

good, vote to pass it along and improve things in the country. The bad we fight, because this country can do better than that. This country can do better than to compromise health and safety standards, than to say that poor kids in school, your hot lunch does not matter.

I just touched on a couple of areas here. There are dozens and dozens of them that make no sense. I hope during this coming week, we can decide to explore some of those in depth and explore the reasons why we feel it is important to stand up and speak out on behalf of some of those as well.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont, Senator LEAHY, who has done an enormous amount of work in this area.

Mr. President, I yield him the remainder of my time, and he may wish to add to that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 6 minutes and 20 seconds.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we add 12 minutes to my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if I may ask the Senator from Vermont if I might address a question through the Chair, I think in the order of business I was to be recognized for up to 15 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is correct. He has 15 minutes reserved.

Mr. COVERDELL. Would morning business still allow that?

Mr. LEAHY. I was aware of the order regarding the Senator from Georgia. The Chair will correct me if my addition is not right. It would make sure he would still have his full 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are still several Senators who have reserved time. The Senator from Indiana has 10 minutes; the Senator from Georgia has also 10 minutes.

Is there objection?

Mr. COVERDELL. As long as I will have time, with the time remaining, for my remarks, I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

WINNERS AND LOSERS UNDER THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have heard from schoolteachers and I have had heard from parents and doctors and day care providers and advocates for children around the Nation. Many of them have called me because, during the past 20 years as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, I have been intimately involved with almost all nutrition legislation in this country.

Certainly, during the last dozen years, there has not been any piece of nutrition legislation that has passed the Congress and has been signed into law by the President that has not ei-

ther been authored by me or cosponsored by me.

I have heard from many Vermonters, from dietitians, dairy farmers, the Governor of Vermont, and volunteers of Vermont food shelves. They feel worried and betrayed. They want welfare reform; they want able-bodied adults to work, as do I. But they do not want to see hunger return in this country with a vengeance.

They do not want to see a country, blessed as no other nation on Earth has ever been blessed with its ability to produce food, have millions of hungry Americans. And they do not want the Contract With America. They believe the Contract With America is antichild and antifamily, and so do I.

The Contract With America is good for big corporations, for huge tax cuts for the rich, and for special interests. I thought we ought to see who are the top 10 winners under the Contract With America. So I put together a chart that explains the top 10 winners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two lists of winners and losers, under the Contract With America, be printed in the RECORD.

TOP 10 WINNERS DURING THE FIRST 100 DAYS OF THE CONTRACT

10. The Coca-Cola Company and the Pepsi Cola Company—soft drinks instead of milk could be served with school lunches. Children and dairy farmers, in contrast, are very big losers.

Pepsi is a big winner since its Taco Bell and Pizza Hut subsidiaries could take over school lunch programs, and other fast food companies are not far behind.

9. Pesticide manufacturers—the chemical giants stand to make millions of dollars with planned cuts in federal regulations that protect the environment. I hope families that drink water in rural areas like the taste of alachlor, atrazine, and cyanazine.

8. Criminals—Republicans plan to stop the President's efforts to put 100,000 new police officers on the streets. All communities who would have gotten those new officers will be big losers.

In Houston, violent crimes have been reduced by 17 percent because of cops on the beat; in New York City, community policing has cut violent street crimes by 7 percent.

7. Four drug giants—the House bill could transfer up to \$1.1 billion to infant formula manufacturers by eliminating the requirement that infant formula be bought at the best price for the WIC program.

Current competitive bidding procedures keep 1.5 million pregnant women, infants and children on WIC at no additional cost to taxpayers. Those up to 1.5 million infants, women and children are losers under the House bill.

6. Locksmiths—funding for child day care is slashed, which means that low-income mothers who want to work may have to let tens of thousands of kids stay home by themselves.

5. Water and air polluters, unwholesome meat and poultry packers—House Republicans plan to cut regulations that protect the environment, air quality, water quality and food safety.

Families that breathe air, drink water and eat food are the big losers.

4. Large corporations—corporations will enjoy huge tax loopholes (such as eliminating the alternative minimum tax which will give corporations \$35 billion over 10 years), defense conglomerates will make large prof-

its, and meat and poultry plants will not have to worry about selling contaminated meats since that will be allowed.

3. The wealthiest 12 percent of Americans—over half the benefits of the tax breaks in the Contract With America go to the wealthiest 12 percent of Americans, those earning over \$100,000 a year.

In contrast, children do not vote and have been targeted for the worst cuts by the Contract With America. Included in the list of Federal funding slashed or totally eliminated is funding for: disabled children, food for homeless children living in emergency shelters, day care for the children of low-income parents who want to work, food for children in over 150,000 day care homes, summer jobs and food service programs, PBS children's programs, and other programs for children.

2. Lawyers—lawyers will make a fortune exploiting all the environmental, tax, and worker protection loopholes in the Contract.

The Republicans create 101 new ways for lawyers to delay environmental, health and food safety regulations.

1. Anyone making over \$349,000 a year—the House Republican proposals give the wealthy an average tax break of \$20,362 through huge capital gains tax cuts, estate tax breaks for the wealthy, and corporate tax loopholes. In addition, U.S. billionaires who renounce U.S. citizenship will be given huge tax writeoffs—\$3.9 billion worth over the next 10 years.

These tax entitlements for the rich, and for corporations, are provided while cutting aid to children, to low-income students who want to stay in college, and to the national service program that provides college scholarships.

TOP 10 LOSERS DURING THE FIRST 100 DAYS OF THE CONTRACT

10. Newborn children—the Contract throws up to 1.5 million pregnant women, infants and children off the WIC program, threatens to make millions go hungry, and provides for major funding cuts for programs that help disabled children, children in child care and homeless children.

9. Children who drink tap water—the House delays regulations that protect drinking water from being contaminated with dangerous chemicals.

8. Children who breathe—the House bill hampers clean air protections which will especially hurt more vulnerable populations such as children.

7. Children who need child care—child care food program funding is cut in half which will likely throw over 150,000 day care homes off the program.

6. Children with mothers who work—the Contract slashes funding for child care for low-income parents who are trying to stay off welfare, get off welfare, or find a job.

5. Children with fathers who work—the Contract eliminates the safety net for families when they most need help during a recession. Benefits to millions of children could be significantly cut during hard times.

4. Children who go to school—funding for educational programs for grade school and secondary schools, funding for the Learn and Serve Program, and funding for AmeriCorps college scholarships is slashed.

3. Children who eat hamburgers—The House bill delays rules on food safety for at least one year. These rules are designed to prevent foodborne illness outbreaks like the one that killed several children in Western states in 1991.

2. Children who are not rich—House tax cuts for wealthy Americans and corporations will make it more difficult to balance the budget, our children will have to pay the bill

later, and low-income children will lose benefits immediately.

1. Children who eat—The House welfare bill will take food away from hundreds of thousands of infants, homeless children and school children. It says to them "have a hungry day," especially during recessions.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, No. 10 on the list are the Coca-Cola Co. and the Pepsi-Cola Co.—in fact, all junk food companies are winners. They are winners under the Contract With America because the House bill eliminates nutritional requirements for school lunch.

I fought these fast food companies last year to make school lunches healthier. They did not want to allow us to make school lunches healthier for an obvious reason: their fast foods are not healthy foods. Congress reduced the saturated fat content in school meals and clarified that schools have a right to say no to junk food manufacturers.

Under the Contract With America, we throw out those healthy meals requirements. Soft drinks can be sold to schoolchildren during lunch instead of milk. Can anybody here who has been a parent, has raised children as I have, tell me that Coca-Cola is more nutritious for them than milk?

Candy companies, fast food giants, junk food purveyors—these are the big winners. Children and the producers of nutritious food in this country are the real losers.

Who is next in line among the top 10 winners? Why, the pesticide manufacturers. The chemical giants can make millions of dollars with the planned cuts in Federal regulations to protect the environment. I hope that families who drink water in rural areas of Vermont or Colorado or Georgia or any other State like the taste of alachlor, atrazine, and cyanazine.

Who else makes out? As a former prosecutor, I was very interested to see the contract provide benefits to criminals. The Republicans intend to stop the President's efforts to put 100,000 new police officers on the streets. They apparently do not want the President to get credit for anything. As one who spent almost a decade in law enforcement, I would like to see those cops on the streets. The Contract With America does not.

Then we have the four giant drug manufacturers that make infant formula for WIC. Man, did they make out like bandits. Let me tell you what is happening. We have Nestle, which is not even an American company. It is a Swiss company. Its annual sales in 1993 were \$37 billion. The other companies also fared well: Bristol-Myers Squibb, \$11 billion; American Home Products, \$8 billion; Abbott Laboratories, \$8 billion.

How did they make out like bandits under the contract? I will tell you how. We have the Women, Infants, and Children Program. Some years ago I called on the Federal Trade Commission to investigate price-fixing and bid-rigging regarding infant formula companies

and the WIC Program. I drafted laws that required States to use competitive bidding when they buy formula under the WIC Program. I then worked to pass a law with bipartisan support in the U.S. Senate which imposes fines of up to \$100 million for price-fixing by these giant drug companies.

Now, this one simple rule saves taxpayers who pay for the WIC Program \$1.1 billion a year. It keeps 1.5 million pregnant women, infants, and children on WIC at no additional cost to taxpayers.

The people who tout the Contract With America—"We are profamily; we are prochildren"—they are probaloney because they voted to get rid of competitive bidding.

That gives a windfall of up to \$1 billion to four giant drug companies. I would like to know whom they contributed to among those who voted for this change.

And what do they use to pay for this windfall in the profamily, prochild Contract With America? They take 1.5 million pregnant women and newborn children off WIC in order to give four drug companies that make \$37 billion, \$11 billion, \$8 billion, and another \$8 billion an additional windfall of \$1 billion.

Can you imagine what would happen if we voted on this change in the daylight? The amendment would say "give \$1 billion in tax dollars to these four giant drug companies, but take 1.5 million women and children, most of whom do not vote, off of WIC."

Maybe some of those who receive contributions from the drug companies still would want to vote that way, but they would be embarrassed to do it in the daytime.

The Democrats offered an amendment to restore the competitive bidding requirement. It lost. Taking millions of pregnant women and small children off the WIC Program is now part of the Contract With America.

The influence the large corporations have had on the contract was outlined in the Washington Post yesterday. The story tells of the influence of the Kellogg Co., Gerber's, Mead-Johnson, Abbott Laboratories, and Coca-Cola on the House legislative process. We in the Senate should not put corporate profits ahead of children.

Maybe we should look at another one on the top 10 list: locksmiths. Funding for day care is slashed under this so-called profamily, prochild Contract With America. It is a Contract on America because they slashed child day care funding. Tens of thousands of low-income mothers who want to work, who want to get off welfare, may have to let their children stay home by themselves. Many of them are going to be latchkey children who have to let themselves in after grade school. Some are going to be locked-in children, whose parents, when they go off to work, have to lock them in. They have to lock them in the house because the parents cannot afford to miss work.

Then look at the next big winners, the water and air polluters, and unsanitary meat and poultry packers. Thousands of consumers get ill each year from contaminated foods. In Washington State, several died from eating hamburgers that were tainted. We have the technology to prevent needless death. But the Contract With America would stall or stop the regulations that would bring that about.

We ought to think about whether we want our children or our grandchildren to eat contaminated hamburger before we stand up and celebrate how we passed the Contract With America. I ask Americans to read the small type, read the small print. And those who want to vote for this, let them stand up, the next time a child dies from a contaminated hamburger, let them stand up and say, "Tough luck; but am I not proud I voted for that."

Of course, you are not going to see that.

The children do not vote. They do not send money to PAC's. They do not contribute.

Then we have large corporations next on the list. Our working families are hurt by the contract. Large profitable corporations make out like bandits. They are going to get \$35 billion over the next 10 years because the contract eliminates the alternative minimum tax. The average Vermont family is going to get very little tax relief under the contract, and they will lose more than they gain. They are going to lose all these things I talked about—school lunches and child care.

The wealthiest 12 percent of Americans, do they make out. Over half of the benefits of the tax breaks in the Contract With America go to the wealthiest 12 percent of Americans—those earning over \$100,000 a year. Those earning over \$200,000 a year will get over \$11,000 in tax cuts. Families earning between \$10,000 and \$20,000 will get \$90. Big deal.

Lawyers are next. I should be happy. I am a lawyer. But I am not happy that lawyers are going to make a fortune exploiting all the environmental, tax, and worker protection loopholes in the contract. The contract creates 101 new ways for lawyers to delay food safety and environmental regulations.

And now here's the big prize—the No. 1 winner under the Contract With America—is anybody making over \$349,000 a year. They ought to be ready to send their checks to every wealthy PAC in this country because they make a killing. They get an average tax break of \$20,362.

In addition, these great patriots who are out there waving the American flag saying, "Look at our Contract With America," do you know what they did? Do you know what their sense of patriotism is? They tell a bunch of billionaires in this country that if you make a billion dollars here in America under our laws and under the advantages of

being an American, if you just go out and renounce your citizenship, we will give you 3.9 billion dollars' worth of tax writeoffs.

Can you imagine anything more obscene or antipatriotic? They stand up there and say, as they wave our flag, "If you renounce your citizenship, Mr. Billionaire, we will give you under the table a few billion of American tax dollars."

They are about as patriotic as they were serious about term limits. The second they thought the bill might pass and they saw that term limits would apply to them, immediately they backed away.

They were all out there calling for term limits. They said, "We want term limits. I have been here 32 years, saying that we need term limits. I have been here 26 years, saying that we need term limits. I cannot understand why we don't get term limits. For decades I have been arguing we should have term limits." Somebody said, "Here. We have enough votes to apply it to your next election, immediately, to you." "Wait a minute. I do not mean term limits for me. I am pretty good. It is for the next guy." It is the same here with this patriotism.

We are giving these tax entitlements to the rich and to large corporations by cutting aid to children and to low-income students who want to stay in college, and by cutting the National Service Program, which provides scholarships. Children do not vote, and they have been targeted for the worst cuts.

Who are the top 10 losers under the Contract With America? They are children. These are the people who lose: Newborn children, children who drink tap water which will more likely be contaminated, children who breathe air which will more likely be polluted, children who need child care, children with mothers who work, children whose fathers are at work, children who go to school, children who like hamburgers, children who are not rich, children who eat, period. Children are the losers. The contract is a contract not with America but against children.

Children who eat—the contract takes away food from hundreds of thousands of infants, homeless children and schoolchildren.

Children who are not rich—they are the ones who are going to pay for the tax breaks for the rich.

Children who eat hamburgers are going to see the regulations on salmonella- or E. coli-free food taken away.

Children who go to school will see their funding for educational programs cut, funding for the Learn and Serve Program, funding for AmeriCorps scholarships all cut.

Children whose fathers work, if they lose their jobs, the safety net is gone.

Children with mothers who work, funding for child care is gone.

Children who need child care, their healthy food at child care is gone.

Clean air protection is gone.

Clean tap water, that is gone.

Newborn children—what I would say one more time is probably one of the most egregious things in the Contract With America is they take away the requirement that the infant formula manufacturers have to be involved in competitive bidding. Some \$1.1 billion is given to four giant drug companies. I expect they are going to buy the tables at the next big fundraiser which those who voted for that have. But as we give them \$1 billion, we also say to a million and a half pregnant women, infants, and children, "Sorry. We cannot afford to do anything for you. But then, heck, you don't vote. You don't contribute, so it is OK."

I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, would you advise me of the amount of time I am recognized for?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

Mr. COVERDELL. Thank you, Madam President.

THE DRUG CARTEL

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, yesterday we had a hearing of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee in the U.S. Senate.

From time to time, in all the clutter of this city and all the issues that we are addressing, something will break through and the magnitude of it is so significant that those who are in the presence of it come to a standstill. I would suggest that was the nature of the meeting held yesterday in the early afternoon in the Senate Dirksen Building.

What was unfolding in the testimony by a very distinguished American was that the United States—and, indeed, this hemisphere—is under attack by a grievous, evil, massively equipped enemy in the name of the Cali cartel or Mafia, or drug lords running with abandon in this hemisphere.

There are five countries in this hemisphere that are at grave risk at this very moment. One is the United States, the second is Mexico, the third is Colombia, the fourth is Peru, and the fifth is Bolivia; not to suggest that there are not other countries in the hemisphere that fall prey to the circumstances, but these five countries in particular are embroiled in a massive confrontation with this Mafia drug organization.

Madam President, there is no other threat that more seriously challenges the national security of the United States and of this hemisphere than these cartels, this Mafia, these drug lords. They are threatening the lives and safety and welfare of the citizens of this country, the others I have men-

tioned, and this hemisphere. We are suffering more casualties, Madam President, in the United States annually than we suffered in the entirety of the Vietnam war.

I would suggest, Madam President, that the fabric of democracy—this is a hemisphere of democracies—the fabric of democracy is threatened and at risk this very day in this confrontation with this evil force.

Let me just share with you for a moment, Madam President, the scope of the enemy we are confronting. This Mafia organization earns \$12 to \$15 billion in annual revenues. The cartel has the resources and the sophistication to penetrate every fabric of social, political, and economic life in this hemisphere. They can literally buy countries. These large criminal drug trafficking empires are better armed than many police forces. They have more sophisticated equipment than many of the armies of the hemisphere. The cartels have the money not only to buy the best minds—MBA's, accountants, lawyers—they are buying police forces, judicial systems, and in some cases, governments.

They work around our past interdiction efforts, now flying large cargo jets, 727's, with up to 10 tons of cocaine into Mexico, where it is then distributed to the United States.

Madam President, I would like to share some of the remarks that we heard yesterday from, as I said, a very distinguished panel of Americans.

First, from Ambassador Robert Gelbard, who is Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, a very distinguished former Ambassador to Bolivia, very knowledgeable with this entire subject. He said:

The spread of international narcotics trafficking constitutes one of the most persistent and serious challenges to America's foreign and domestic interests in the post-cold-war era.

He went on to say that:

Cocaine consumption by casual users fell significantly between 1985 and 1992.

But it is now on the rise again.

He says:

The potential for the problem to get worse is great.

And I would underscore that 100 times.

We heard from Stephen H. Greene, Deputy Administer of the Drug Enforcement Agency. He says:

The technological capabilities of the Cali Mafia may very well be impenetrable.

I repeat: It may very well be impenetrable.

The Cali Mafia has now formed a partnership with transportation organizations in Mexico, with whom they work hand in glove to smuggle increased amounts of drugs across the U.S. border. Drug trafficking organizations in this hemisphere continue to undermine legitimate governmental institutions through corruption and intimidation. Here at home, drug availability and purity of cocaine and heroine are at an all-time high.