

failed on almost any level of analysis, what else could they do? Here is what we see.

The United States today will also re-address the question of whether or not Colombia should be recertified. It is an arguable question. In the last year, since we denied certification, the Colombian military genuinely seems to have at least undergone some change. They have mobilized 5,000 troops and through the use of joint military and law enforcement operations destroyed laboratories producing 1½ tons of cocaine per day. They have issued 3,000 arrest warrants on drug charges and removed 450 million dollars' worth of cocaine from the production pipeline.

The administration may or may not, on their own evidence, recertify Colombia. But the Colombian experience gives evidence that, while it is difficult to take action against a friendly government, people in Colombia or Mexico that we respect, it is successful. Our decertification of Colombia produced results. It is a question the administration must address before deciding on their actions about Mexico today.

The President is faced with three possibilities in deciding whether to certify Mexico in the drug war. He can certify that Mexico is fully cooperating with the United States Government actions. That would be false on its face. There is no evidence to support a conclusion that Mexico is being cooperative. Indeed, it would make the entire certification process lose all credibility. No nation involved in narcotrafficking within its borders would ever feel any responsibility or pressure to cooperate with the U.S. Government activities if we were to so stretch our credibility by fully certifying Mexico.

Second, the administration can decertify Mexico and bring a halt to all American foreign assistance except antidrug programs.

Or, third, the administration can decertify Mexico but grant a national security waiver. The last of these options I would understand. People could legitimately argue the relative merits of decertification with a national security waiver, based on specific promises of the Mexican Government; to deny certification but, for 1 more year, to give one last chance for them to meet the responsibility to their own people, the international community, and their previous promises. But to certify, given that this other option is available, would be inexplicable to our own people, an insult to those engaged in this country in law enforcement, and contrary to the evidence.

On occasion, in this country, we describe our efforts against narcotics as a war on drugs. But in dealing with foreign governments with whom we would like to have good relations, we seek to win a war without casualties. The sensitivities of the Mexican Government might be a casualty in this certification, but it is necessary if we are to be serious and produce real results.

Finally, I hope the administration will reach the right judgment. The stakes are high. I urge the administration to take these comments and these facts into consideration in reaching its judgment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, may I inquire, is the Senate in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

PRESIDENTIAL VIOLATION OF FEDERAL CAMPAIGN LAW

Mr. CRAIG. In speaking in morning business this morning, I want to express my concern, actually for the first time, on an issue that has been brewing publicly and not so publicly for well over 2 months now. As the Senate struggles to try to develop a mechanism under which we can effectively investigate the alleged wrongdoing at the White House as it relates to Presidential campaign fundraising, the issue gets larger and larger by the day. Yesterday, I finally believed it was time to speak out in relation to the Justice Department appointing independent counsel. I say so because it is obvious to me now that the public does not want the Congress to grind itself into gridlock and partisan fracturing in an effort to do what it should responsibly do, and that is investigate alleged wrongdoing or violations of law on the part of the executive branch.

Be that as it may, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are also finding themselves in what I believe to now be a most embarrassing situation, having not to do this, or to reduce the scope of what we should legitimately do, all in defense of a President who, by the hour, appears to be increasingly more involved in what is allegedly wrongdoing or violation of Federal campaign law.

So, yesterday, I asked the Attorney General in a press release to appoint independent counsel and to move ahead with what she and the Justice Department must responsibly and rightfully do. The New York Times editorialized, and they said this:

Janet Reno's insistence that she is waiting for creditable evidence before appointing an independent counsel has now reached a point of mindlessness. By the standards that applied to the Carter, Reagan, and Bush administrations, the threshold for appointing an independent counsel has been reached and passed. If she will but look, Ms. Reno will see a pervasive pattern of reckless behavior and an array of suspicious incidents that cry out for an independent counsel.

That editorial went on to say—it speaks of the White House, and it says:

Presidents and their White House aides are inevitably involved in campaign planning, as certainly U.S. Senators are in the planning of their campaigns. But, by openly bartering Presidential invitations for political con-

tribution and by relentlessly mixing official and political, this administration has gone so far beyond the normal rules of political behavior and the traditional interpretation of Federal law that even so dogged a Democrat as Pat Moynihan. . . .

And so on and so forth. And it speaks again for Ms. Reno to appoint that independent counsel.

This morning in the Washington Times, again, headlines, "Reno Not Ready for Outside Probe."

My question today is to Ms. Reno. When will you be ready? When there is a massive public outcry of wrongdoing or alleged wrongdoing? When the evidence piles so high at the door of the White House that you cannot step across the threshold to go see your friend, the President, Mr. Clinton?

Ms. Reno, wake up. Listen to what is being said in public. It is time to act. It is time we develop an independent counsel, bipartisan, nonpartisan, to investigate what is now verging on a major scandal. Someone asked me while I was traveling in Idaho last week, "Why is the President out advocating campaign finance reform when it appears that he is the greatest violator?" I said, "There is an old adage that those who sin the most are the first to the altar."

We find it increasingly embarrassing to read in the newspapers everyday that somehow the White House, the very image of this country, was used for personal gain in a way that no other President has used it.

So, once again, today I call on the Attorney General to do what she must responsibly do. The allegations grow by the day. Ms. Reno, do what you should do. Appoint an independent counsel to investigate, in a nonpartisan way, what should be done, for the sake of the Presidency and the White House itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article entitled "Irate Clinton Blasts Moves for Counsel" be printed in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 18, 1997]

IRATE CLINTON BLASTS MOVES FOR COUNSEL

(By David Rogers)

WASHINGTON.—An angry President Clinton called Democratic senators this week complaining of demands inside the party for a special counsel to investigate foreign influence in fund raising for his presidential campaign.

Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D., S.D.) was awakened around 1 a.m. Monday by Mr. Clinton. Leaders of the Democratic Senatorial Committee were also called Sunday night by the president, who angrily reminded senators he had gone to New York to raise money for their campaigns in the prior week.

None of the senators called by Mr. Clinton would discuss these conversations, and the White House declined to comment. Members of Congress and Democratic aides, however, confirmed the timing and substance of the calls. Mr. Clinton appears to have been provoked by Sunday talk shows in which former New Jersey Sen. Bill Bradley and Sen. Russell Feingold (D., Wis.) endorsed the appointment of an independent counsel.

The picture of an agitated president making late-night calls is very different from the calm image the White House has sought to project. The incident testifies to the increased tension between Mr. Clinton and Congress amid the almost daily revelations regarding his past fund-raising practices.

Trying to seize the high ground, Democrats are demanding that Republicans make a commitment to allow campaign-finance-reform legislation to come to the floor this year. But Mr. Clinton's outbursts may only feed Republican complaints that Democrats are stalling on behalf of the embattled president—an important fund-raiser.

The fight is expected to come to a head in the Senate as early as next Wednesday. Mr. Daschle said yesterday that Republicans must promise to bring up campaign reform this spring if Democrats are to support funding for a GOP-backed inquiry of campaign abuses by the White House.

"We will not agree to funding . . . to anything, until we get campaign-finance reform," said the South Dakota Democrat. His statement, the clearest linkage of the two issues to date, is designed to exploit GOP division on this front.

The Republicans' strongest reform advocate, Arizona Sen. John McCain, supports both an independent counsel and a campaign-finance bill, but Majority Leader Trent Lott (R., Miss.) is decidedly cool to overhauling the current system. Caught in the middle is Sen. Fred Thompson (R., Tenn.), who chairs the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, charged with carrying out the planned inquiry. And some Republicans are openly proposing to scuttle Mr. Thompson's budget if the investigation becomes a vehicle to advance campaign reform.

Mr. Lott last night warned Democrats against filibustering the committee's funding but said he had exhausted efforts to reach a compromise and expected to meet the issue head-on next week.

As the Thompson inquiry has stalled, smaller investigations are springing up. One of the latest comes from a Senate Judiciary subcommittee overseeing the National Bankruptcy Review Commission. The commission's chairman, Brady Williamson, attended a fund-raiser for Mr. Clinton last September that drew a large set of big donors from the bankruptcy professional community.

In an interview this week, Mr. Williamson said he went as a "private citizen" and only after seeking an opinion from the White House counsel's office. But Sen. Charles Grassley (R. Iowa), chairman of the Judiciary subcommittee, said yesterday he had received written correspondence indicating those running the event had pressured members of the banking industry to attend if they wanted to be heard on bankruptcy issues.

In another development, Federal Bureau of Investigation agents who this week raided the Washington offices of the U.S.-Thai Business Council couldn't find records related to Ban Chang International, which shared offices with the council and helped finance it. Pauline Kanchanalak, a major Democratic contributor whose gifts are now under scrutiny by the FBI, worked for Ban Chang and helped organize the council.

Ban Chang is a subsidiary of Ban Chang Group, a conglomerate based in Bangkok, Thailand. Last June Ms. Kanchanalak and a relative gave \$185,000 to the Democratic National Committee in conjunction with a coffee event at the White House with President Clinton, attended by top executives of another Thai conglomerate, CP Group.

People familiar with the matter say the FBI wants to know if Ms. Kanchanalak knows where the records are, but she is currently thought to be in Thailand. Her Wash-

ington-based attorney, and an attorney for Ban Chang in Washington, couldn't be reached for comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

MEXICAN CERTIFICATION

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to address an issue which has been raised by other Members on this floor, which I believe is of great significance and which must be resolved in the next few days. That is that the Clinton administration has a difficult matter of rendering a decision, in consultation with the Secretary of State, as to whether or not to certify Mexico as a nation that is cooperating in the area of our war on drugs.

There are many factors to consider before making such a decision, but the primary factor for me is what effect does such a decision have on our ability to fight the use of drugs here in the United States? Drug abuse continues to be one of the primary serious problems, primary and most serious problems, our Nation is facing, especially among our young people in our inner cities. Fighting drugs has to be one of the most important goals of this administration and of this Congress.

Since the so-called certification process was begun in the mid-1980's, Mexico has always been deemed to be a nation that is making a strong effort in the drug war, and many of us in Congress have had concerns, and continue to have concerns, about Mexico's progress.

So at some point, you have to evaluate the effects of bestowing certification status on Mexico. Has certification improved Mexico's ability to deal with drug cartels? Have cocaine seizures increased? Are drug dealers being arrested and convicted? Are antimoney-laundering bills being enacted into law in Mexico? And finally, and perhaps most important, are the Mexican law enforcement agencies cooperating with us and are they free of corruption?

It is this last point that I think remains the most single significant concern and impediment to certification. The arrest of the Mexican General Jesus Gutierrez Rebollo, the Mexican drug czar in charge of Mexico's counternarcotics efforts, on a charge of bribery, cocaine trafficking and for having ties to organized crime leaders in Mexico's drug cartels, was, in the words of our own United States drug czar, General McCaffrey, a "terrible blow." It really is more than that, of course. To have the chief law enforcement officer in the area of drug enforcement in Mexico turn out to be nothing more than a front man for the Mexican drug cartels undermines all credibility of the effort of Mexico in the area of fighting drugs.

Our intelligence agencies are now conducting a damage assessment to establish how many of our agents, in-

formants and counterdrug operatives were put at risk. It is believed that a very large number have been put at risk, and, in fact, the damage to this intelligence network may exceed the damage that was created in the CIA by the Aldrich Ames case. If you remember, in the Aldrich Ames case a large number of agents and operatives for the CIA died.

When you add up the evidence about the results of certification, you have to wonder what effect it has had on stemming the flow of drugs into this country. Mexico is the source of 70 percent of the cocaine on American streets and is the growing source of the most violent types of drugs. The primary cartels which are now shipping their drugs to the United States are no longer centered in Colombia. They are two cartels centered in Mexico. The antimoney-laundering laws are incomplete and not yet implemented. In short, the battle against drugs being shipped to the United States from Mexico is being lost in Mexico.

In light of the ongoing corruption and the flow of drugs into our Nation, I believe the United States must withhold full certification. The cost of drug abuse to our society remains too high to take any other course. There is no doubt that on the domestic front, we can do a great deal more, and we must. In fact, it was unfortunate that this administration essentially ignored this problem during its first term, but the administration has now turned its attention to this issue, and, hopefully, we can make greater progress. We need strong leadership from the White House. The President does control the bully pulpit and, as we saw with Mrs. Reagan's efforts under the "Just Say No" program in the eighties, the White House can have a dramatic effect on utilization.

But at the same time, we must pursue a more effective policy that will cut off the flow of drugs from source countries like Mexico. I believe that withholding full certification to Mexico would send the right message from the American people to the Government of Mexico, and that message is that the status quo is not acceptable. I urge the President to hear the concerns of our agents on the front lines who cannot trust their Mexican counterparts for fear of being compromised. As the DEA Administrator, Mr. Constantine, stated, "There is not one single law enforcement institution with whom DEA has a really trusting relationship."

It is time, Mr. President, to take strong action, and I strongly suggest that we not pursue certification.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I want to also speak on another subject which is of equal importance. It is of importance, however, to the next generation in a different way. It is of importance in the area of fiscal policy, and that is the question of Social Security.