

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.

Madam President, Mr. John Walters, who is president of the New Citizenship Project and former Acting Director and Deputy Director for Supply Reduction Office at the Office of National Drug Control Policy, says that:

Between 1977 and 1992, illegal drug use went from fashionable and liberating to unfashionable and stupid. Overall casual drug use by Americans dropped by more than half between 1985 and 1992.

A period for which there was intense education about the damage of drugs.

Monthly cocaine use declined by 78 percent.

That has turned around, Madam President, and now it is skyrocketing.

Last December, the University of Michigan announced that drug use, particularly marijuana use, by 8th, 10th, and 12th graders rose sharply in 1994, as it did in 1993 after a decade of steady decline.

These are terribly alarming statistics, affecting the personal general safety and welfare of our own citizens.

Madam President, let me share with you just for a moment the cost that this represents to our fellow citizens in this country. Each year, the drug cartels ship hundreds of tons of cocaine in the United States, killing and maiming more Americans each year than died in all the years of engagement in Vietnam. And 2.5 percent of the live births in the United States are now cocaine crack exposed babies—100,000 per year. We have had a lot of talk about children in this Chamber over the last few hours and days. And yet, we seem to accept that 100,000 new babies are born as crack babies in the United States. Each year, the cartel drains \$70 to \$140 billion in revenues out of the United States. That is \$70 to \$140 billion, Madam President. If this trend continues, 820,000 children will try cocaine in their lifetime; 58,000 of them will become regular users.

Well, Madam President, we can get caught up in the statistics, but the point I am trying to make here this morning is that the United States, Mexico, Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru are all at grave risk and are being challenged openly and directly by a powerful, brutal force that on a daily basis is costing the lives of our fellow citizens and are putting at jeopardy the very fabric of this democratic hemisphere.

Madam President, when we get into these discussions, there is a lot of fingerpointing. And there is certainly plenty of room to do that.

I do want to point out, as we address this issue, that in each of these countries, there have been citizens who have fought valiantly—in the United States, in Mexico, Colombia, Brazil, Peru, Bolivia—who have fought these problems, who have died fighting these problems. And my remarks in that sense are not incriminating. I applaud the efforts that have been expended in our country and these others to address the problem.

But the fact remains that we have not solved this issue and there are circumstances in each of the countries

that must be addressed. I would suggest that a new focus needs to be brought to this crisis.

I would suggest the forming of a new alliance of these five countries; that we must come to the table; that we must sit across the table from one another and we must approach the new century by lifting the bar, by lifting the standard of what we are going to achieve; that we must set our sights, these countries directly affected, these countries in the hemisphere must bring this era of abuse and attack on the citizens of the hemisphere to an end.

I would suggest that we have the technology to remove the product, the coca leaf, and we ought to do so as quickly as possible.

By the end of this century, the coca leaf should not be able to be grown in the hemisphere.

I read from the International Narcotics Control Strategy Report issued in March of this year:

The United States, which has pinpointed the major growing areas, has spray aircraft and a safe herbicide that can destroy illegal cultivation in a matter of months. Since the coca bush does not fully come on line until it is 18 months or 2 years old, these simple measures could deprive the cocaine trade of its basic material, crippling it, if not destroying it entirely. We need the necessary cooperation of the two largest coca growing countries to carry out this simple but effective crop-control measure.

Madam President, we simply must set as a goal among these five countries that we are going to eliminate this source of evil. We have the technology to do it. We have the knowledge of where the product is. It must be removed.

The chief kingpins behind these cartels are known and their locations are known and they must be arrested. Under the constitutional law of each of these countries, there are adequate provisions to arrest, detain, and punish these individuals doing so much damage in our country and throughout the hemisphere.

We must seek special rights of extradition so that these criminals can be brought to bay in the United States when they attack our citizens, as they are doing.

This is a stealth issue. This is an issue that is pervasive. If any other country was pouring chemicals into the United States causing the death or maiming of hundreds of thousands of citizens on an annual basis, it would not be tolerated. The whole Nation would rise up in defense. And yet we are quietly proceeding reducing the resources to attack this problem.

I am going to close, but I will just say that it is time for a new focus. I think these five major countries should come to the table. We need to mutually agree on the end game that the product will be eliminated, that the kingpins will be arrested and will understand that they will be on the run for the rest of their lives, and that other appropriate measures of cooperation, extradition and other laws for interdiction,

and the like, will be put in place, and that once those standards are mutually agreed upon and that this hemisphere will not accept degradation of democracy and an attack on the citizens, we will set the bar. People will either participate or we will know permanently they are not cooperating.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Georgia has 10 minutes to speak. Does the Senator from Georgia wish to yield?

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, I need to go ahead and make my remarks. I have been waiting for some time, but I will certainly yield.

Mrs. BOXER. I would like to make an inquiry if it is possible, that concluding the remarks of the Senator from Georgia, I be permitted to speak as in morning business not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] is scheduled for 10 minutes. Does the Senator from California wish to ask unanimous consent for 10 minutes following the Senator from Indiana?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, that would be perfectly acceptable. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from California will have 10 minutes following the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Indiana.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my colleagues.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time we used for that dialog not come out of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLICY ON HOMOSEXUALITY IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, in view of the recent attention to the policy on homosexuality in the Armed Forces, Senator COATS and I would like this morning to update the Senate on the status of the legislation which was enacted in 1993 as section 571 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994. Both Senator COATS and I will be speaking to this subject this morning. I think that our joint statements certainly reflect the continuing bipartisan consensus in support of the basic legislation that was enacted in 1993.

This discussion is precipitated by the recent district court decision in *Able* versus the United States and the reaction to it. In my view, the *Able* decision was not correctly decided. I believe it will be reversed on appeal, particularly in view of the unusual approach taken by the district judge in which he, in effect, drafted his own statute, manufactured his own legislative purposes, and reviewed the policy