of our agents was tortured, an incredibly horrible death. We have a cap actually imposed by Mexico on the number of agents. We have a very small number. It is almost incredible for the size of the problem. But even so, those who are there are still put at risk, and Mexico still refused to help us.

□ 2115

Radar in the south. And I am getting some word that Mexico is beginning to cooperate in getting radar to the south so before the drugs come into Mexico, and we know they are coming from Colombia and Panama and other locations, that we could stop those illegal narcotics. But that is still not in place.

And then enforcing the laws that are passed. Now, we have gotten Mexico to pass some laws, and the laws are on the books, but there is not the enforcement. They have a corrupt judicial system; they have a corrupt law enforcement system from the guy on the beat or the gal on the beat all the way to the President's office. And that has been documented with the former President Salinas and his family, with those in incredible positions of power, with incredible amounts of money that they have skimmed off of the drug trade, including one Mexican general who tried to place \$1.1 billion that he had gotten. We know he had gotten it through illegal narcotics proceeds, and he tried to place it in legitimate financial institutions. But we have not had cooperation.

I started with extradition. And let me say that several weeks ago, as I began to mention, our subcommittee, at the request of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), conducted a hearing on one of the 275 extradition requests that we have. This was a case relating to the murder of Mrs. Bellush, a young mother of about five or six young children in Florida in Sarasota who was murdered several years ago. She was shot and then stabbed to death and left to die, with her young baby children left in the pool of her blood until the family members came home and found her.

We held a hearing to protest and to look into and investigate why Mexico had refused to extradite Mr. Del Toro.

Mr. Del Toro was not a Hispanic citizen. He was a citizen of the United States, born in the United States to parents who are United States citizens; and he helped commit this incredibly horrible crime and then fled to Mexico and has for the past several years used the Mexican judicial system to avoid coming back and facing justice in the United States. Thank goodness last night the Attorney General called me and said that the Mexican Supreme Court had ruled in favor of extradition

and Mr. Del Toro is on his way back to face justice.

It is small compensation, small condolence to the Bellush family, but it is one extradition. Unfortunately, there are 274 other extradition requests on some 40 major drug dealers, Mexican nationals, who have been involved in illegal narcotics. Now, I believe we have had one Mexican national who has been extradited, but I have brought to the floor again some of the mugshots of these individuals.

Agustin Vasquez-Mendoza. He is wanted on conspiracy to commit armed robbery and highly involved in illegal narcotics trafficking and kidnapping and aggravated assault. He is a fugitive, has not been arrested and one of the individuals who we are trying to get back to the United States. Again I bring up the Amezcua brothers, who we also would like extradited to face justice in the United States.

So we have succeeded in one small case. We have some 200-plus requests for extradition of these individuals. I do not believe that Mexico, who has always been a close ally, and we have millions of Mexican-Americans in the United States, I do not believe these friends that we have had or Mexican-Americans agree with Mexico's current stance to thumb their nose at the United States and refuse to extradite these individuals who have been involved in murder, illegal narcotics, and trafficking.

So we will continue to put pressure on Mexico, which is now a major producer of heroin, but also the source of 60 to 70 percent of the illegal narcotics transiting into the United States. We will do everything possible.

We did introduce, just before we went into recess, a resolution which we hope to bring up on the floor which does praise Mexico for some of the small steps that they have taken, but also holds Mexico's feet to the fire to produce on extradition, to produce on a maritime agreement, to produce on assisting our DEA agents, to produce on enforcing the laws that they have passed rather than thumbing their nose at the United States.

So until we start working with the programs that do work, that are cost effective and at the source, in cooperation with these countries and as a cooperative partner, getting them the resources through these programs, we will not be successful.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I am pleased to sum up tonight with the message that I started out with and that is that drugs destroy lives. Over 14,000 Americans lost their lives last year, almost 100,000 since the beginning of the end of the drug war, which was January 1993. And again the statistics show and the facts show and prove that the war on drugs ended with the beginning of this administration, and it is so difficult to start it up and that there has been so much damage to our Nation, to our young people, and so many families across this land.

Mr. Speaker, since I have some time left, I would like to provide a little update as to what is going on as far as narcotics around the world. If my colleagues think the United States is tough, the headlines in one of the recent newspapers is, "Three Beheaded in Saudi Arabia For Drug Trafficking."

This is a report of Friday, May 8. "Three convicted drug traffickers were beheaded in Saudi Arabia on Friday. Saudi Arabia's Islamic courts imposed death sentences for murder, rape and drug trafficking. So far this year, 21 people have been executed, 29 put to death."

"China executes 58 to mark world anti-narcotics day." In China, they have a different approach to illegal narcotics. "China marked world anti-narcotics day by executing 58 drug traffickers." So just a little update on the news in China and how they treat drug traffickers.

Then this report from today's Financial Times. "Caribbean court will speed hangings." And this deals with drug trafficking which has prompted crimes. Let me read from this: "Many islands have witnessed rapid increases in murders and other violent crime over the past decade. Murders in Jamaica last year averaged 2.6 a day, twice the level of 10 years ago. Murders have doubled in Trinidad and Tobago over the past 5 years, with many of those linked to narcotics smuggling, say officials."

So they have a treatment, and the treatment really cuts down on recidivism, and that is hanging, which is being demanded by these nations that have also felt this scourge of illegal narcotics.

Mr. Speaker, I like to provide Members of Congress and the American people with little updates on what is going on in the war on drugs and how others from time to time approach this serious problem. Not that I recommend any of these procedures or remedies that I have reported here tonight. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their indulgence, and I will return again next week.

TITLE IX AND WOMEN'S SPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the most exciting sporting events of all time took place in Pasadena's famed Rose Bowl. Over 90,000 spectators, a record attendance for a women's sports contest, saw the United States women's soccer team defeat China on penalty kicks. Many millions more around the world saw this thrilling match on television. In this country television ratings were higher than for the National Hockey League finals and most of the National Basketball Association playoffs.

I congratulate all the wonderful young women who participated, not just those from the victorious U.S.

team but also the fine athletes from the Chinese squad and representatives from the other 14 nations that participated in this wonderful Women's World Cup. Marla Messing and Donna de Verona deserve everyone's gratitude for staging this magnificent tournament.

I would also like to praise ABC and ESPN for showing every match in its entirety, without commercial interruption, and live, except when two contests were being played at the same time.

The opportunity for the American public to see the action is something I have long fought for. When the American women's soccer team won the world championship in 1991 in China by defeating Norway 2 to 1, the final was only seen in this country by tape delay several weeks later. In contrast, the same match was shown live on two stations in Norway.

Consequently, I protested strongly when Americans were denied the right to see on television any of the soccer or women's softball matches in the 1996 Olympics. This was inexcusable, particularly since both American teams won the gold medal. I also objected at the poor treatment received by television viewers who wished to watch the U.S. men's and women's hockey teams at last year's winter Olympics. Since the U.S. Olympic committee is chartered by Congress, I am urging the House of Representatives' Committee on Government Reform, of which I am a member, to exert strong oversight so that the American public will receive better treatment at next year's Olympics. I know that Americans are anxious to see their beloved soccer team perform once more, and I am sure they will also enjoy our wonderful women's softball athletes when they get the opportunity to see them in action.

I think it is important to call attention to the important role that Title IX, enacted into law in 1972, played in preparing our women's team for the World Cup, and I congratulate my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) for having authored and enacted that law in this House.

Prior to the enactment of Title IX, female athletes in this country had limited chances to compete. I know when I was in school if I wished to be involved in athletics the only opportunity was to be a cheerleader. Donna de Verona, an Olympic gold medalist in swimming in the 1964 Olympics, was unable to obtain an athletic scholarship at an American University despite her considerable outstanding talent.

We must not heed those who complain that Title IX is responsible for the elimination of college men's basketball, wrestling and other so-called nonrevenue sports teams. In fact, we must find ways of extending the philosophy of Title IX to other areas where women are discriminated against in the sports world. In this regard, I refer to professional sports.

In this respect, 27 years after the introduction of Title IX, women are dras-

tically discriminated against in the professional sports world. As of now, the women who won the world championships for the United States in women's soccer have no opportunity to play as professionals in this country. On the other hand, the members of the men's soccer team that finished last in France at the Men's World Cup last year have ample opportunities to play professionally in the United States and abroad. I do not wish to demean our American men's soccer athletes. I am confident they will do much better at the next world cup.

I think it is important to point out that virtually all men's professional sports teams receive significant government assistance in the form of subsidies and substantial tax breaks for whatever venue they play in. Many of the stadiums are actually constructed by municipal governments and either turned over to a team or leased at a very low rent. I believe that we must see that these facilities and tax breaks are available to women's professional teams on an equal basis.

□ 2130

THE DEBT AND THE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about fiscal responsibility, the budget deficit and hopefully paying off the debt.

We have a very promising situation right now where we are finally headed towards balancing the budget. It was not too long ago when that seemed like an impossible dream. I remember in 1990 when we looked at budget deficits growing on a yearly basis, stacked on top of an already multi-trillion dollar debt, it seemed impossible to think that we would ever dig our way out of that hole, but thanks to a strong economy, the private sector kicking in and some good decisions made by both sides of the aisle and by President Clinton's administration, we are to the point where we almost have a yearly balanced budget. Now, we still have a \$5.6 trillion debt to deal with, but we are headed in the right direction, for the moment.

That is why I rise to speak this evening, because the "for the moment" part could change. As we head into the budget negotiations that are starting in earnest in both chambers and at the White House, we need to be very careful not to lose the progress that we have gained and not to, in essence, snatch defeat from the jaws of victory which we still have plenty of time to do.

I think there are a couple of ways this might happen. The first way is when we start throwing numbers around of the surplus. We have heard

the numbers in the trillions of dollars about how much money we have got lying around. I want to try this evening to clarify exactly what we are talking about, because there are a number of variables in these numbers that often do not come with the rosy scenarios that various politicians are laying out for people to hear.

We have heard, for instance, that we have and will run up, as currently projected, \$6 trillion in surpluses over the course of the next 15 years. There are a number of problems with this scenario. First of all, of that \$6 trillion, better than half, almost, I think it is like \$3.1 trillion, will be ran up in the Social Security trust fund. Any surplus that we have in the Social Security trust fund is not money that we can spend because it is money that we borrow from that trust fund with a promise to pay it back plus interest so that we can meet the obligations of the Social Security trust fund. If we were to take that money and treat it as a surplus and spend it, we would in essence—not in essence, we would—be spending money twice. That is exactly the sort of thing that got us in trouble in the 1980s. If you spend money twice, you wind up in debt because you do not have it when you need it.

So right away we lose half of that 15-year figure, better than half of that 15-year figure. You could still look at that and say, "Gosh, \$2.9 trillion over 15 years, that is still a lot of money." It is, but it presumes that our existing budget of all spending will be reduced by 20 percent. Not only will it not increase but we will make cuts of 20 percent. This was part of the 1997 balanced budget agreement that occurred before our economic situation got rosier and more money poured into the coffers. I do not want to be one to predict the future, but having been around this place for the last year or so and listening to people talk about all the various programs, from defense to education to you name it that people feel are underfunded, much less in need of a 20 percent cut, I find it very hard to believe that over the course of that 15 years we are actually going to have that 20 percent reduction. So if we assume that again, we are going to get in trouble. That puts us in a position where you realize there is not that much money there.

Lastly, and most importantly, these are projections, estimates. Now, we have to do projections and estimates. You have to sort of guess, if you will, at what your budgets are going to look like so you can plan for the future. That is acceptable, but I would not count our chickens before they hatch. Because that 15-year projection is based on 15 years of continued growth and low inflation. Now, granted the growth that is projected is lower than we have had in the last year or two, as we have had the long peacetime expansion, the longest that we have had in a while, but still there are times when revenues go down instead of up, when