

I understand that every time we go out or every time a bill comes up, the Senator from New Mexico will be up here raising questions and maybe even objections. We have other things we need to do that are equally or more important. So it is not my intention at all to allow this thing to go on indefinitely.

But you do understand, as the majority leader, you work with the chairman, you help the chairman, and the chairman helps you, and you work with the ranking member. This is a place of great comity, and we want to keep that. I am trying to honor that as a majority leader who is, you know, sort of learning as I go along, making a few mistakes here and there, but getting some things done on the way, too. So I think you know from what we have been able to do over the last 8 months, I work steadily at these things, and at some point we are going to get to vote on this. I do not mean to say in the great wild blue wonder. We are working very aggressively, and I believe we are going to get a process to get it dealt with in April.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, let me just respond by saying I appreciate the statements by the majority leader. I have observed the majority leader here for several months, and I have great confidence that when he expects and intends for a particular matter to come to the Senate floor and be dealt with, that that will actually occur, and I am encouraged by his statements to that affect. On that basis, I will not object to this particular unanimous-consent request.

I will plan to renew my concern once we return from this recess if it is not clear at that time that we have all parties in agreement as to the timing to bring that convention to the floor. I think timing is essential.

I have no problem with amendments and changes. I am not trying to dictate the end result on what the Senate does, but I think it is very important that we vote on it in a timely fashion. I take the statement by the majority leader to be a statement that he intends and expects that we will work assiduously to bring that about. I thank the majority leader.

I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I thank the Democratic leader and the Senators on both sides for the work that has been done on this. I believe now we will have a good discussion about what is or is not going on with regard to the drug battle that we are fighting, with the American Government and the Mexican Government being involved.

Madam President, I believe we are able now to get a time agreement, which I think would be very helpful to all Senators to know that we are going to proceed and there will be a time specified so we can have a vote by 4 o'clock, hopefully. I discussed this with

the Democratic leader and other Senators. I believe we have a reasonable agreement here.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 29, House Joint Resolution 58, regarding the certification of the President with respect to Mexico and there be 4 hours 45 minutes total for debate on the resolution and an amendment, to be divided as follows: Senator COVERDELL in control of 1 hour, Senator FEINSTEIN in control of 1 hour, 1 hour under the control of the majority leader and 1 hour under the control of the Democratic leader, Senator GRASSLEY in control of 30 minutes, and Senator TORRICELLI in control of 15 minutes.

I further ask unanimous consent that there be one amendment in order to be offered by Senators COVERDELL and FEINSTEIN. I further ask unanimous consent that no other amendments or motions be in order, and following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to a vote on the amendment, to be followed by third reading and final passage of House Joint Resolution 58 without further action or debate.

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that in addition to this request, which I fully support, that the request be amended to accommodate a need by the senior Senator from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, to speak for 30 minutes on another matter. I ask unanimous consent that following the vote, the Senator from West Virginia be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I amend my unanimous-consent request to include that additional 30 minutes for the Senator from West Virginia after the vote.

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

Mr. LOTT. Again, Madam President, I thank Senator DASCHLE for his cooperation.

#### PROVIDING FOR THE CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I send an adjournment resolution to the desk calling for adjournment of the Congress for the Easter holiday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) was agreed to as follows:

#### S. CON. RES. 14

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of busi-*

ness on Thursday, March 20, 1997, Friday, March 21, 1997, or Saturday, March 22, 1997, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee in accordance with the resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, April 7, 1997, or until such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, March 20, 1997, Friday, March 21, 1997, or Saturday, March 22, 1997, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 8, 1997, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

#### DISAPPROVAL OF THE CERTIFICATION OF THE PRESIDENT REGARDING MEXICO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) disapproving the certification of the President under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regarding foreign assistance for Mexico during fiscal year 1997.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, first, let me thank the majority leader, the minority leader, and all of those Senators who have been engaged this morning in our efforts to move House Joint Resolution 58. Needless to say, I am very pleased that we have been able to come to this unanimous consent to consider this resolution of paramount importance as it relates to the drug cartels and the impact they are having on our country, on Mexico, and in all countries within our hemisphere.

Madam President, I will read from a statement by Thomas A. Constantine, Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, which was given before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 12, 1997. I am giving this statement as a prelude to my remarks to frame the scope of the issue to which this resolution confronts.

Many phrases have been used to describe the complex and sophisticated international drug trafficking groups operating out of Colombia and Mexico, and frankly, the somewhat respectable titles of "cartel" or "federation" mask the true identity of these vicious, destructive entities. The Cali organization, and the four largest drug trafficking organizations in Mexico—operating out of Juarez, Tijuana, Sonora and the Gulf region—are simply organized crime groups whose leaders are not in Brooklyn or Queens, but are safely ensconced on foreign soil. They are not legitimate businessmen as the

word "cartel" implies, nor are they "federated" into a legitimate conglomerate. These syndicate leaders—the Rodriguez Orejuela brothers in Colombia to Amado Carrillo-Fuentes, Juan Garcia-Abrego, Miguel Caro-Quintero, and the Arellano-Felix Brothers—are simply the 1990's version of the mob leaders U.S. law enforcement has fought since shortly after the turn of the century.

But these organized crime leaders are far more dangerous, far more influential, and have a great deal more impact on our day to day lives than their domestic predecessors. While organized crime in the United States during the 1950's through the 1970's affected certain aspects of American life, their influence pales in comparison to the violence, corruption and power that today's drug syndicates wield. . . . The drugs—and the attendant violence which accompanies the drug trade—have reached into every American community and have robbed many Americans of the dreams they once cherished.

And I add, even, in thousands of cases, their lives.

In the face of this massive drug problem and its effect on two friendly countries, the United States and Mexico, the administration decided to certify Mexico as being fully cooperative in our joint battle. The message that sent, Madam President, to the people of both of our countries was that things are going along pretty well. They are not. In fact, they are in crisis proportions.

We cannot accept a statement to the American people, a statement to the people of Mexico, and a statement to the people of this hemisphere that we are winning the struggle, because we are not. We are losing it in its current configuration.

That led, Madam President, a number of the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, in every region of our country, and of every political and philosophical persuasion, to say no. That is a ratification of the status quo, and the status quo is unacceptable. It is unacceptable.

Now, some interpret that as an attack on Mexico. I do not see it that way. I see it as an honest appraisal of a situation that is debilitating to both Republics. The President of Mexico himself has said that the greatest threat to the Mexican Republic are the drug cartels. We cannot accept the status quo.

Madam President, House Joint Resolution 58 is a rejection of the status quo and a victory for the people of both countries who want to renew and reinvigorate this battle, to put it on a new course. Throughout the debate, I have argued that we need to find a new place to be other than just the debate over whether any country has met a criteria established by the United States as to whether they are adequately fighting the battle or not. The point is, the battle, as it has been fought, is being lost and we must find a new way to come to the struggle. I am pleased to say that in House Joint Resolution 58 there is language that is adopting my suggestion, along with that of Senator DODD of Connecticut, that we reconstruct in

the hemisphere the way we come to the battle. And it calls on the President, when he goes to Mexico and Latin America later this year, and to the Caribbean, to bring this subject up and to begin talking about how we can come together as equal partners to confront this stealth adversary that cares for no human being nor any sovereign nation. If we fought the battle in the Persian Gulf, Madam President, like we are fighting this adversary—and I might add that it is virtually as dangerous—we would have lost that struggle, as we are losing this one. We need to reinvigorate the struggle, and this proposal, which is endorsed by such a wide array of people, does just that.

Madam President, I want to say a few words about this, because every time somebody stands up and says the status quo is unacceptable, you are immediately pushed into a category of being insensitive to those in Mexico, or other countries who were trying to help us, and, indeed, we know they are there. And no one who is an author of that resolution has it in their mind that they want to make their job more difficult. But if the only answer we get is, "Just keep this quiet, don't raise the issue," and every time it is raised you are categorized as somebody who is offending another nation, that is inappropriate and unacceptable.

The work that we have been doing here is absolutely on target. This country and Mexico, and all the other countries in the hemisphere, have to go public about the scope of the enemy we are struggling with. That is what this resolution does. It takes us to a new place and a new day and a more open and honest discussion in the hemisphere about this adversary.

Technically, Madam President, this resolution will cause the administration to come to the Congress and demonstrate to us that they have renewed this battle not only in the hemisphere, but in the United States. There is a mutuality about this resolution. It acknowledges that our country is a key element in the problem. Not only are we a consumer and the No. 1 consumer of these illicit drugs, but we are a producer of the drugs themselves, and a grower of them. We have to get this on the table. If you are going to eradicate marijuana in Mexico, let's get it eradicated here. The technologists tell us we can find any of these products where they are growing. Well, let's find them and get rid of them.

A contention that made this resolution such a struggle to come to was that the administration did not want us to come back and revisit this question later in the year. In the last hours, as the majority leader described, late last evening, that provision was removed. I think the administration needs to take note of the fact that this report will be due at just the time this Senate and this Congress will be dealing with appropriations. And the appropriators and the authorizers who

have been following this for a long time are going to keep right on doing that, and they eagerly await the report. You will not be able to remove Congress from this issue, and everybody should take note of that. Every friend of the hemisphere should take note of it.

Madam President, I hope that this is interpreted throughout the hemisphere as an instrument of assistance, good will, rededication, compassion, and concern, because that is what was in the hearts and minds of all the Senators, and others, who worked to produce this document.

I want to particularly say thank you to Senator FEINSTEIN, who has been at this job a lot longer than I, and I admire her work; Senator D'AMATO of New York, who joined her last year; Senator GRASSLEY, who is the chairman of our drug task force, who has worked tirelessly to deal with these problems; Senator KERRY of Massachusetts, who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and worked in these final negotiations; Senator MCCAIN of Arizona; Senator DOMENICI of New Mexico, and, of course, our co-author, the junior Senator from Texas, KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, who was in every step of the negotiations from the beginning. The prints of her work are fashioned into this resolution as well. I know I will have left somebody out and, for that, I apologize because it has been such a wide array of people who brought this resolution to the floor.

There are many, many issues that are very important in the U.S. Congress, but I believe when you look at the hemisphere and all the opportunity in this hemisphere of democracies—40 percent of all United States exports occur in this hemisphere, which is much larger than Europe, and larger than the Pacific rim. We have a lot at stake, big time. But there is one cloud that hangs over us throughout the hemisphere, and it's the drug cartels. We have to restructure the battle. I hope this stands as a beginning to go to a new struggle and, ultimately, a victory.

Madam President, parliamentary inquiry. Do you have the resolution? Has it been submitted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is pending. The amendment has not been offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 25

(Purpose: To propose a substitute.)

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, under the previous consent agreement, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HELMS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, and Ms. LANDRIEU, proposes an amendment numbered 25.

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. REPORT REQUIREMENT.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The abuse of illicit drugs in the United States results in 14,000 deaths per year, has inordinate social consequences for the United States, and exacts economic costs in excess of \$67,000,000,000 per year to the American people.

(2) An estimated 12,800,000 Americans, representing all ethnic and socioeconomic groups, use illegal drugs, including 1,500,000 users of cocaine. Further, 10.9 percent of Americans between 12 and 17 years of age use illegal drugs, and one in four American children claim to have been offered illegal drugs in the past year. Americans spend approximately \$49,000,000,000 per year on illegal drugs.

(3) There is a need to continue and intensify anti-drug education efforts in the United States, particularly education directed at the young.

(4) Significant quantities of heroin, methamphetamines, and marijuana used in the United States are produced in Mexico, and a major portion of the cocaine used in the United States is imported into the United States through Mexico.

(5) These drugs are moved illegally across the border between Mexico and the United States by major criminal organizations, which operate on both sides of that border and maintain the illegal flow of drugs into Mexico and the United States.

(6) There is evidence of significant corruption affecting institutions of the Government of Mexico (including the police and military), including the arrest in February 1997 of General Jesus Gutierrez Rebollo, the head of the drug law enforcement agency of Mexico, for accepting bribes from senior leaders of the Mexican drug cartels. In 1996, the Attorney General of Mexico dismissed more than 1,200 Mexico federal law enforcement officers in an effort to eliminate corruption, although some were rehired and none has been successfully prosecuted for corruption. In the United States, some law enforcement officials may also be affected by corruption.

(7) The success of efforts to control illicit drug trafficking depends on improved coordination and cooperation between Mexico and United States drug law enforcement agencies and other institutions responsible for activities against illicit production, traffic and abuse of drugs, particularly in the common border region.

(8) The Government of Mexico recognizes that it must further develop the institutional financial regulatory and enforcement capabilities necessary to prevent money laundering in the banking and financial sectors of Mexico and has sought United States assistance in these areas.

(9) The Government of Mexico has recently approved, but has yet to implement fully, new and more effective legislation against organized crime and money laundering.

(10) The Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico are engaged in bilateral consideration of the problems of illicit drug production, trafficking, and abuse through the High Level Contact Group on Drug Control established in 1996.

(11) The President of Mexico has declared that drug trafficking is the number one threat to the national security of Mexico.

(12) In December 1996, the Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico joined with the governments of other countries in the Western Hemisphere to seek to eliminate all production, trafficking, and abuse of drugs and to prevent money laundering.

(13) Section 101 of division C of the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104-208) requires the Attorney General to increase the number of positions for full-time, active-duty patrol agents within the Immigration and Naturalization Service by 1,000 per year through the year 2001.

(14) The proposed budget of the President for fiscal year 1998 includes a request for 500 such agents.

(15) Drug cartels continue to operate with impunity in Mexico, and effective action needs to be taken against Mexican drug trafficking organizations, particularly the Juarez and Tijuana cartels.

(16) While Mexico has begun to extradite its citizens for the first time and has cooperated by expelling or deporting major international drug criminals, United States requests for extradition of Mexican nationals indicted in United States courts on drug-related charges have not been granted by the Government of Mexico.

(17) Cocaine seizures and arrests of drug traffickers in Mexico have dropped since 1992.

(18) United States law enforcement agents operating in Mexico along the United States border with Mexico must be allowed adequate protection.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COOPERATION ON DRUGS BY COUNTRIES IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE.—It is the sense of Congress to urge the President, in his official visits in the Western Hemisphere, to examine with leaders of governments of other countries in the Western Hemisphere the effectiveness of efforts to improve counterdrug activities in order to curtail the production, traffic, and abuse of illicit drugs, and to define plans for specific actions to improve cooperation on such activities, including consideration of a coordinated multilateral alliance.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS OF PROGRESS IN HALTING PRODUCTION AND TRAFFIC OF DRUGS IN MEXICO.—It is the sense of Congress that there has been ineffective and insufficient progress in halting the production in and transit through Mexico of illegal drugs.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than September 1, 1997, the President shall submit to Congress a report describing the following:

(1) The extent of any significant and demonstrable progress made by the Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico, respectively, during the period beginning on March 1, 1997, and ending on the date of the report in achieving the following objectives relating to counterdrug cooperation:

(A) The investigation and dismantlement of the principal organizations responsible for drug trafficking and related crimes in both Mexico and the United States, including the prevention and elimination of their activities, the prosecution or extradition and incarceration of their leaders, and the seizure of their assets.

(B) The development and strengthening of permanent working relationships between the United States and Mexico law enforcement agencies, with particular reference to law enforcement directed against drug trafficking and related crimes, including full funding and deployment of the Binational Border Task Forces as agreed upon by both governments.

(C) The strengthening of bilateral border enforcement, including more effective screening for and seizure of contraband.

(D) The denial of safe havens to persons and organizations responsible for drug trafficking and related crimes and the improvement of cooperation on extradition matters between both countries.

(E) The simplification of evidentiary requirements for narcotics crimes and related crimes and for violence against law enforcement officers.

(F) The full implementation of effective laws and regulations for banks and other financial institutions to combat money laundering, including the enforcement of penalties for noncompliance by such institutions, and the prosecution of money launderers and seizure of their assets.

(G) The eradication of crops destined for illicit drug use in Mexico and in the United States in order to minimize and eventually eliminate the production of such crops.

(H) The establishment and implementation of a comprehensive screening process to assess the suitability and financial and criminal background of all law enforcement and other officials involved in the fight against organized crime, including narcotics trafficking.

(I) The rendering of support to Mexico in its efforts to identify, remove, and prosecute corrupt officials at all levels of government, including law enforcement and military officials.

(J) The augmentation and strengthening of bilateral cooperation.

(2) The extent of any significant and demonstrable progress made by the Government of the United States during the period beginning on March 1, 1997, and ending on the date of the report in—

(A) implementing a comprehensive anti-drug education effort in the United States targeted at reversing the rise in drug use by America's youth;

(B) implementing a comprehensive international drug interdiction and enforcement strategy; and

(C) deploying 1,000 additional active-duty, full-time patrol agents within the Immigration and Naturalization Service in fiscal year 1997 as required by section 101 of division C of the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104-208).

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to add the name of Senator LANDRIEU of Louisiana as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Madam President, I yield the floor at this time.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am genuinely grateful to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN] for their excellent work on this issue. They deserve credit for keeping the Senate focused on the question of Mexico's counterdrug cooperation with the United States.

Through this resolution, Senators COVERDELL and FEINSTEIN, in a very fair and very essential way, have made clear the Senate's dissatisfaction with the status quo.

Mr. President, I know of no Senator who was pleased with the President's decision to certify Mexico as cooperating fully with the United States; the evidence clearly supports a different conclusion. This resolution gives both the President of Mexico and President Clinton an opportunity for redemption.

Mexico's President Zedillo has made numerous declarations against drug trafficking—which we applaud. Moreover, we recognize that President Zedillo is no Ernesto Samper. But, as for the two countries, Colombia and Mexico, the only difference between the two is that, in Colombia, the Presidency was bought and paid for by drug lords, while, in Mexico, the Presidency may be the only level of government not bought and paid for by the drug lords.

Mr. President, U.S. law requires more than well-meaning statements for a nation to be certified as cooperating fully. Our law requires performance. In the case of Mexico, performance has fallen far short of the rhetoric.

While the creation of bilateral commissions perhaps satisfies the bureaucratic need for meetings, meetings are meaningless unless they produce tangible results—arrests, convictions, and seizures.

The same can be said of laws: The passage of new laws does not stop drug trafficking; enforcement of laws does. We are still waiting for any implementation whatsoever of the laws against organized crime and money laundering. Indeed, the latter's effect may have already been negated when Mexico expanded legalized gambling, a time-honored way for criminals to launder money.

Corruption with impunity remains the *modus operandi* for the Federal Judicial Police, which more often resembles a criminal enterprise than a law enforcement agency. At the January wedding of drug kingpin Amado Carrillo Fuentes' sister, for example, policemen were guarding Carrillo's family and friends. This is further evidence that Mexican police are more likely to protect than arrest drug traffickers and their interests. Impunity is also the unwritten law for drug traffickers and their allies in official positions, such as Gen. Jesus Gutierrez Rebollo, Zedillo's drug czar.

Here was a case in which the senior Mexican counternarcotics official was protecting the biggest Mexican drug kingpin, Amado Carrillo. The administration argues that the arrest of General Gutierrez Rebollo is evidence of the Mexican Government's commitment to fight corruption. My questions are: Why was he ever hired in the first place as Mexico's senior counternarcotics official? Was this an intelligence failure? What damage has Gutierrez Rebollo done to compromise law enforcement and intelligence operations against the drug cartels? And are U.S. law enforcement agents now at greater risk because of this fiasco?

Mr. President, this is not an isolated incident. Just this past Monday, on March 17, another Mexican Army general was arrested for drug corruption. It seems that on the day the administration certified the Mexican Government's cooperation with United States counterdrug efforts, this general was offering a Mexican official \$1 million in

exchange for allowing cocaine shipments to pass through Tijuana.

In Mexico, corruption is not confined to the federal government. It is equally pervasive at the state and local levels. Just last week, a judge in Guadalajara dropped charges against a major drug trafficker. Also, according to credible reports, a number of state governors, who are also prominent within the ruling PRI party, have been on the drug traffickers' payroll. As long ago as 1989, I cited one of these governors, Manuel Bartlett, as one senior official compromised by drug traffickers.

Mr. President, I won't cite all the statistics that show that, over the past 6 years, arrests of drug traffickers and cocaine seizures have decreased significantly in Mexico, while the volume of cocaine, heroin and methamphetamine going through or coming from Mexico increases. Despite this record, the United States has continuously pretended that the Mexican Government has been a faithful partner in the fight against illegal drugs. The vast majority of the Mexican people are our allies; but I have grave reservations about most of the Mexican Government.

The President and Barry McCaffrey, amongst others, have spoken eloquently about the horrors of drug use on our streets, recognizing that this scourge is destroying lives throughout this hemisphere. The American and Mexican people deserve better. Silence is tacit consent to this corruption which allows the drug trade to flourish. Only by exposing the corruption can we begin to make a genuine difference in attacking this evil.

In this light, Mr. President, the refusal to recognize the marriage between Mexican Government officials and drug traffickers is all the more troubling. Congress must make known its disagreement with the conclusion that the Mexican Government is cooperating fully.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized for such time as I might consume within the hour allocated to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The Senator is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you, very much.

Mr. President, this country has always had a great debate about drugs. Do you fight drugs on the supply side, or do you fight drugs on the demand side? There is no question but that we have a demand problem. But there is also no question that we have a supply problem. My answer to that is that this country has never really done both really well. We have never really engaged in an all-out fight against drugs on both the supply side and the demand side.

What is before us today is somewhat limited in scope because it has to do with the certification action involving Mexico and whether that action should, in fact, take place; whether Mexico should be certified, as the President said.

The resolution now before this body, known as the Coverdell-Feinstein amendment, I think is significant. Let me tell you the two ways that I look at this.

This resolution is either the first step to a new and forceful partnership to fight drugs all out on both the supply side and the demand side, and to join with Mexico in so doing, to accept President Zedillo's statement that drugs are the No. 1 security problem of Mexico, and to add to that the United States statement that drugs are, in fact, the No. 1 security problem for the United States of America, which I believe them to be, or this is the first step in a major battle next year, if this resolution is ignored, to decertify Mexico as being noncooperative in the supply side of the cooperation that goes into the retardation of drug flow into this country.

Mr. President, I want to begin by once again paying my respects to the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Senator COVERDELL. He and I share a dedication to the idea that the status quo on United States-Mexican counterdrug cooperation is simply not acceptable, and his leadership on this issue has helped us reach this point. It has been an honor and a privilege to be his partner in this effort. And I look forward to continuing to work with him and his outstanding staff in the fight against international drug trafficking.

I also want to acknowledge the Senator from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON, whose contribution to this effort was invaluable. Her State, like mine, shares a long border with Mexico. So this issue hits home to us in a direct and a meaningful way. Other Senators too numerous to list, with names like DODD, KERRY, MCCAIN, DOMENICI, as well as others, the majority leader, the Democratic leader, have all weighed in to bring this effort to fruition. And I have appreciated working with each and every one of my colleagues to get to this outcome.

Just over a year ago, as has been said, Senator D'AMATO and I started talking about whether Mexico merited certification as a fully cooperative partner in the war against drugs. Our view was that Mexico had simply not made enough progress in the war on drug trafficking to justify certification. At that time, despite the fact that we laid down 10 specific criteria, no one paid us much attention.

Well, people have paid attention this year. On February 28 of this year, the President made the decision to certify Mexico as fully cooperating with the United States in the fight against drug trafficking. But it just didn't wash in the Congress. The evidence simply does not support the claim that Mexico met the standard of full cooperation in 1996.

As all of my colleagues are well aware, Senate procedures made it impossible for us to get a vote on what many of us believed was the best option—to decertify Mexico but allow the

President to waive the sanctions based on what is termed a "national interest waiver." If decertification with a waiver had come up for a vote I believe it would have passed the Senate by a large and even possibly veto-proof margin. I do not say that lightly. In the House, it would have passed overwhelmingly. Instead, the House passed with over 250 votes a resolution that decertifies Mexico in 90 days unless specific conditions are met.

So this resolution, which we will pass today, expresses Congress' deep concern over the lack of progress in key areas of Mexico's counterdrug effort.

Let me quote from subsection (c) of the amendment. "It is the sense of the Congress that there has been ineffective and insufficient progress in halting the production in, and transit through, Mexico of illegal drugs."

This statement has never before been made by this body and the other body in concert. And I believe it will be, and no one should underestimate what that means.

In short, while we could not decertify Mexico, the Congress rejects the administration's claim that Mexico has fully cooperated with the United States. The evidence I believe is overwhelming. Last week, I tried to lay this case out with some specificity, the case that Mexico has not earned decertification. I will not repeat here all of the facts to prove that Mexico has not met the test of full cooperation. But let me just remind my colleagues of a few of those facts.

No. 1, cocaine seizures by Mexican authorities in 1996, 23.6 metric tons, were barely half of what they were in 1993 when there were 46.2 metric tons. You see how they have dropped and how they have barely picked up this past year.

Drug related arrests in 1996 were 11,038, less than half of what they were in 1992. In 1992, what I am saying is that the cooperative effort on arrests was double what it has been this past year. And these are specific measurements that can't be challenged. They are there. You have to look at them.

Another way of measuring this, for those of us that are familiar with how drugs reverberate on streets, is whether street prices are dropping or rising. If the street prices for cocaine and for heroin drop on the streets, you know there is more supply.

If they rise on the streetcorners of New York and Los Angeles and Chicago and Dallas and other cities in this Nation, then you know there is less supply. Let us for a moment take a major city, a huge city, over 6 million people in Los Angeles, and let us look at street prices. The street prices of cocaine today, in Los Angeles, are 22 percent lower than they were in 1993. This is for a kilogram, \$21,000 in 1993, dropping to \$16,000 today.

Let us take a look at the street value of black tar heroin, almost entirely transferred to the United States from Mexico. Here is the street value of this black tar heroin in California.

In 1993, per ounce, it was \$1,200. Look at it go straight down. Today, it is \$400. Part of that is the fact that it is in competition with the pure white cocaine that comes from other places, but still the black tar heroin is heavily used by addicts, and you can see the drop in the street price, which clearly means more supply.

Then you take the major traffickers. What has happened is that as the Cali cartels of Colombia become less potent in this area, the Mexican cartels have become more potent. Specifically, Senator COVERDELL enumerated four of them—the Juarez, Tijuana, Sonora, and Gulf cartels. And our DEA has clearly stated to us in testimony, written and verbal, that the Mexican major drug cartels today are operating with impunity, and even the State Department admits that "the strongest groups such as the Juarez and Tijuana cartels have yet to be effectively confronted."

Mexican cartels have assassinated 12 high-level prosecutors and senior law enforcement officers in just the last year. Here is the clincher. None of these murders has been solved. Twelve major Federal and statewide prosecutors, sometimes the head prosecutor, people who want to do a good job, have been assassinated for doing that good job. It has often been said that those they cannot buy, the cartels will kill.

Corruption is endemic in Mexico's Government, police, and military. The Mexican drug czar was arrested for corruption as was another senior army general just 2 days ago. DEA Administrator Constantine has said "there is not one single law enforcement institution in Mexico with whom DEA has an entirely trusting relationship."

Mexico has enacted money laundering legislation last year. So far the legislation has not been implemented. Banking regulations were finally issued last week, 2 months late, but they do not take effect until May, and their effectiveness has not yet been evaluated.

Mexico has failed to adequately fund the Binational Border Task Forces agreed to by the two sides in a much touted bilateral meeting, and as we all know, to this day Mexico has forbidden our DEA agents taking part in these border task forces, if they cross the border from our country to Mexico, to carry sidearms to protect themselves on that side of the border.

Mexico has refused to allow United States Navy ships patrolling for drug smugglers to put into Mexican ports to refuel without 30 days' notice.

The reason this is so important is that if you are trailing a ship, whether it is a fishing vessel or another maritime vessel, you may need to pursue it into Mexican waters. More drugs are now coming into our country via maritime channels. Fishing boats, commercial boats, ships, and other maritime transportation devices are today carrying increased tonnage of drugs. If we have a Coast Guard ship tracking one

of these vessels, it may have to put into port—and the Mexican traffickers have become very sophisticated about moving out, taking the time so that they know the ship following them needs to refuel. If our vessels have to put in, they cannot because our ships have to give 30-day notice before they refuel.

Well, of course, one of the biggest tonnages of cocaine transferred through maritime channels actually was a ship leaving Peru which our Navy was able to get to, but the cartels are very smart. They learn how to prevent this from happening. So this is an important area.

And then finally a battle that we have had back and forth—and I still hold fast to this statement—Mexico has never extradited a single Mexican national to the United States on drug charges despite 52 extradition requests, for at least 13 of which the paperwork has been completed. Now they have made advances, they have begun to extradite Mexican nationals on other charges, and I think they should be commended for that. But that is not yet full cooperation.

So I think the record is clear. It is not credible to make claim that Mexico has fully cooperated with the United States in combating drug trafficking, and that is the standard required by section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Despite these facts, the claim has been made by the administration that progress has been made, and I respect that. The administration has said that they believe some of the things I have just alluded to are in the process of being corrected. That is why originally we felt it was so important to have this body be able to monitor progress, comment on progress on September 1 in an expedited way, and make a finding if we found the progress inadequate.

That has been removed from this resolution, but the administration will still report on progress. You can be sure that I and others in this body will come to the floor and make our comments on September 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 on whether we regard this progress as being adequate.

So as we engaged in negotiations with the administration over the past week on this resolution, it was extremely important to put into place a mechanism by which we could hold the administration accountable. We have compromised here. But we also have 10 specifics. Subsection (d) requires the President to support on progress in 10 specific areas—and I urge Members to begin to look at this. It begins on page 6 of the resolution following this historic statement that "it is the sense of Congress that there has been ineffective and insufficient progress in halting the production and transit through Mexico of illegal drugs." We say that not later than September 1 the President shall submit to the Congress a report and then we list 10 areas of concern to be addressed in the report. Let me outline those 10 areas.

The first is effective action to dismantle the major drug cartels and arrest and extradite their leaders. This goes specifically to the two most powerful groups, the Juarez and Tijuana cartels, as well as others like the Sonora and the Gulf cartels.

Second, better cooperation between the United States and Mexican law enforcement including the funding and deployment of the Binational Border Task Forces and allowing United States agents in these forces to arm themselves for self-defense. That is the implication. By September 1 we will know whether it has been achieved or not. The answer then will be yes or no.

Third, better enforcement at the border. This means increased screening for and seizures of contraband. It also means, and Senator HUTCHISON was very effective in incorporating this into our resolution, that we call for the funding and the assignment of an additional 1,000 agents on the border this next year. The administration's budget has funding for 500. Let me say to the administration, from this side of the aisle, that is not adequate. We are asking for 1,000, by official action, incorporated in this legislation.

Improved cooperation on extraditions—that is the fourth. This goes specifically to the need for Mexico to extradite Mexican nationals who are wanted in the United States on drug charges. A good start would be the 13 such requests pending. There are several dozen more on the way. On September 1, we will see how many extraditions there have been.

Fifth states easier rules of prosecution of drug traffickers. At the present time, the evidentiary rules in Mexico—and Mexico is aware of this—are such that, in their country it is very difficult to come by a conviction.

Sixth, full and ongoing implementation of effective money laundering legislation and enforced regulations—for banks and other financial institutions—these are the money-changing houses outside of banks—with penalties and sanctions for those who do not comply and immunity for those who help, so people who turn in money launderers will not be assassinated. We are hopeful—and I commend Mexico for taking action in this regard—we are hopeful that last week's progress in issuing these regulations will lead, now, to effective enforcement. We all know it is one thing to have something on the books, it is another thing to see that something is carried out and enforced. On September 1, Senator COVERDELL and I and others will both be looking at these. Are they in place? Have they been effected? Have they been enforced?

Seventh, increased eradication of drug crops, including marijuana and opium—this is the seventh. We hope and expect that eradication figures will increase this year. I believe our Nation is prepared to play a role in any binational cooperation that the Mexican Government would wish in that regard.

Eighth, implementation of a comprehensive screening program to identify, weed out, and prosecute corrupt officials at all levels of the Mexican Government, police, and military. This means vigorous screening of candidates before they are hired, not rehiring corrupt policemen after their dismissal, and prosecution of those found to be corrupt. We commend Mexico for firing 1,250 law enforcement officers. The problem is, none were prosecuted. That is the problem. And we are asking for cooperation.

I think it is worth noting that the Los Angeles Times reported yesterday that 3 percent of the Mexican police tested positive for drug use in a recent survey. This was 3 percent of Federal personnel screened. I think it added up to some 424 Federal law enforcement officers who failed drug tests. We have that same problem in our Nation. So we admit it and we try and screen. We are asking our partner in Mexico to do the same thing.

Ninth, we have a clause in there regarding support by the United States of Mexico's efforts to combat corruption. I cannot conclude without saying that Mexico has made efforts. I believe Mexico has made efforts. I simply question the adequacy of those efforts. But, for those efforts that have been made, we should provide support, and I believe every Member of this Congress, and certainly this Senate, wants to do so. So, this clause reads, "the rendering of support to Mexico in its efforts to identify, remove and prosecute corrupt officials"—they would ask us for that support, but we would certainly say that support would be forthcoming.

The 10th and final provision calls for "the augmentation and strengthening of bilateral cooperation." This is not specific in the law we are writing. It is nonspecific. At the administration's request, we removed a direct reference to air and maritime cooperation. But I think the record should show that Congress does expect this report to discuss progress made in areas such as aircraft overflight and refueling rights, aircraft radar coverage, and maritime refueling rights.

I look forward to receiving this report on September 1. The record will reflect that, and Senator COVERDELL and I and Senator HUTCHISON and others, come September 1, as sure as the sun will come up, we will make an inquiry to see what the progress has been. And if the Congress finds the progress cited by the administration to be inadequate, it will no doubt find ways to respond.

This report, in essence, in addition to the findings carried up front in this resolution and the two senses of the Senate, urging the President on his visit to put forward this new, multilateral cooperative, hemispheric drive, if you will, reflect a new strategy, a new plan, new bilateral cooperation, and the specific sense of the Senate, and our conclusions as to why we would have to say there has not been full cooperation up to this point.

I very much hope, in summary, that there will be a very strong vote in this Chamber for this resolution. If it passes, I have been assured by John Hilley of the White House Office of Legislative Affairs and General McCaffrey, Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, that the administration will work hard to get this resolution passed by the House. If they do, I believe it will pass the House. John Hilley and General McCaffrey also assured me that the President will sign this resolution as passed by the Senate.

We, for the first time in history, will have passed a law, not a sense of the Senate resolution, but a law which states a purpose, which states a new effort, which states specifics, and which asks that on both the supply side and the demand side there be a new effort by both the United States of America and the sovereign, independent country of Mexico, to address the drug problem together, both on the demand side here with us and the supply side there with Mexico.

It is a very important, significant piece of legislation. I believe, I sincerely believe, it can have major, long-term impact. If it does not, the alternative is very clear next year. It is very clear. And it will not be just Senator D'AMATO and I next year, or Senator COVERDELL and I, and Senator HUTCHISON and others, and hopefully a majority this year. It will be a full-blown effort to see that this progress is carefully evaluated. And whatever action we must take, we will, in fact, take.

Mr. President, let me express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN, for lifting his objection. I know he has very deep and heartfelt feelings about the Chemical Weapons Convention. I have said to him informally, and I will say here, I will certainly do everything I possibly can to provide him with any help I can give, to see that it comes to the floor. But I am very pleased he has withdrawn his objection and we will be able to bring this debate to a conclusion with a vote on this resolution.

Mr. President, I ask how much time remains on my hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 31 minutes of time remaining.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, before the Senator from California leaves, I want to express my gratitude for her tireless work. I do want to mention, while she is here, a debt I believe we both owe to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Senator HELMS of North Carolina hovered over these efforts throughout, and as late as minutes before an accord was struck,

personally heard out all the suggestions that had been made, compromises, and I believe was a major contributor to the conclusion by his attention, concurrence and coauthorship of this provision. I know the Senator from California would acknowledge that as well.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much. I would like to acknowledge that. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is, in fact, a cosponsor of this legislation. Like me, he had very strong feelings, and I know when you have very strong feelings, compromise is difficult. He did do that. I am very thankful, because I think we have a very strong piece of legislation as a result, and his support was certainly vital and, I think, crucial to getting this resolution on the floor and getting the vote that, hopefully, we will get. So I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank Senator FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, also thank Dan Fisk and Elizabeth DeMoss from Senator HELMS' Foreign Relations Committee staff, Dan Shapiro with Senator FEINSTEIN, Randy Scheunemann on the majority leader's staff, and especially Terri Delgadillo and Steve Schrage of my staff.

I yield up to 10 minutes of my time to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Thank you, Mr. President. I commend Senator COVERDELL, in particular, for his leadership on this issue, his hard work and, along with him, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator HELMS, the chairman, Senator MCCAIN, Senator DODD, Senator HUTCHINSON, and the leaders for the hard work they put in. Certainly they put in many, many hours working to resolve a very thorny and very difficult issue.

Having said that, it is with regret and some reservation that I say I believe the resolution before us today is totally insufficient. We have now taken a very substantive and meaningful action against a poor decision by the Clinton administration and turned it into a political football and, Mr. President, I believe we have fumbled the football on the goal line.

While I realize the outcome of this vote is evident, it is clear I cannot, in good conscience, stay silent and not speak to the deficiencies of the resolution on which we will be casting our votes.

As best I can tell, while the resolution says many good things, while it says some very meaningful things, when you boil it all down and when you look at it, the essence of what we get from this resolution is a report that we are asking the administration, we are telling the administration to give us in a few months, and that, after all is said and done, is all there is to it.

I hold in my hand several newspaper accounts, recent newspaper articles which raise serious questions as to the efficacy of the Mexican Government's counternarcotics efforts. Let me just give you some of the headlines:

"Another Mexican General is Arrested and Charged with Links to Drug Cartel."

"2nd Mexican General Faces Drug Charges."

"424 Fail Drug Exams in Mexican Law Enforcement."

The list goes on and on. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[The New York Times, Mar. 18, 1997]

ANOTHER MEXICAN GENERAL IS ARRESTED AND CHARGED WITH LINKS TO DRUG CARTEL

(New proof that traffickers have corrupted high levels of Mexico's military)

(By Julia Preston)

MEXICO CITY, March 17.—A Mexican Army brigadier general was arrested today on charges that he offered a multimillion-dollar bribe to a top Mexican law enforcement official on behalf of a notorious cocaine cartel.

Brig. Gen. Alfredo Navarro Lara is the second high-ranking military officer to be jailed on drug-related charges in a month. His arrest is new proof that traffickers have succeeded in corrupting the highest levels of the Mexican armed forces.

Jesús Gutiérrez Rebollo, a division general who was the head of the federal drug agency, was arrested on Feb. 18 and accused of protecting and receiving benefits from Mexico's most powerful drug lord, Amado Carrillo Fuentes.

Today's arrest also indicates that competing drug gangs have divided the officer corps in their campaign to buy protection. General Navarro Lara is accused of trying to buy off the authorities in the border state of Baja California in the service of the Arellano Félix brothers, a criminal cartel that has waged a bloody war across northern Mexico against the rival band of Mr. Carrillo Fuentes.

The only announcement of General Navarro Lara's arrest came in a terse press release tonight by the office of Attorney General Jorge Madrazo Cuéllar. Neither Mr. Madrazo nor any Defense Ministry official was available for further comment.

According to the release, General Navarro Lara invited the top federal justice official in Baja California to a private meeting in a "luxurious suite" in a Tijuana hotel early this month. The general is said to have offered the official, José Luis Chávez García, who is also an army brigadier general, payments amounting to \$1 million a month in return for cooperation in allowing cocaine and other narcotics to pass through the state en route across the border into the United States.

General Navarro Lara is said to have conveyed a threat from the Arellano Félix brothers that they would kill General Chávez García and his family if he refused to agree to the plan.

A justice official who formerly held the top post in Baja California, Ernesto Ibarra Santés, was shot dead in Mexico City in September 1996. Several gunmen arrested in that killing were known to be hired members of the Arellano Félix gang.

General Navarro Lara was formally charged today with drug trafficking and racketeering and was confined to a maxi-

mum security penitentiary on the outskirts of Mexico City. He was described in news reports here as a commander in a military region with headquarters in the central city of Guadalajara, where General Gutiérrez Rebollo also served.

In his first sworn statements taken at the prison, General Navarro Lara admitted making the bribe offer but said he had not taken any payments from the Arellano Félix brothers and only cooperated with them after they threatened to kill one of his children.

The arrest comes as President Ernesto Zedillo is struggling to rebuild Mexico's anti-narcotics program after the devastating arrest of General Gutiérrez Rebollo, under pressure from the United States Congress, which is moving to reverse President Clinton's recent decision to certify Mexico as a fully cooperating ally in the drug war.

Mr. Zedillo has said he is determined to detect and arrest officials implicated in the drug trade no matter how high their rank.

Last week Mr. Zedillo chose a civilian official with no narcotics investigating experience, Mariano F. Herrán, to replace General Gutiérrez Rebollo as head of the drug agency.

[L.A. Times/News/Nation & World, Mar. 18, 1997]

SECOND MEXICAN GENERAL FACES DRUG CHARGES

(By Mark Fineman)

MEXICO CITY.—For the second time in a month, federal authorities here Monday announced the arrest of an army general on drug charges. The senior officer was accused of offering \$1 million a month to Mexico's top counter-narcotics official in Tijuana to protect one of the country's largest drug cartels—and of threatening to kill him and his family if he refused.

The attorney general's office announced late Monday that Brig. Gen. Alfredo Navarro Lara had been charged with drug corruption, bribery and criminal association and jailed earlier in the day outside Mexico City in the Almoloya de Juarez high-security federal prison.

On Feb. 18, Gen. Jose de Jesus Gutierrez Rebollo, then Mexico's anti-drug czar, was sent to Almoloya after he was charged with taking bribes to protect the nation's most powerful drug-trafficking cartel, allegedly headed by Amado Carrillo Fuentes.

Gutierrez's arrest last month stunned a nation unaccustomed to drug corruption within its army and sent shock waves as far as Washington just two weeks before the Clinton administration recertified Mexico as a U.S. ally in the drug war. President Clinton cited the arrest as evidence that Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo is committed to rooting out drug corruption—even in the nation's powerful army.

But U.S. congressional concerns that widespread official drug corruption here had compromised U.S. intelligence and drug enforcement efforts helped drive the House to pass a resolution decertifying Mexico last week.

As the Senate begins debate this week on that decertification resolution—which Clinton has vowed to veto—Navarro's arrest Monday further demonstrated both the depth of drug corruption in Mexico and Zedillo's resolve to punish it.

\* \* \* \* \*

MEXICO LET SUSPECTED DRUG TRAFFICKER MOVE \$168 MILLION OUT OF SEVERAL BANKS

(By Wall Street Journal staff reporters Laurie Hays and Michael Allen in New York and Craig Torres in Mexico City)

Mexican officials failed to stop a major suspected drug trafficker from spiriting



away \$168 million despite a joint U.S.-Mexican effort to freeze his bank accounts, U.S. officials allege.

The money transfers, which effectively crippled an ambitious bilateral investigation into Mexican money laundering, came just weeks before President Clinton certified that Mexico was cooperating fully in the international drug fight, U.S. officials say. The episode is likely to fuel congressional criticism of the decision.

Clinton administration officials themselves have sharply criticized Mexico's handling of the affair. Testifying before a Senate panel earlier this month, Deputy Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers said he had registered "our strong protest" at the failure to freeze the money.

A spokesman for the Justice Department said agency officials, along with those from the State and Treasury departments, had a "face-to-face confrontation" with Mexican officials over the incident. He declined to elaborate.

Mexican officials involved in the matter disputed the U.S. version of events.

The case centers on the Gaxiola Medina family, a prominent clan that runs a local lumber-distribution business in the northern Mexican state of Sonora.

#### INDICTMENT IN UNITED STATES

In May 1994, a federal grand jury in Detroit indicted Rigoberto Gaxiola Medina on charges that he ran a trafficking organization that distributed more than 2,200 pounds of marijuana in the U.S. beginning in 1992. The indictment lists 25 other defendants.

According to the indictment, the operation loaded marijuana on trucks in Tucson, Ariz., and delivered it throughout the U.S. Sales proceeds were allegedly collected in Michigan and wired to Mexican banks.

#### BANCO MEXICANO AND BANCA SERFIN

Mr. Gaxiola Medina didn't enter a plea in the case and couldn't immediately be located for comment.

The U.S. Customs Service began a money-laundering investigation into the money transfers in April 1996, according to people familiar with the matter. U.S. agents contacted Mexican Finance Ministry officials, who in turn traced almost \$184 million in deposits to 15 Mexican bank accounts. The Finance Ministry put in an official request to the Mexican attorney general's office on Jan. 8 to freeze the accounts, these people add, but when the money was frozen on Jan. 20, only \$16 million remained.

Customs officials were notified by the Mexicans on Feb. 27 that the money was gone, these people add—one day before the White House's decision to certify Mexico was announced.

"Let's just say we gave them the information and they weren't as successful as everyone would have hoped in seizing it," said Allan Doody, director of financial investigations for U.S. Customs. "I would say the Mexican government is looking into exactly what happened. Right now nobody knows where the money went."

Three Mexican officials involved in the case said it isn't clear when the money left the accounts. They say roughly \$183 million arrived from U.S. and Mexican banks into accounts controlled by the Gaxiola Medina family. But the officials deny that most of this money was transferred out of those accounts in 1997. "The most logical hypothesis is that the money left over a period of time," said one official. "These are high turnover accounts."

#### ROLE OF FINANCE MINISTRY

U.S. officials said they believe the Mexican Finance Ministry, which has authority over certain Mexican money-laundering regula-

tions, acted honorably. Suspicion of wrongdoing centers on the Mexican attorney general's office, which Mexican officials themselves acknowledge is rife with corruption. The Mexican general running the attorney general's anti-narcotics program at the time of the incident was later arrested on charges that he took bribes from a powerful drug lord.

Reports of the money disappearance first appeared in the Mexican newspaper *El Universal*.

Members of the Gaxiola Medina family couldn't be reached for comment. Regoberto Gaxiola Medina is listed in corporate records as the divisional administrator of the family wood business, known as Grupo Industrial Gaxiola Hermanos SA, but it wasn't immediately clear whether he was the same person indicted in Detroit.

Pedro Garcia Palzuelos, an attorney for the Gaxiola Medinas, said the family businesses naturally deal in large sums of money and foreign exchange. Mexican law-enforcement officials "didn't encounter any crime related to drug trafficking and they aren't going to find one," said Mr. Garcia Palzuelos, adding that there isn't "proof of money laundering."

U.S. officials have long worried about Mexico's role in laundering drug profits. "Given the primary methods used to move narcotics proceeds in the mid-90s, Mexico's financial system has become the indispensable money-laundering center for criminal organizations throughout the Americas," the State Department wrote in its latest overview of narcotics trends.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, the importance of Mexico's full cooperation with the United States antinarcotics efforts cannot, I believe, be overstated. Drug use among American teenagers has nearly doubled in the last 5 years. More importantly, more than 70 percent of illegal narcotics coming into the United States flow through Mexico. I know that many of those drugs originate in Colombia, incidentally, which we decertified, but 70 percent of those coming into the United States now flow through the nation of Mexico.

Mr. President, as we all know, on February 28, the Clinton administration certified that Mexico cooperated fully with United States efforts to combat international narcotics trafficking during 1996. However, on February 27, the day before, the administration received a bipartisan letter from 39 Senators—I signed it, Senator FEINSTEIN signed it, and many of my colleagues signed it—urging our Government to deny certification to Mexico. The facts unequivocally show us that Mexico has not—I say, has not—fully cooperated with us.

Not one Mexican national out of the 100 or more that the United States wants for trial here on serious drug charges has been extradited to the United States, despite our Government's numerous requests. Not one has been extradited.

Our own DEA Administrator, Tom Constantine, has recently said:

There has been little or no effective action taken against the major Mexico-based cartels. . .

Then he said:

The Mexicans are now the single most powerful trafficking group—worse than the Colombian cartels.

So while we are willing to decertify Colombia, our own DEA Administrator says Mexico is now worse, and we are going to certify them. You explain to me the logic in that, explain to me the consistency in that, explain to me how we, in good conscience, can do that.

Mexico's counternarcotics effort is plagued by corruption in the government and the national police. Among the evidence are the eight prosecutors and law enforcement officials who have been murdered in Tijuana in recent months. Furthermore, the revelation that General Rebollo, Mexican's top narcotics official and a 42-year veteran of the armed forces, had accepted bribes from the Carrillo-Fuentes cartels casts grave doubts on Mexico's ability to curb corruption at the highest level of its government. Corruption is now, in fact, pervasive in the Mexican Government.

Mr. President, we in this body must all be well aware that Mexico continues to be a major transit point for cocaine illegally entering the United States from South America, as well as a major source country for heroin and marijuana.

The 1997 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, issued by the United States State Department, explicitly notes that Mexico is the transshipment point for 50 to 60 percent—50 to 60 percent—of the United States-bound cocaine shipments and up to 80 percent of the meth precursors. This report notes that in 1996, Mexico supplied 20 to 30 percent of the heroin and up to 80 percent of the foreign-grown marijuana entering the United States of America.

The fact is that four Mexican drug trafficking organizations dominate the narcotics trade between the United States and Mexico. The DEA calls these groups the "Mexican federation" and estimates that they gross \$10 billion to \$30 annually in drug sales. Mr. President, those drug sales are to our children, to our Nation and to our culture, and they threaten the very future of our Nation.

On February 28, 7 hours after the President announced his certification of Mexico, again with the full knowledge of congressional disapproval, Mexico's Attorney General's office issued a statement that its own senior officials had released Humberto Garcia Abrego, a reputed money launderer and brother of convicted drug kingpin, Juan Garcia Abrego. We do not know whether he was released earlier—whether it occurred on the 28th or earlier—with the announcement being held until after the President's certification decision was made public. But, again, we see how this country has been treated over a decade of this certification process.

Mr. President, I ask you, can we not do better? Tom Constantine said, in short, there is not one single law enforcement institution in Mexico with whom DEA has an entirely trusting relationship. Can we not do better than



that, certifying a country that cannot fully cooperate with our counterdrug efforts? What message does this send to our children about the seriousness of the drug war? Our children are the real victims of this policy.

I have heard the repeated argument that if the narcotics market in the United States was not so bloated, then there would be no reason for a continual supply of drugs coming across our borders. Supply and demand. Quite frankly, I agree with that assertion. However, let's tackle that issue in the crime bill, not on the certification of a foreign country not being cooperative with our efforts.

I am committed to winning the war on drugs, and we can only do that by championing the causes to reduce the amount of drugs in this country, appropriating funds for antinarcotics efforts, and assisting the DEA in the fight. But Mexico has not been helpful, and that is the fact and that is the truth.

It is ironic, I think, that while we stand aside and certify Mexico's full cooperation, we pass a resolution that asserts that in fact that has not been the case.

I have the joint resolution before me. It says this:

There is evidence of significant corruption affecting institutions of the Government of Mexico (including the police and military).

It says this:

In 1996, the Attorney General of Mexico dismissed more than 1,200 Mexico federal law enforcement officers . . . although some were rehired and none [none] has been successfully prosecuted for corruption.

We are going to say, through the certification of Mexico, that they have been fully cooperative when that is not the reality of the resolution that we are passing.

We say in the resolution:

The Government of Mexico has recently approved, but has yet to implement fully, new and more effective legislation against organized crime and money laundering.

That is what we say in the resolution we are going to vote for, which flies absolutely in the face of the certification of Mexico.

The resolution says:

Drug cartels continue to operate with impunity in Mexico, and effective action needs to be taken. . . .

And yet we are going to certify Mexico as being fully cooperative and making progress.

We have a resolution that we are going to vote on that says:

Cocaine seizures and arrests of drug traffickers in Mexico have dropped since 1992.

So while we say that arrests and seizures are down, we are going to say that we are going to certify them as making progress and being fully cooperative.

Then on page 6 of the resolution, the sense-of-Congress portion of the resolution, we say:

It is the sense of Congress that there has been ineffective and insufficient progress in halting the production in and transit through Mexico of illegal drugs.

While we say that, we stand aside and allow certification to take place.

I ask Mr. COVERDELL, who controls this time, for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. So while we say in the resolution it is our sense they have been ineffective and there has been insufficient progress, we allow certification to go forward, which says in fact they have been making progress and that they have been fully cooperative.

To my colleagues I simply say, I think that is inconsistent, I think that is intellectually dishonest, and it is unfortunate, and it does a disservice to the citizens and our constituents whom we serve.

We pass a resolution asserting that they have failed, that they have not made progress, and then we allow certification to go forward.

How can we reconcile our treatment of the nation of Colombia a year ago and decertify and with a straight face now certify Mexico through which 70 percent of the illegal drugs flow into this country? You do it. I cannot.

I believe that this certification process has become a sham. It is intellectually dishonest to move forward with that. The entire resolution upon which we will be voting contradicts that certification—two standards—that they have been fully cooperative and they have been making progress. We pass a resolution that says they have not been fully cooperative and they have not been making adequate progress. You reconcile that. I cannot. I yield the floor.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield up to 10 minutes of my time to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask the Senator, how much time do you have?

Mr. COVERDELL. Let me ask the Chair. I assume about 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, under those conditions, I ask that you notify me when I have used 7 minutes. I do not think I should use 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, about 4 years ago I came to the floor of the U.S. Senate—I did not check for the exact date, but I came to the floor to congratulate and praise Mexico. In par-

ticular, I was praiseworthy of their then-President Carlos Salinas.

I even said on the floor of this Senate that, man for man, I thought he had the best Cabinet in the free world. In fact, I chose some of his Cabinet members because of their tremendous intellectual capacity and great training and compared them with our then-Cabinet members and said, I am pleased to tell the Senate that for the first time in history they probably have a better Cabinet than the United States of America.

For those people in Mexico who wonder how Senators like Senator DOMENICI have become more and more concerned about what is going on in Mexico, let me suggest that it was a very serious letdown to this Senator. It was a serious letdown having made statements like that, to find out what they were doing and what that pinnacle of free enterprise and privatization, a graduate of our best schools of economics, Carlos Salinas, was all about.

So it was that just a few weeks ago, as one Senator, I joined in saying to the President that he should not certify Mexico as being in compliance and cooperating fully.

But I would remind my good friend, the new Senator from Arkansas, that we in the Congress do not certify. The President certifies. What happened, even with many of us saying he should not, the President certified that Mexico was in cooperation and compliance.

So now we are confronted with the situation where our own President and all of those who work for him, including a very able drug czar, Gen. Barry McCaffrey, have told us that the best thing we can do is keep the pressure on Mexico, but not to proceed with decertification from our end on the legislative side because in their opinion, instead of making matters better, it will make matters worse. Instead of causing more cooperation, it will cause less. Instead of causing Mexico to work with us in many areas that they are working in that we are now all becoming familiar with, it will force them politically to sever those kinds of relationships and to go their own way.

Might I remind fellow Senators, all of this is happening in the context of an election in Mexico which is going to take place in the not-too-distant future.

Fellow Senators, I understand Mexico. My State borders Mexico. For those who wonder whether I know about their culture, I would remind you that 38 to 40 percent of the residents of my State speak the Spanish language. While many of them are truly Hispanics from Spain, there are many who are Mexicans. But in all respects, I understand the relationship of Mexico and its populace, to the United States. I understand how they feel about us in terms of whether we really are their friends or are we the big giant to the north who is always trying to tell them what to do?

So I have come to the conclusion, absolutely and unqualifiedly, that it is

better for us not to override the President but to go ahead and state our case, state our case in a resolution and then say godspeed to the President and General McCaffrey and all the others. Let us see if we can get better cooperation between these two great neighbors in the next few years.

I remind everyone the best experts now say we are not going to fix this drug problem with Mexico where all of these drugs come flowing into our States.

I might say to my friend, Senator COVERDELL, they are pouring into my State, you can be assured, and into the principal city, although it is a couple hundred miles from the border, Albuquerque. We have never had so many murders and gang slayings and drug addictions as we have now because we are at the crossroads of the two interstate highways, both of them leading in some way to the south toward Mexico.

So I am aware of that. But I came to the floor to make sure that Mexico understands that we have once again—and I hope it will be rather unanimous in the Senate—that we have come to the conclusion that we want to urge our nations to cooperate and we are urging, if not begging, Mexico to do what it can to be more cooperative and do more to alleviate this scourge on our people.

I want to also say that the current President of Mexico, Ernesto Zedillo is a very competent man. Some say he is not a good enough politician. But indeed he has a good enough brain and a good enough commitment to that country. I believe—and here again I hope I am right—that he is absolutely honest, that he is truly dedicated to clean up what he can clean up in Mexico.

President Zedillo I hope you will do that. And I hope America is there helping you rather than hindering you as you attempt to do that.

This resolution is a good resolution because it requires that sometime in September a full report will be sent to the Congress of the United States by our President, indicating whether there has been progress made in the many areas cited in this resolution. We are clearly laying before the Mexican leaders what we hope is a constructive resolution, by saying these are the kinds of things where we must see some progress.

We will be around for another day. The Mexican Government knows that. The President will be around next year and have to decide on certification again. I think the President understands that we are not expecting certification to come easy and to be a matter of course or ever just be a matter of whatever the State Department recommends. We are moving in the direction of saying we should be honest about it.

For now, most of us who urged that the President not certify, we have all come to the same conclusion. We want

to lay before the American people and the Mexican people and their government what we think is going wrong in Mexico and say we want to help with it. We want to say that we are willing to stand back and do what we can in our appropriation process with the things we must do on the border for law enforcement, but we are also saying to Mexico, you can count on it. We are doing this because our President urges us to. Gen. Barry McCaffrey, the drug czar, urges us to. The State Department urges us to. But we are going to hold all of them accountable, not just Mexico.

We are expecting our Government to say the Senate really is serious and we should do something about these areas. I must say to our Government, we really risk future action by the U.S. Senate—I do not speak for the House—if we do not get some real performance and some honest evaluation in this report that we are requesting here.

That is why I am here. I feel this will do more good in our efforts to work binationally with Mexico. We need to work with Mexico on myriad fronts—those affecting this drug scourge that is flowing into American cities and thus into our young people and Americans across the board.

I thank Senator COVERDELL for his leadership, and the distinguished Senator from California.

It was a pleasure to help you get the letter signed. I think I got a few Senators, and I am pleased to have been on that. I believe our collective work will bring forth positive fruit both for us and for Mexico.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank the Senator from Mexico for his generous remarks and his long work on this subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 4:45 p.m., the Senate proceed to a vote on amendment No. 25, and immediately following that vote, the joint resolution be read for a third time and passed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, rule XII is waived and the agreement is entered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the quorum time be applied proportionately to all who have time reserved.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I, too, would like to commend the distin-

guished Senator from the State of California, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, as well as the Senator from Georgia, Mr. COVERDELL, and those who I believe in good faith have come together with this agreement. I respect their work. I know their purpose and their intent.

I do not know whether other Senators will vote in opposition to this agreement on this day. I do not know if there are any, but I will not vote for it. I want, Mr. President, to make clear my reasons, because I look at the same facts and I simply come to a different conclusion.

I remember, Mr. President, being told at the end of the cold war we were going to be free of some of the compromises of our own interests which were necessary when we were defending ourselves in that great international struggle. We would be able to speak the truth again and to put our own interests of our own people first.

This is a test of that principle. It is argued that to tell the truth about Mexico and to decertify Mexico as an ally in the war against narcotics would involve offending Mexican sensibilities. Given the realities of Mexican history or the Mexican political situation, it would cause political complications.

Mr. President, the question is not whether or not Mexico would be offended by a truthful analysis. The issue raised is whether or not Mexico is an ally in the war against narcotics. That is the only question that was asked. It is the only question that is relevant.

The truth is unmistakable. Mexico is not assisting, is not an ally in the war against narcotics, and saying that it is or postponing the judgment, as would be done by this resolution, does not escape that truth.

The truth, Mr. President, is that 14,000 Americans die every year from illegal narcotics. If this judgment is to be postponed until September 1, and March, April, May, June, July, and August are to pass, then another 7,000 Americans will be consumed in the spiral of death by illegal narcotics, and they will have died while we maintain a false conclusion.

What is it, Mr. President, we would say to the law enforcement officers from New York to Los Angeles to Chicago, to small towns all across America, to DEA agents around the world, who risk their lives every day facing the truth, if we will not face the truth?

Mexico has had an opportunity in the last year to choose sides in the war against narcotraffickers. They had a choice when the United States filed 52 extradition requests with the Mexican Government and no one was extradited. They had a choice when 250 Mexican law endorsement officers were dismissed from their positions because of corruption, and none were prosecuted. They had a choice when the Mexican Congress passed money laundering statutes which were not enforced. Mr. President, Mexico has had a choice every day for the last year.

Now, it may be the will of this institution to give them another 6 months

to make that choice again. I believe, Mr. President, that given the extensive corruption in the Mexican Government, the compromising of Mexican law enforcement officials, and their pervasive operation of narcotrafficking criminal organizations in Mexico, Mexico may now not only lack the will, but may no longer possess the ability to control the flow of narcotics to the United States. We cannot construct a policy of interdicting narcotics in Mexico by becoming part of a silent conspiracy, where Mexico pretends to be helping interdict narcotics and we pretend to believe them.

This judgment gets no less painful after 6 more months pass than it will be today. It was said, Mr. President, during the cold war that the United States and the Soviet Union went eye to eye and America never blinked. The United States and Mexico are now facing a war against narcotics, and we have made an unfortunate decision to turn our face away from the truth. The proper action of this Senate, in my judgment, would be to vote to decertify Mexico and place both Mexico and those who influence her on notice that a price will be extracted for the deaths of 14,000 Americans every year by illegal narcotics, a price will be extracted for failing to choose sides in the war against narcotics.

Mr. President, I know this is a difficult decision for every Member of the Senate. But we do not face the hardest choices. The real choices are made by our agents in the Drug Enforcement Administration, by those on border control, by the families who wait up every night to see whether their fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters in law enforcement in our cities and on our borders will come home alive. Our choice is easy. Look at the facts, review the evidence, and tell the truth. There is an open season on the American border for narcotics. Calling Mexico an ally in the war against drugs will not make them a friend and not force them to choose sides. This is a painful choice that must be made by the citizens of Mexico and her business and political leaders. If some are voting for this postponement of judgment until September 1 because they believe it would cause political problems for the PRI, the current political leadership of Mexico, then let it be so.

We serve no American or Mexican purpose by hiding from judgment the current political leadership of Mexico. It is a moment of truth by our own people. If elements of the leadership are corrupted or compromised against the interests of not only other nations against fighting narcotics, but against defending Mexico in the interests of our own people, then let the Mexican people understand that truth and vote accordingly. That is the decision, Mr. President. I believe that we postpone not only recognizing the truth about Mexico's participation in the war against drugs, but we postpone, by our silence, the Mexican people realizing

the truth about their own government, at a time of political judgment in the Mexican electoral system.

For Mexican interests and for American interests, I will vote against this resolution.

A long time ago, we came to the decision that there would be a war against drugs. In wars, there are casualties. At the moment, the principal casualties are our own children and the police officers of our own country. It would be unfortunate if some in the Mexican political establishment have to face the wrath of their own people, or if the good name of Mexico is compromised. Perhaps, Mr. President, they will be added to the list of victims in the war against drugs. No war is ever won without casualties. It's time to get serious in the war against drugs. I believe decertifying Mexico is an important step.

Mr. President, I will vote accordingly.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call time be equally divided on both sides.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

In the last few weeks, the Congress has spent considerable time considering Mexico. A great deal has been said and a number of proposals are on the table about how to respond to the President's decision to certify Mexico as fully cooperating.

These proposals include a resolution to simply decertify Mexico. And a resolution that would put on record the Congress' concern about the lack of visible progress on drugs. We also have a House proposal that is critical of the administration. This proposal would create another minicertification process. That means we get to have this discussion on Mexico all over again in September based on a report to follow the President's summit in Mexico next month.

In my view, these various proposals reflect a generalized concern about

Mexican cooperation and a lack of consensus on how best to respond.

We need to ask ourselves where we began on this issue. The whole reason for this debate grows out of a simple fact. Congress did not accept the President's decision on Mexico. Many in Congress doubt the willingness or ability of Mexico to fight drugs. In response, Congress sought to exercise its legal obligations under the Foreign Assistance Act to find a means to overturn his decision. The means available were not satisfactory. Thinking in the Senate does not seem to favor a straight up-or-down decertification of Mexico. In addition, any such effort, even if it should pass both Houses, will face a veto. Congress does not have the votes to override. Thus, our options on how to proceed have narrowed.

Many people have compared the decision to decertify Colombia with the decision to certify Mexico. They have pronounced the process unfair since both countries have corruption problems but they were judged differently. While that is true, the basic reason is that the situations are not the same. The reason for decertifying Colombia was based on reasonably convincing evidence of corruption at the highest levels of Government. We do not have parallel information on Mexico. On the other hand, when you look at the same categories of achievement or cooperation, Mexico scores at least as well as Colombia on most of them. This is not to say that we should be content with what Mexico has done. I do not believe that Mexican officials are content. Nor do I think they take any pride in recent revelations about high-level corruption. My point is that we should not be hasty in making decisions about a country with whom we are so closely linked. We should not rush to decisions involving our third largest trading partner.

Instead, I offered an approach that I believe was both reasonable and responsible. It would have maintained our concern for accountability but it did not create yet more certification procedures for us to have to get through. And I doubt that circumstances will be any less ambiguous 90 or 120 days from now. My proposal did establish clear guidelines whereby we all—Mexico, Congress, and the public—could judge the state of cooperation using the same terms of reference. This proposal would have kept the process that Congress created. We created that process with clear intent and deliberation. I do not think it is time to change that. It is not time for the proposed experiment in Government currently on the table. Given where we started, it does not achieve what we said we expected at the outset. Nevertheless, it is the only proposal on the table. Thus we come to this vote.

I will vote for this joint resolution with reservations. I will look forward, however, to working with my colleagues in the future for a formula that ensures accountability within a

framework that permits informed decisionmaking.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will support the bi-partisan compromise crafted by Senators FEINSTEIN, COVERDELL and the administration because I believe the United States must signal the Mexican Government that the status quo is no longer acceptable in regard to anti-narcotics cooperation. The massive and growing influx of illegal drugs into this country from Mexico is a significant threat to both of our countries and it must be stopped.

Prior to the President's decision to certify Mexico, I joined 40 of my Senate colleagues in writing to the President and urging him to decertify Mexico because of its abysmal record—a record which includes a complete failure to extradite nationals wanted for drug crimes in this country, as well as rampant corruption at all levels of the anti-drug effort. The arrest last month of Mexico's top anti-drug official on charges that he was on the payroll of one of Mexico's largest drug cartels illustrates the nature and extent of this problem. Further, I am deeply concerned about Mexico's decision to replace much of its national police force, which was removed due to widespread corruption, with the Mexican military, an organization with a very poor record in regard to human rights offenses.

Mexico may well be a significant economic partner with the United States, but the current level of illegal drugs entering this Nation unabated from the south is simply unacceptable. Our economic partnership with Mexico should not include the flourishing drug trade which currently uses Mexico as a primary transit point. While I believe the President should not have certified Mexico, I support the Feinstein compromise because, in light of the Administration's decision, it represents the only legitimate opportunity to hold the Mexican Government accountable. I will watch the actions of our southern neighbor very closely over the coming months in the sincere hope that the Mexican Government will rededicate itself to join the United States in our effort to deal with illicit narcotics which infect both of our nations.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee in bringing forward this compromise resolution with regard to Mexico and the narcotics issue.

At the outset, I want to compliment the Senators who have been deeply involved in the negotiations on this matter—the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from California, and the Senator from Texas.

They and many other Senators have a deep and abiding concern about the serious threat that drug trafficking in Mexico poses to both that country and the United States.

Indeed, we all agree, I suspect, on several issues.

First, it is clear that we cannot overstate the role of Mexico as a source for narcotics. Mexico is the primary transit route for cocaine entering the United States, a major source country for heroin, methamphetamines, and marijuana, and a major money laundering center for illicit profits from the narcotics trade.

Second, I believe we agree that the United States bears a significant responsibility for combating the narcotics trade. Undeniably, the demand for narcotics in this country spurs the narcotics trade. But we are not solely to blame for Mexico's ills.

As the Mexican Government continually reminds us, Mexico is a sovereign nation, and it has the responsibility to do all that it can to confront the threat of the powerful drug cartels—cartels which now have considerable influence in Mexican society.

Third, we agree that corruption in Mexican law enforcement is endemic. That corruption is deeply rooted, as even Mexican President Zedillo acknowledged in his State-of-the-Nation address last fall.

Fourth, we all agree that Mexico must do much, much more in the war on drugs—as the White House acknowledged last month when the President made his certification.

All this leads to the fundamental question now facing us: What can Congress do to help us achieve our objective of reducing the flow of narcotics from Mexico to the United States?

I was disappointed that the President certified that Mexico had met the standard of fully cooperating, or taking adequate steps on its own. The systemic corruption in Mexico, combined with several failures to follow through on commitments made, argued against granting Mexico a full stamp of approval. Instead, I urged the President to invoke the national waiver, because I believed that our interests would be better served by not isolating ourselves from Mexico—which would surely occur were we to fully decertify Mexico. For my part, I believe it could have long-lasting, damaging repercussions that we cannot now predict. At a minimum, it would inhibit the political space that President Zedillo has to press forward with his agenda of reform.

And if we destroy President Zedillo's political resolve to combat the drug traffickers, we will have achieved nothing—and we may well lose the gains we have recently made. In other words, decertification and exercising the full penalties possible under decertification offers a cure that appears to be worse than the disease.

I am pleased that we have come to a bipartisan agreement—reached last night in negotiations with the administration—on the best way forward. The resolution recognizes the aspects of the issue that I have stated—specifically that both countries must take strong action to combat the scourge of narcotics. In addition, the resolution lays out

several benchmarks—a set of policies that we expect both the Mexican Government and the United States Government to undertake in the coming months.

For example, it makes clear that Mexico must implement its recently enacted anti-crime laws, including the new money laundering statute and the organized crime law. In addition, Mexico must investigate and prosecute official corruption at all levels of government—and we must do all we can to assist Mexico in that effort. And Mexico must deny safe haven to persons and organizations responsible for drug trafficking.

These and many other measures—if vigorously implemented—will be critical to strengthening the effort against the drug trade.

Mr. President, we have a major problem in Mexico. It is, in part, the result of our success in reducing the flow of narcotics through the Caribbean and Florida—and our success, in cooperation with the Government of Colombia, in dismantling the major cartels in that country. The emergence of powerful cartels in Mexico is a manifestation of the so-called balloon effect—if you pressure the drug traffickers in one area, they will move to another. Unfortunately, the traffickers are nothing if not resilient.

The result, for both Mexico and the United States, is the expansion of organized crime syndicates that have considerable power and influence over not only the drug trade, but also Mexican society itself. Combating this development will require a major commitment—of resources and political will—by both our Government and the Mexican Government.

The cooperation we have received from Mexico in the past year is far from perfect. We all acknowledge that. But we have made important progress in the past few years, and this measure will be an important contribution to spurring even greater cooperation between our two Governments.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senators from Georgia, California, and Texas were able to reach agreement with the administration on a resolution addressing certification of Mexico's cooperation in fighting illegal drugs. I have been strongly opposed to a straight or even qualified decertification, which I believe would have undermined U.S. interests and been counterproductive in our efforts to address the scourge of illegal drug use in America.

I am not here to argue that the situation in Mexico today, with respect to drug trafficking, is in any way acceptable or serves United States interests. The Senators from California, Georgia, and many others deserve commendation for speaking out strongly about the deteriorating condition surrounding anti-drug efforts in Mexico, and the critical imperative that Mexico take stronger action to stem the flow of illegal drugs across its border into the

United States. The statistics with which we have become familiar are alarming and worsening: 10.9 percent of children in the United States between 12 and 17 years of age use illegal drugs; Mexico is the source of 70 percent of the marijuana shipped into the United States, and is a transit point for between 50 percent and 70 percent of the cocaine shipped into our Nation; drug arrests and drug seizures in Mexico are only half of what they were just 4 to 5 years ago; there are 52 outstanding United States extradition requests for drug dealers in Mexico, although few, if any, Mexican nationals have been extradited to the United States on drug charges; drug-related corruption has reached the highest levels of the Mexican Government, with the recent arrest of Mexico's highest ranking anti-drug official.

Mr. President, I could go on, but the fact is clear: the Mexican Government, in partnership with the United States, must do a better job of stopping illegal drug production and trafficking. The 10 billion dollars' worth of narcotics that is illegally smuggled from Mexico into the United States each year must be sharply reduced, or even better, eliminated.

But let's be clear about one thing: Solely addressing the situation in Mexico—the "supply side" of the drug problem—is incomplete and insufficient. Precious little time in the debate on decertification has been devoted to addressing the demand side of this problem, that is, the tragic, insatiable appetite for illegal drugs in the United States. If there were no demand for illegal drugs here at home, the drug kingpins and cartel chiefs that have caused so much misery, would be unemployed. A Washington Post editorial earlier this month makes this point clear, stating "the demand equation remains the true frontline of the war on drugs." I am pleased that the language agreed to in these negotiations at least in part addresses this critical aspect of our fight against drugs. We would be remiss in not putting today's debate in its proper perspective.

Nevertheless, Congress is right to speak out in an appropriate manner on the deterioration of antidrug efforts in Mexico, and the need to take concrete measures to stem this tide. I would argue that much—not enough, but much—has already been done: the drug certification law passed in 1986, while imperfect, has produced a framework that can produce real results. Nations that receive United States and international assistance are each year held to a very large measure of accountability for their cooperation with the United States in combating drugs. The specter of losing most United States foreign aid and having IMF and World Bank loans vetoed is certainly a strong incentive for governments such as Mexico to cooperate with us and take needed action.

Despite all of the problems in Mexico, there is evidence that the certifi-

cation law has compelled Mexico to do more than it would have done were the law not in place. President Zedillo, in particular, has taken a number of steps, including the arrest and firing of thousands of corrupt and criminal individuals in Mexico. His Government has also eradicated an area the equivalent of 5½ times the island of Manhattan. Finally, President Zedillo has declared the drug cartels and the corruption associated with them to be Mexico's principal national security threat. But more needs to be done, and the Clinton administration has the appropriate tools available at its disposal to make further progress on achieving some very important goals. The amendment before us today not only maintains the administration's ability to enhance its cooperation with Mexico, but provides for needed accountability to Congress and the American people.

On February 28, President Clinton certified to Congress that the Government of Mexico was fully cooperating with the United States in antidrug efforts. The question before the Senate during the past several weeks is should we overrule the President's decision and decertify Mexico? I have argued that, despite the deteriorating situation in Mexico, congressional decertification is the wrong approach, and would actually be counterproductive in solving these problems. I am gratified that the authors of the original decertification resolution have made significant compromises with the administration so that such a vote has been avoided.

Decertification would have been a slap in the face to our diplomats, who have labored, often painstakingly, to prod the Mexicans to help us crack down on illicit drug trafficking. Not only would it upset these delicate diplomatic efforts, a straight decertification would incite the well-known nationalistic political forces in Mexico, making it even more difficult for President Zedillo to further cooperate with us in achieving the goals all of us share. If it's difficult to work with Mexico now, I shudder to think what would have happened if Congress had overruled the administration by passing a straight or even qualified decertification.

I prefer instead to entrust our diplomats with the task of negotiating expanded antidrug efforts with the Mexicans, rather than hoping that decertification, even if sanctions were waived, would compel action on their part. As the March 3 Washington Post editorial states, decertification is "a blunt instrument poorly designed for the delicate political work of drug enforcement. . . . A nationalistic reaction is the inevitable result." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

[From the Washington Post, March 3, 1997]

#### A FINE LINE FOR MEXICO

President Clinton drew a fine line, but a sensible one, between certifying Mexico and decertifying Colombia as a reliable partner of the United States in fighting drug trafficking. The record of both Latin countries in stemming the dread trade is sad. But at least the Mexican government is demonstrably trying—it had the political courage to arrest its corrupted drug policy chief on the eve of the certification proceedings—while the president of Colombia is established as the creature of a drug cartel. Mr. Clinton decided that President Ernesto Zedillo's capacity to do better would be strengthened by certification and that President Ernesto Samper was beyond redemption. It is an arguable decision, but it fits the exigencies of the American certification law, and it also fits the facts.

By now it is accepted in the White House and elsewhere in the administration that the American certification law is a blunt instrument poorly designed for the delicate political work of drug enforcement. In a hemisphere where the premise of effective diplomacy is to respect the sovereign equality of member states, this law brings American power to bear on supply and transit states without either consulting them or providing them a reciprocal opportunity to pass judgment on American policy. A nationalistic reaction is the inevitable result. Still it is the law, and the president is bound to enforce it. Secretary of State Madeline Albright, in announcing the administration's decision on Friday, acknowledge the obligation of the United States to press ahead with its own strategy to reduce demand—a strategy it had introduced, to something less than full public attention, earlier in the week. The demand equation remains the true front line of the war on drugs.

Mexico was unconditionally certified as an American drug-fighting partner. So it is not exposed either to the political rebuke or to the economic penalties that follow from being de-certified. But Mexico is far from being in the clear. Mrs. Albright publicly listed the particular policy areas (capture and extradition of kingpins, money laundering and so on) in which the United States expects to see Mexican progress, and which she, the attorney general and the anti-drug chief will monitor.

A considerable number of legislators have indicated that they will attempt to reverse the administration's certification of Mexico. They should ask themselves how such a gesture, satisfying as it might be for the moment, actually would serve their cause, and what effect it might have in other areas of policy—trade, immigration, environment—where good relations with Mexico are vital to American interests.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, the amendment before us today represents a far more prudent approach to this sensitive issue. It outlines in detail the serious problems involved in Mexico today, and makes it clear that further progress is needed. However, instead of simply clubbing Mexico and walking away, this amendment sets very specific benchmarks for improved anti-drug efforts by Mexico, and requires a progress report from the administration by September 1. Among other things, this report must describe the extent to which our two nations have made significant and demonstrable progress on dismantling drug cartels, improving law enforcement relationships, and increasing cooperation on

extradition of Mexican drug dealers wanted in the United States. The amendment makes it entirely clear both to this administration and to Mexico where the failings have been and what our priorities are. However, under this compromise, nationalist forces will not be incited in Mexico, and our diplomatic efforts can continue smoothly.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment. Thank you.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I think the process that has culminated in this amendment has shown that however well-intentioned, the drug certification process is poorly conceived. Mexico is clearly not cooperating in the counternarcotics effort as it should. How can it, when practically the highest ranking Mexican officials responsible for dealing with the problem are profiting from the drug trade themselves?

But decertifying Mexico would cause more problems than it would solve, by creating resentment with the very people with whom we are seeking to build stronger relations.

I will vote for the amendment, but I want to stress that I am very disappointed that the administration has not acted more forcefully and visibly to encourage the Mexican Government to deal effectively with the corruption and human rights abuses committed by Mexico's police and armed forces. We should send a strong signal to Mexico that this will no longer be ignored. I would have favored a stronger resolution than this, as I know many others would have, including the resolution's sponsor, but I hope the Mexican Government appreciates the seriousness with which we regard these concerns.

The reports of rampant corruption among Mexican military and law enforcement officials, and the human rights abuses they have been involved in, are alarming, as are reports of growing paramilitary activity in Mexico. I am concerned that, with United States support, Mexico is blurring the line between its police and armed forces. I am also concerned that our ability to monitor the equipment we provide to Mexico is inadequate. I have urged the administration to be very specific in its agreements for the transfer of equipment to the Mexican police or armed forces, so there is no ambiguity that it is to be used for counternarcotics activities and not counterinsurgency activities. Those agreements should also specify that if members of police or military units that receive our assistance are implicated in abuses, they will be immediately removed and steps taken to bring them to justice. We have done this recently in agreements with Colombian officials, and there is no reason why it could not be done in Mexico.

The United States and Mexico must work together to combat this problem. But while I and others expect far more from the Mexican Government to deal with corruption and the violence per-

petrated by their own agents, unless we curb the demand in our own country, drug abuse will remain a national crisis.

In the last 10 years, the United States has spent \$103 billion on programs here and abroad against drugs. Yet the DEA reports that the amount of cocaine entering the country, as well as the rates of heroin and cocaine abuse among Americans, have remained steady. Again, the evidence is clear. We will not solve this problem until we aggressively deal with the causes of drug use and addiction in our own country.

Mr. President, I want to thank Senators DODD, FEINSTEIN, COVERDELL, KERRY, MCCAIN, and HUTCHISON who have worked very hard to reach a compromise on this difficult issue.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Mexico resolution.

I think it offers a constructive solution to the bilateral problem we are facing. It gives the President of the United States an opportunity to discuss with President Zedillo of Mexico the various concerns many of us have about the progress our two countries are making in the drug war. And it does so without provoking unnecessary and counterproductive tensions between our countries.

The problems in Mexico's drug enforcement are well known. You can hardly open a newspaper without learning about even more instances of corruption and incompetence at all levels of government and law enforcement.

It's a sad chronicle that makes for truly depressing reading. It's understandable why so many concerned Members of Congress are raising serious questions about the effectiveness of Mexico's antidrug effort.

But it's important that we in Congress stay focused on doing what's in our own national interest—not on symbolic gestures that fail to accomplish that interest.

The problems we face are real.

There are 12.8 million Americans who use illegal drugs, including 1.5 million cocaine users and 600,000 heroin addicts.

More than 1 out of every 10 children between 12 and 17 years of age use illegal drugs. One out of every four claims to have been offered illegal drugs in the past year.

The American people recognize that these are important problems—and that we have to take serious action. But let me point out, Mr. President, that there are many, many people in Mexico who support our goals. To succeed, we need that support.

Without their support, it would not have been possible for Mexico to make even today's limited progress against the drug traffickers.

That progress is limited, but it is nonetheless real.

Over the last year, in spite of the well-known cases of corruption, the Mexican Government has posted in-

creases in drug seizures and crop eradications. That includes a 15-percent increase in marijuana seizures, a 6.3-percent increase in cocaine seizures, and an almost 80-percent increase in heroin seizures.

In 1996, Mexican authorities reported an increase of nearly 14 percent in the number of people arrested on drug trafficking and related offenses, including 28 high-level members of drug trafficking organizations. This year, as has been widely reported, Mexican authorities arrested General Jesus Gutierrez Rebollo—who had been in charge of the National Institute to Combat Drugs—for supporting the activities of the Juarez cartel.

We didn't catch him, Mr. President. The Mexicans themselves did.

Should we expect further improvements in law enforcement operations? Absolutely. We need to monitor the full enforcement of the law—in other words, keep close watch on how many of these arrests lead to prosecution and jail time.

In 1996, the Mexican Congress passed tough laws to address the problems of money laundering, chemical diversion, and organized crime. Now we should insist on full enforcement of those new laws.

This year, we have seen improved cooperation in the areas of money laundering and extradition. Mexico and the United States established a high level contact group on narcotics control to explore joint solutions to the shared drug threat and to coordinate bilateral efforts. We should now expect this increased cooperation to yield clear, positive results.

But one thing is clear: Both Governments need to dedicate greater resources to stop trafficking along our border. Senator HUTCHISON informed the Foreign Relations Committee last week of the enormous difficulties faced by her fellow Texans along the border. Specifically, ranchers with property along the border are being bribed, coerced, or having their lives threatened by traffickers seeking to use private property as a back door into our Nation. These ranchers have been told by Federal officials that it would be years before enough new border agents could be assigned to better secure their property.

Listen to some of the stories these ranchers tell—stories about the gunfights they have fought with drug gangs, and having to carry guns whenever they leave the house. It sounds like a John Ford movie about the Old West.

That has got to change.

Mr. President, let me conclude by making a broader point about Mexico's future. In my view, with this resolution, we create the opportunity for a new round of cooperation between the United States and Mexico. Mexico is not only a neighbor with whom we share a 2,000-mile border, it is also this country's third largest trading partner. If we are to be successful in our anti-drug efforts, Mexico must be our ally.



Yes, the Government of Mexico needs to do more within its borders, and with us, to combat drug trafficking. The real question before us is how can we improve on that partnership.

We all know what the problems are. We all agree that they are very, very serious. But we should also recognize that this is a crucial moment in Mexico's history—and they need our support if they are going to continue in the right direction.

What the Mexican people are trying to do is make the transition from a one-party state, in which corruption and excessive government mandates stifle the hope for widespread prosperity, to a multiparty state that creates jobs and rewards job creators.

President Zedillo appears to be trying to free up Mexican society and reform the political process—changes that will make Mexico a more stable neighbor for the United States. He is opposed by powerful elements in his ruling party, and make no mistake, the outcome is still in doubt.

Now more than ever, the people of Mexico need to know that we want them to be our partners. Our national interest is served by a prosperous and democratic Mexico—a Mexico that offers hope and opportunity for its citizens.

The drug war is one area where we must continue to work together. We should redouble our efforts to look for constructive solutions—to reduce trafficking, to crack down on money laundering, and most important of all, to reduce the demand for drugs.

Our countries must be united in a very important partnership. In the anti-drug effort, as in so many other areas, we have a major common challenge, and we can only prevail if we face it together.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, this month both Houses of Congress have been engaged in a difficult debate over whether to uphold or overturn the President's certification of Mexico as fully cooperating with the United States to fight drug trafficking.

This debate has had a growing negative impact on U.S. relations with an important country and trading partner along our southern border. The debate also has shown how the certification process under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is not as effective as Congress originally intended it to be.

Under current law, notice provided to the target country is often too late and not specific enough to fix the problems. Moreover, access to more timely and specific information would assist Congress in exercising its legislative and oversight responsibilities.

Therefore, on Tuesday of this week, I introduced S. 457, a bill to provide a new option to the President to place countries such as Mexico on a probationary status of 7 months, during the period of March 1 through September 30. If by the end of this probationary period, the target country complies

with the specific conditions stipulated by the President, full certification would be granted. However, if these conditions are not met, the United States would act firmly by cutting off aid beginning on October 1 of this year.

I am pleased that the compromise the Senate is considering today reflects to some extent the main components of my bill. The pending resolution recognizes that Mexico has taken insufficient steps to stop drug trafficking and it stipulates a 6-month period of time in which the President will review Mexico's progress in this area. The resolution also requires the President to submit a report to Congress by September 1 on Mexico's progress.

However, the resolution we consider today does not nearly go far enough. Its findings regarding Mexico are not specific; it does not provide specific steps Mexico must take to continue receiving aid; and it does not amend the existing law to improve the certification process in the future, as my bill does.

I am voting in favor of the pending resolution today because it is the only legislation the Senate will consider this week to address the certification of Mexico. Nevertheless, I urge my colleagues to support S. 457 to improve the certification process for the future. I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the joint resolution that the majority leaders, my fellow Republican and Democratic colleagues, and the administration has concluded with relation to certification of Mexico. Even though I do not think that this resolution goes far enough, I realize that this agreement is a bipartisan effort that should be enacted for the good of the Nation.

Frankly, I am disappointed that we consider a nation that supports drug cartels and warlords worthy of programs funded by the hard earned dollars of American taxpayers. However, this resolution will make certain demands of Mexico and the administration to ensure that progress is made in Mexico. This resolution does not entirely burden Mexico with this responsibility; it will also create a partnership. This partnership will try to strengthen bilateral border enforcement, create a permanent working relationship between law enforcement agencies of both nations and actually assist Mexico to identify, remove and prosecute corrupt officials at all levels of Government. By creating this partnership, Mexico and the United States will closely study this situation and actually try to ensure that both of our efforts are being met. With such limited resources, our assistance to Mexico should make a difference.

Mr. President, we must work toward ensuring that Mexico halts these destructive practices for our most precious national asset, our children. Over the past few years, there has been a marked increase in the levels of co-

caine, heroin, methamphetamines, and marijuana flowing into the United States through Mexico. This is hitting every urban and rural community in the United States. The protection of our most vulnerable possession, our children is the strongest argument for the passage of this legislation.

Finally, we should not be saying to the American people that this law is only good if we can also pass the chemical weapons convention treaty. This is not to suggest my opposition or support for the treaty, but I believe that each issue should be kept separate so as to ensure that both are considered on their own merits.

Thus, the most important issue for this Congress today—the only issue for Congress today—is to move forward on this resolution.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, today we will vote on one of the most difficult issues facing our Nation: the illegal drug trade in Mexico and the United States. The resolution we will vote on requires the President to report by September 1, 1997, on the efforts of Mexico and the United States to achieve results in combating the production of and trafficking in illicit drugs. I support the resolution, and am hopeful that the report will show significant progress by Mexico and the United States in fighting the war on illegal drugs.

As my colleagues have discussed today, we cannot win the war on drugs unless Mexico achieves significant progress in the areas of drug trafficking, extradition, corruption among Mexican law enforcement and other officials, interdiction networks, implementation of laws and regulations to combat money laundering, eradication of crops destined for illegal drug use in the United States, and the strengthening of bilateral border control.

Border control must also be a top priority of the United States; and while my colleagues, including Senators COVERDELL, FEINSTEIN, and HUTCHISON, have done an excellent job detailing what must be done to further our and Mexico's efforts to fight illegal drugs, I want to concentrate for a moment on the need for additional United States Border Patrol agents.

First, I am pleased that one of three things we are asking the President to do by September 1 is detail the progress made in the deployment of 1,000 additional U.S. Border Patrol agents in 1997 as required by my amendment to the Immigration Act of 1996.

Without an effectively controlled border, the United States cannot even begin to win the war on drugs. I was disturbed that the President's fiscal year 1997 budget to Congress requested the addition of only 500 Border Patrol agents, instead of the 1,000 required in the 1986 Act. Senators MCCAIN, GRAMM, HUTCHISON, and DOMENICI recently joined me in sending a letter to the President, urging him to comply with the law, revise his budget request, and

deploy 1,000 additional agents in 1997. Without an adequate contingent of customs and border agents, the problem of individuals smuggling drugs and illegal immigrants across our border will only worsen.

Border Patrol agents are on the front lines every day, working hard to seal off our borders from increasing levels of illegal immigration and the drug trade. The agents that Congress has added over the past few years have made a difference, but the need for additional agents keeps growing. Drug and illegal alien smuggling continues to grow—illegal immigrants are expected to increase by 275,000 per year over the next several years—and the effects of illegal drugs, particularly methamphetamine, have been devastating for the citizens of Arizona and the rest of the Nation.

Just a few weeks ago, a study on drug use in America showed a large increase in youth drug use over the last 5 years. Arizona fared poorly, with much higher drug use than the national average, including a startling statistic that our sixth graders are twice as likely to have tried methamphetamine than high school seniors nationwide. While we continue to talk about the need to fight illegal drugs, the precursor chemicals that make methamphetamine are being smuggled into Arizona in increasing volume. It must stop.

As the resolution we are voting on today says, the abuse of illicit drugs results in at least 14,000 deaths per year in the United States, and "exact economic costs in excess of \$67 billion per year to the American people."

Although many of us would like to see more specific actions that the Mexican government should take to show serious improvement in the war against illicit drugs, it is my hope that Mexico will be able to show significant accomplishments in the areas outlined in the resolution. Likewise, the administration must be able to show specific, detailed action in the war against drugs by, among other things, deploying 1,000 additional agents in 1997.

Mr. President, not rhetoric, but actions. That is what we must demand of Mexico and that is what we must demand of ourselves. We must work diligently to eradicate the scourge of illegal drugs that has taken so many of our citizens, young and old alike, hostage. This compromise resolution should be passed by the U.S. Senate.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues today in strongly endorsing this bipartisan resolution, which represents an important step in the fight to curb the flow of drugs from Mexico.

This resolution strongly registers Congress' unhappiness with the current situation in Mexico. It includes a clause stating that it is the sense of Congress that "there has been ineffective and insufficient progress in halting the production in and transit through Mexico of illegal drugs."

There is ample evidence that Mexico is not doing enough to combat this problem. Let me cite a few examples.

More than half the cocaine coming into the United States is smuggled across the United States-Mexican border.

Major quantities of heroin, marijuana and methamphetamines used in the United States are produced in Mexico.

Drugs are being moved illegally across the United States-Mexico border by major criminal organizations operating on both sides of the border.

And, of great concern to the United States, there is evidence of significant corruption affecting the Mexican Government and undermining its anti-drug commitments. The most dramatic recent evidence of this fact was Mexico's February 1997 arrest of its drug czar, General Gutierrez.

This resolution helps us move beyond the annual certification debate in achieving concrete action in a constructive way. Passage of this resolution will strengthen the President's hand in his upcoming April trip to Mexico. It puts the United States in a position to get the greatest possible cooperation from the Mexicans in fighting the war on drugs. And, most importantly, it puts the Mexicans on notice that we will expect such cooperation.

This resolution clearly expresses Congress' view that the Mexican Government must do more and that the United States needs a plan to push that effort. The resolution lays out the positive steps they must take by requiring the President to submit a report to Congress by September 1 of this year laying out progress with Mexico in the following important areas: Investigation and dismantling of drug cartels, development and strengthening of the working relationship between the United States and Mexican law enforcement officials; strengthening of bilateral border enforcement; denial of safe havens for those responsible for drug trafficking, including improvement of cooperation on extradition matters between the United States and Mexico; simplification of evidentiary requirements for narcotics and other related crimes; full implementation of effective laws and regulations to combat money laundering; eradication of crops intended for illicit drug use; establishment of screening process to assess the suitability of all law enforcement personnel involved in the fight against organized crime; and the support given to Mexico in its efforts to identify and remove corrupt officials throughout the government, including law enforcement and military officials.

The resolution also directs that the report include progress on important domestic goals, including the implementation of antidrug education efforts in the United States focusing on reducing drug use among young people; the implementation of a comprehensive international drug interdiction and enforcement strategy; and provid-

ing the additional personnel needed to get the job done.

This resolution is not, and must not be, the end of this process. The 1998 drug certification process will give Congress another chance to express its support or disapproval of the progress we have made with Mexico.

The resolution is not perfect, but it takes us in the right direction.

Let there be no mistake: the United States cannot tolerate anything less than an all-out effort to control illegal drugs. Mexico must demonstrate a dramatic increase in its cooperation in the effort to stop the flow of drugs across the United States-Mexico border. The United States obligation is to insist on Mexico's cooperation and to make it clear that we will do everything we can to support their effort. We will be closely monitoring progress in this area. Without it, we will face an intolerable threat to our children and a severe degradation of our relationship with Mexico.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DODD. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader has 50 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes of leader's time, and I will try to use less than that time.

Let me begin these remarks by thanking the sponsors of this resolution that is pending before the Senate. I want to especially thank our colleague from Georgia, Senator COVERDELL, with whom I have the pleasure of serving with as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps, Narcotics and Terrorism of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He played a very major role in shaping the compromise that is now before us. I would mention as well our colleagues, DIANNE FEINSTEIN from California, KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON from Texas, JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona, and others who worked tirelessly in helping put this resolution together.

I commend them for their work in putting this resolution together. I am happy to have been a part of it. Even though I do not agree with every word in it, on balance I believe it is a very constructive approach to a very difficult problem. I am sure that all of us who worked to forge this compromise would have liked to see things added or subtracted depending upon our points of view. But, that is the nature of how a resolution like this is assembled.

I think the pending amendment captures the views of this body fairly accurately, and I suspect, the views of the American people whom we represent. Yes, there is a sense of outrage,

fear, worry, and frustration over the ongoing threat posed by the Mexican drug cartels. We have paid a very heavy price for their relentless efforts to ply their trade wherever they can get away with it. The human costs of drug use are real and mounting. This scourge that still ravages this country called drugs has caused great damage to millions of people in this country and elsewhere.

The pending amendment is an attempt to express to our neighbor and ally to the south of us, Mexico, where more than 50 percent of all the drugs that come to this country are produced or transit through, that we would like to see more cooperation in our efforts to eliminate drugs from both our countries.

Mr. President, the economic costs to the American people from the illegal use of narcotics is in excess \$67 billion annually. Estimates are that nearly 13 million Americans regularly use illegal substances. The revenues generated by the drug kingpins totals more than \$49 billion annually—a rather remarkable statistic.

The Mexican drug cartels allocate more than \$6 billion of ill gotten gains for the sale of drugs in order to bribe, or otherwise corrupt Mexican law enforcement and judicial authorities involved in counternarcotics programs.

We consume 50 percent of all the illegal drugs produced in the world. We represent 5 percent of the world's population. So clearly the United States is at the heart of the international drug problem. More and more, this is not solely an American problem. Drug consumption is beginning to ravage countries which in the past never had a problem with illegal substances and drugs. But today that is changing, and even in producing countries—transit countries—nations where money laundering goes on, consumption and the ravages of consumption are beginning to wreak havoc in these nations as well.

I cite just of few statistics. There are clearly many more. I know my colleague from California provided some other statistics in the course of her remarks concerning, for example, the amount of product coming into this country.

Let me say that I think it is perfectly appropriate and proper that we raise the issue of the effectiveness of our allies and neighbors' counter-narcotics efforts. But we should admit as well that we could do a better job here at home in helping to wage an all out effort against illegal drug use. We need to take a good hard look in the mirror as well.

I would argue very strenuously that were it not for the consumption in this country, were it not for our consumption problems, that we would have far less of a problem with nations like Mexico and others. I don't say that is an excuse to let those nations off the hook who produce, process, and transship these illegal drugs that wind

up on our streets. But if we are going to have an intelligent and thoughtful discussion about drug abuse and illegal drug production, and the problems these create, then we need to spend at least as much time in analyzing what we in the United States are doing or are not doing in our own country that creates the market for these products as we do pointing the accusing finger at those who are involved on the supply side.

Simply put, if we did not have a domestic consumption problem we would not have the magnitude of the problem of the supply side that exists in Mexico today. With enough resources we can probably deal with Mexico. Or we can deal with Peru, and Colombia. But what we have learned historically is that as we begin to put pressure on narcotraffickers in one country, they simply relocate to another. This will continue to be the case so long as our domestic consumption rates continue to go up. The producing countries, the transit countries, the money laundering countries, are only temporary locations in the transnational international drug trafficking business.

So the first line of defense has to be a far more aggressive effort here at home to try to educate young people against the dangers and the problems associated with illegal drug use. We also need better treatment programs so that those who are hooked on drugs who want to change will have someplace to go to for help in breaking these incredibly debilitating habits. Yet today, there is a long waiting list at our drug treatment centers—a list of addicts wanting treatment that is currently unavailable to many of them. The waiting period to get into treatment can be as long as 4 years in some instances. Having to wait months and months for treatment certainly doesn't contribute to our efforts to reduce the problem of consumption.

I hope as we attempt to seriously come to grips with the international drug threat to the United States—and it is not going to disappear overnight—that we focus a lot of our attention on reducing domestic drug abuse.

Just as I believe we need to place more emphasis on the demand side, I think we need a serious rethinking of how we approach the supply side of the equation. The current approach as embodied in the annual certification process is not working. In 1986 when Congress enacted the drug certification law there was a great deal of frustration that neither the United States nor other countries were doing enough to fight the drug war. So Congress, on a bipartisan basis, set up a certification process in order to bring attention to the issue and try to do something about it. I strongly suggest to my colleagues—and I realize that I may be in the minority on this issue—that we ought to scrap this certification process and try to come up with some alternative idea that would allow us to develop a working partnership with other

governments, particularly those in our own hemisphere.

There are good people in Mexico who want to see this problem stopped as well.

In fact, I made note the other day—it is worth repeating here today—that when President Zedillo of Mexico came forward and took some significant steps in dealing with the people in his own country who had been corrupted by this process, his favorability rating rose more than 10 percent in Mexican public opinion polls. It isn't just American citizens who are deeply troubled by the rising cost of illegal substances and drugs. The people of Mexico, the average citizen in the street, is worried about this. The mother in Mexico City is just as worried about her child becoming hooked on these substances as a mother in Hartford, or a mother in Atlanta, or a mother in Los Angeles. We need to be sensitive to that because they have to help us as well in trying to build a base of public support in Mexico that will encourage Mexican authorities to get tough on narcotraffickers and corrupt government officials.

My colleague from Georgia may have addressed this already. I will just state it briefly. I think our colleague from Georgia has a very sound idea in terms of how we might look at this problem a bit differently. He has proposed that all countries that are involved in the various aspects of the drug trade, whatever their level of involvement, sit down and start figuring out how we can work together to solve this problem. It isn't going to be solved in one year or two. It isn't going to be solved at all unless we come up with a common plan—a plan developed by co-equals trying to deal with this issue. That is the only way to get the kind of cooperation that is absolutely critical if we are going to be successful in dealing with our allies and others who are producing these products.

I see my colleague. I will be glad to yield to him because I raised his name and mentioned his program.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, first, I want to acknowledge the almost tireless support of the Senator from Connecticut in behalf of the concept.

Just to take a second, the resolution before this body does for the first time enumerate the concept and calls on the administration to air it during the upcoming meetings in Mexico. I just wanted to mention that.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague for mentioning that.

I strongly urge the administration and others to take a strong, hard look at this and come forward with ideas so we can get off the certification track that brings us back here year in and year out picking winners and losers and deciding whether or not they are going to be on the good list, or the bad list, or the marginally good list. Whether they are going to be certified, decertified, or granted a national interest waiver. Debating that kind of question and getting votes of 55 to 45 or 65

to 30 for the various legislative initiatives surrounding certification doesn't get us anywhere.

We have significant evidence that decertification has not fostered better cooperation from other countries. For the last 11 years we have decertified a handful of countries year in and year out. None of these countries counter narcotics efforts have improved as a result of that action.

The simple question that must be asked about the current procedure is if it is not working should it continue? Shouldn't we consider an alternative that might really be effective in achieving the cooperation that is necessary to reduce the ravages of this problem?

If we don't try something new, we will be sitting here, I promise you, with more charts next year and more charts the year after that, and more charts the year after that, and we can beat our chests, pound the table, and scream at neighbors and allies. But my fear is that it doesn't get any better.

So, when your idea is not working very well, you ought to think anew. What the Senator from Georgia has done in my view is think anew on this. I commend him for it. I don't think he thinks nor do I think it is a perfect idea. But I think it has the seeds of success written into it. If we give it a chance and try to make it work, then I think it can produce the results that we all are looking for.

Mr. President, again I commend the authors of this amendment. I think they have expressed the views of all of us more or less. We are all blessed to have General McCaffrey heading up narcotics efforts. He has done an excellent job and he enjoys universal support for his efforts.

I urge the adoption of this amendment. But, more importantly, Mr. President, I urge that we find a different way in the coming weeks and months to address this issue before we find ourselves back again engaged in an exercise that isn't achieving the kind of results that many of us would like to see accomplished.

With that, Mr. President, I urge adoption of the resolution and yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank my colleague from Connecticut for his remarks and again, as I have in the past, for his attention to this concept that we have been discussing for now 2 years, and hopefully this resolution will bring it to a new level of discussion. I apologize for interrupting, but I did want to note that we had embraced some of this concept in the resolution.

Now, Mr. President, I yield up to 5 minutes of my time to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I thank the Chair. I thank my good colleague from Georgia for yielding time to me. I would also like to thank and recognize and compliment Senator COVERDELL, Senator FEINSTEIN, and others who have worked tirelessly on this effort to try to get more help in stopping all the drug trafficking through Mexico. I know they have worked very hard to try to craft a vehicle and language to be able to get at this issue, which we all want to do, which is reduce the drug trafficking, reduce the amount of drug flow from and through Mexico to the United States. I applaud their efforts and their tireless work in getting this done.

However, in looking at the language of this bill, I must rise in opposition to certifying Mexico as complying with our drug-trafficking efforts, and this is not, in my estimation, as I consider this vote and weigh it carefully, about bashing Mexico. This is not about bashing the administration. This is about complying with the law and interpretation of that law and a judgment that each of us must make. The fact is section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act requires that the President certify that Mexico has cooperated fully with the United States or taken adequate steps on its own to fight drug trafficking.

That is the law, and that is the interpretation and that is what each of us have to interpret, whether this is done: Has Mexico cooperated fully with the United States or taken adequate steps on its own? Sadly, I come to the conclusion the facts are that Mexico has not cooperated fully with the United States and the steps they have taken to combat the drug trade are far from adequate. I am sad in taking that position and in looking at it this way, but I can arrive at no other conclusion.

There was a slight increase in 1996 in both drug seizures and arrests of drug traffickers. But sadly, again, this is because the numbers for 1995 were so low. Their record over the 1992 to 1993 period shows that they can do much better; they were much, much higher. So the Mexican Government, working more in cooperation with us, can do much better. In fact, Mexico's current record clearly indicates that they should not be certified for antidrug cooperation. U.S. drug agents report that the situation on the border has never been worse.

I applaud Senator COVERDELL and Senator FEINSTEIN for laying out in detail the facts that are before us. I would like to reiterate some of them again if I could.

Mexico continues to be a major transit point for cocaine entering the United States from South America. Fifty to 70 percent of the cocaine entering the United States transits Mexico, and Mexico is a supplier of 20 to 30 percent of the heroin to the United States market and up to 80 percent of the foreign-grown marijuana. Seizures of cocaine were about the same as the last 2 years but about half the level of seizures in

1991 to 1993. Drug arrests were up for 1995. However, they were considerably less than arrests in 1992 to 1993. Mexico refuses to allow the United States Navy ships patrolling for drug smugglers to put into Mexican ports to refuel without 30 days' notice. Mexico has enacted money laundering legislation, but so far the legislation has not been implemented, and Mexico is 12 months late in producing necessary banking regulations.

The record on this issue is clear, and sadly so. It is not credible to claim that Mexico has fully cooperated with the United States in fighting drug trafficking. On the contrary, the major Mexico-based drug cartels have risen to being some of the most powerful trafficking groups in the world.

I think we absolutely have to send a strong signal to the administration and to our neighbors to the south that the certification process is not just a rubberstamp exercise and that we require action on this issue. I say again that I arrive at this conclusion sadly because I think everybody in this body would much rather be able to easily certify, and I do applaud the efforts of Senator COVERDELL, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator HUTCHISON, and many others in working on this. But we are just not there and I cannot support the certification.

I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Massachusetts has requested time. I will yield 7½ minutes of my time to him, and I believe the Senator from Georgia will yield time.

Mr. COVERDELL. If the Senator from California will withhold this allotment of time for one moment while I deal with a unanimous consent that both sides agreed to in trying to facilitate a number of our Members who are trying to visit the White House and some others who are trying to catch aircraft. I will do this and then we move to Senator KERRY from Massachusetts under the circumstances the Senator has just outlined.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the vote scheduled to occur at 4:45 today now occur at 3 p.m., and further, the following Senators to speak for up to the designated time: Senator KERRY for 15 minutes, Senator HUTCHISON for 10, Senator FEINSTEIN for 5, Senator BOXER for 5 minutes, Senator COVERDELL for 5 minutes, and any statements relating to the issue provided for in the consent remain in order prior to the close of business today.

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I thank the Senator from Georgia for his intercession and his

help, and I particularly want to pay tribute to the Senator from California, [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], who has been pressing so hard on this absolutely vital issue of concern to every single American.

I listened carefully to the comments in the Chamber, particularly those of the Senator from Connecticut a moment ago. We differ on the question of whether certification is effective or not. The fact is, were it not for certification, we would not be here today fighting about what the appropriate action is with respect to Mexico and there would not be such sensitivities by Mexico or us to the consequences of our actions. Were it not for the certification process, there are whole countries that would continue to disregard, as they did prior to the certification process, any notions of cooperation. It is, frankly, only by virtue of the certification process that we have made the extra judgments with respect to Mexico that lead us to understand the dire circumstances that we find ourselves in today.

Having said that, I want to comment on one other aspect of this, because I agree with the Senator from Connecticut. I have been, I think, forceful in speaking out on this over the last years. Any efforts to make any judgment about any other country must be accompanied by efforts to make judgments about ourselves. In fact, efforts to judge ourselves ought to come first, and we ought to be much tougher on ourselves than we are on the others.

The fact is that after all these years of so-called declarations of war on drugs and all of the talk about its importance and all of the hype, we really do not have a legitimate war on drugs in our own country. I hear some people sometimes say, well, the reason we are losing the war on drugs is x, y or z. We are not losing the war on drugs, Mr. President. We are not fighting the war on drugs. Ask a lot of prosecutors around the country whether they have sufficient resources. Ask judges whether they can move people through the courts fast enough. What happened to the initiative to have drug courts? Ask drug addicts, who are the first people we ought to discuss this with, what they say about the system and if it is serious, because we treat less than 50 percent of the drug addicts in this country. If you want to take the pushers' clients away, we ought to have treatment on demand in America, clean the streets up of the addicts, have an outreach effort that identifies them in community after community and show some tough love in the United States and provide the treatment. You cannot have pushers come along fast enough to make up for that loss of business. Do you want to deal with the people who are hitting people over the heads and robbing cars and stealing radios and entering houses at night? Then that is the way to do it. But we do not. We do not even educate all our kids in America about the danger of

drugs. Only 55 percent of our children get education about drugs. The fact is that from 1956 until 1994, we enacted 43 so-called comprehensive laws to deal with international narcotics control. From 1961 to 1991 we passed over 100 bills to combat drugs. There have been 10 major multilateral declarations and agreements signed between 1970 and 1992. Between 1966 and 1991 we created roughly 18 new agencies, councils, offices, and institutes to pretend to deal with drugs. Since President Bush established the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy, we have had four drug czars.

I think these efforts tell the story. Drug use by adults may be down a little bit, but the fact is that drug use by kids is on the rise. In 1992, the number of 12th graders using illegal drugs was 27 percent; in 1996 it was 40 percent. And our efforts to educate kids about the dangers of drugs are just plain inadequate. In 1996, only 36 percent of 8th graders thought that if they took LSD once or twice they could risk harming themselves. Similarly, only 51 percent believe that crack can harm them; and only 45 percent think that cocaine could hurt them. All of these numbers are down from 1991.

So, as we talk about Mexico, let us not forget the failure of our own efforts. I intend to bring us back to this issue again and again, in the next months. It is time for us to do the job here. Every day there are 20 million 10-15 year old kids out there who need something to do after school. We cannot shut schools in the afternoon, we cannot be devoid of after-school programs, we cannot cut sports, music, arts, all of the options for our children, and suggest that they go home to houses where there is no parent, and not expect to reap the harvest of that kind of abandonment. Mr. President, that is our responsibility.

Now, what about Mexico? They also have a responsibility. We are honest, at least, about judging our court system. We are honest about putting our cops in the street, 100,000 more of them, to try to deal with this. We are honest about trying to prosecute people, police officers and others in various departments across the country, who have shown a proclivity to break the law. That does not really happen in Mexico—not really. There is a fake process that goes on there. In fact, what really happens in Mexico is that one cartel buys out the police and the judges and the prosecutors in order to bring pressure on its rival cartels. For example, the attorney general and 90 percent of police, prosecutors and judges in Tijuana and the state of Baja California are judged to be on the payroll of the Arellano-Felix cartel.

Do you want to sit around and expect them to do something? They will not because drug corruption is endemic throughout the system. Let me turn to some other examples. During his 2 years in office, former Attorney General Lozano fired some 1,250 Federal po-

lice officers and technical personnel for corruption. Yet not one of these has been successfully prosecuted. When Mexican army officers raided the wedding party of Amado Carillo Fuentes sister, they found members of the Mexican Federal Judicial Police guarding the party. Carillo Fuentes escaped thanks to a tip from the police about the raid. And on the very day that certification for Mexico was announced, Humberto Garcia Abrego, brother of Juan Garcia Abrego, and chief money launderer of the Gulf cartel was allowed to go free by Mexican officials, even though he was still under investigation for drug related crimes.

Until the Mexican Government recognizes this reality and throws out all the policemen, prosecutors, judges, and military officials on the payrolls of the traffickers, and basically says, "We are going to start again, and we are committed to this," it is impossible to have the kind of cooperation that is necessary in this effort. Our own DEA Administrator, Thomas Constantine, has told us that "There is not one single law enforcement institution in Mexico with whom DEA has an entirely trusting relationship."

When we went down to meet with the President of the United States and various Cabinet people on this subject, President Clinton properly put the issue to us. He made a judgment, for reasons that I can understand—I do not agree with, but I understand—he made a judgment that the best way to get Mexico to try to engage in this effort was to certify them. I disagree. In my judgment, to certify them, or anything less than what we are doing here now, is to ratify the status quo. And it is to say that the same patterns of behavior that have sufficiently gotten you by any critical judgments over the span of the last 10 years will be able to continue into next year and the next year until whenever it is that the United States decides they are going to start to judge things the way they really are.

The way they really are is known by everybody. Let me quote from our own State Department's International Narcotics Control Strategy Report for this year:

Taking advantage of the 2,000 mile border between Mexico and the United States and the massive flow of legitimate trade and traffic, well entrenched polydrug trafficking organizations based in Mexico have built vast criminal empires that produce illicit drugs, smuggle hundreds of tons of South American cocaine, and operate drug distribution networks reaching well into the continental United States. Mexico is the principal transit route for South American cocaine, a major source of marijuana, and heroin, as well as a major supplier of methamphetamines to the illicit drug market in the United States.

And nowhere but California do they understand the methamphetamine aspects of this better.

Mexico is the transshipment point for at least 50 to 60 percent of the United States-bound cocaine shipments and up to 80 percent of the methamphetamine precursors.

According to our U.S. health experts the consumption of methamphetamines is on the rise and may soon outdistance the use of cocaine as the drug of choice in the United States. Mexican-based drug trafficking organizations are the heart of this trade. The DEA reported in 1996 that:

... criminal organizations from Mexico, deepening their involvement in methamphetamine production and distribution in the United States, have radically reshaped the trade. With access to wholesale suppliers of precursor chemicals on international markets ... these groups can manufacture unprecedented quantities of high purity methamphetamine in large labs, both in Mexico and across the border in California.

Mr. President, the problem is these very cartels have reached their tentacles so far into the Mexican structure that you really have to engage in the most extraordinary kind of effort in order to change what is happening. I recognize that there have been some positive steps here and there, but the fact is, they are truly small developments measured against what we know Mexico has to do and what we have asked Mexico to do. That is the true measure of cooperation.

The fundamental problem in Mexico is the corruption that exists at any and all levels, even among those charged with fighting the drug effort. You see an occasional arrest, yes. But those arrests by Mexican authorities are not necessarily reflective of the commitment to root out drug traffickers, but rather of a well-coordinated plan by one cartel to eradicate the other by having law enforcement officials on their payroll. One of the reasons we did not immediately realize that Mexico's drug czar, Jesus Gutierrez Rebollo, was corrupt was because he arrested major drug traffickers but only those who worked for the rivals of the cartel that he worked for, that of Amado Carillo Fuentes. So, on February 18 the Mexican Defense Secretary, Enrique Cervantes announced that Gutierrez aided the Carillo cartel for 7 years by protecting cocaine shipments in exchange for vehicles, real estate and cash.

It was his taste for the good life, not Mexican efforts to root out corruption, that caught him up. And you could read a number of journalistic accounts of what happened that show that it was actually accidental that Gutierrez finally got caught.

Mexican authorities have also tried to tout the arrest and deportation of Juan Garcia Abrego, and there is no doubt that the Gulf cartel has been severely hurt by that. But what we are seeing, already, are indications that the only long term effect of those efforts is going to be to allow Carillo Fuentes to move in and takeover the Gulf cartel's operations. Likewise, efforts to target the Tijuana cartel, run by the Arellano-Felix brothers, are likely to wind up being orchestrated by Carillo Fuentes through his connections with corrupt law enforcement officials.

Mr. President, what we are trying to do here today is be sensitive to the

needs of a friend and of relationships. I hope, and I pray that President Zedillo will be able to move in the direction that he has indicated that he wants to move. Unlike Colombia where you have a top-down kind of corruption, in Mexico you have a bottom-up kind of corruption. President Zedillo is going to need all the help he can get.

In my judgment what the United States Senate is going to do today, by going on record as supporting this resolution, will, hopefully, send a signal that all of us need to do more, that all of us need to hold each other up to a tougher standard, and that we need to ask Mexico to do more to help us stem this flow of drugs.

Is that the whole deal? No. As I have made clear, the bulk of the responsibility is ours.

Until we face up more to the demand side of the equation, it may seem difficult to be as demanding internationally. But that does not mean we should not be, and it does not mean that we must not ask a country as deeply affected by this as Mexico has been to begin to join us to a greater degree in this battle. It is my hope and my belief that this effort today will enable us to continue to cooperate while simultaneously sending an important signal about the seriousness of our certification process.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Texas is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank Senators COVERDELL and FEINSTEIN. I think they have come a long way in this process, and I appreciate their willingness to stand with what I think will be the strongest vote in the Senate and do something that is constructive, rather than destructive.

I thank Senator DODD, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator DOMENICI. I thank Senator LUGAR for coming in and helping in this process. It took all of us together to come up with a solution that we thought would be something workable with our Senate colleagues, hopefully with our House colleagues, and something that would be a help to our relationship with Mexico.

I think that was the key to this matter, because, in fact, Mr. President, we are losing the war on drugs. Mexico is losing the war on drugs. They are seeing their country rifled with corruption because of the billions of dollars that are coming in illegally, and America is losing the war on drugs because we see 1 in 4 of our children who say they have been offered illegal drugs, children as young as 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 years old. Yes, Mr. President, what we are saying today is it is no longer business as usual in the drug war.

Mexico is not a country that is thousands of miles from our border. This is our border. Mexico is our border. We are tied. We are tied economically; we are tied in security interests. We can-

not walk away from this issue. It is our joint problem, and that is what we are saying today by passing this resolution.

We had \$8 billion of trade with Mexico in 1975. Today, it is over \$100 billion. Mexico is the United States' third largest trading partner; it is Texas' largest trading partner, with \$22 billion of trade between Texas and Mexico. But our relationship is deeper than that. It is not just dollars. Every one of the border States—California, New Mexico, Arizona and Texas—were once part of Mexico. So our cultures are ingrained. We together, in the past few years, have drifted into accepting unacceptable conditions in the arena of drug trafficking. I cannot imagine a worse situation.

In my State, we have ranchers who will not go outside into their front yards without guns, because they may meet someone with an AK-47 walking across their ranch with illegal drugs. There is a state of lawlessness in my State that we have not seen since the frontier days, and we cannot let this stand. In fact, a number of our ranchers are selling their land to the highest bidders because they feel defenseless. And guess who the highest bidders are? They are people fronting for those who are trafficking illegal drugs. They are paving their way through the United States through the remote areas of our border States. This is a frightening situation.

In Eagle Pass, the intimidation began when "coyotes" were smuggling illegal aliens through this remote border area took to cutting fences and using cattle ranches as a back-door entrance to America. When local and State officials complained to the Federal Government, the response was that would be 2 years before we can get help to you. So my State sent Texas Rangers down to the border. But even that has not been enough to do the job. So we have a problem that we must solve together.

Another new thing that seems to be happening is our customs agents on our side of the border, many of whom have relatives in Mexico, are now being threatened with harm to their relatives in Mexico if they do not cooperate with drug traffickers. So this corruption is on both sides of the border.

The number of drug seizures in Mexico in 1996 was only half the number of seizures in 1993. The number of drug-related arrests in Mexico in 1996 was half the number in 1992. Mexico is the source of 20 to 30 percent of the heroin coming into our country, 70 percent of the foreign-grown marijuana, and the transit point for 50 to 70 percent of the cocaine shipped into our country. This is a sieve, and we must plug the holes.

I will say that having just described a horrendous situation in Mexico, let's look at America. In America, according to the Office of National Drug Control Policy, over 12 million people are drug addicts; 10.9 percent of young Americans between the ages of 12 and



17 are using illegal drugs; drug-related illness, death and crime cost this country nearly \$67 billion in 1996.

So I have been troubled about what we are doing on our side, and yet, shortly after taking office, the Clinton administration cut the Office of National Drug Control Policy staff by more than 80 percent, hardly making it a priority. They also have made proposals to cut the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Agency, the FBI, the Immigration and Naturalization Service and other Federal agencies, including, though Congress has authorized 1,000 Border Patrol agents, only coming forward with a budget for 500.

I have spoken to the Attorney General, Janet Reno, I have spoken to the new drug czar, Barry McCaffrey, both of whom I respect very much, and I have said this is unacceptable. I cannot have my State being overrun and have only half the contingent of new Border Patrol agents that Congress has authorized. Congress has made this a priority, and we must have the same commitment from the administration.

The "Just Say No" campaign that Nancy Reagan put forward was effective, and we must have an education effort much like that one that says to our young people, "Drugs will hurt you, they will hurt you tomorrow, and they will hurt you 20 years from now when you have children." We must let them know that if we are going to win this war on drugs.

So, Mr. President, we are asking for more. We are asking for more from our country and more from Mexico, because the fact of the matter is, we are in this together. Just like any good marriage, when there is a problem, you cannot solve it if only one party is willing to talk. We must have both parties willing to talk, both parties willing to give, both parties willing to say, yes, if we make a bigger effort together, we can lick this problem, just as we have licked the problems for over 300 years between our two countries. We don't really have an alternative and our children's lives are in the balance.

So the differences between Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator COVERDELL and myself and others about how we would solve this problem were all differences of what would be the most effective. There was never a difference among any of us about what the problem is. And that is, we are losing the war on drugs. We are losing a generation of our young people. And that is not good enough.

We must do better. And we will do better with the resolution that is before us today that says the two countries will sit down together and we will address the concerns, we will address the concerns of money laundering, of corruption. We will address the concerns of demand on our side. And, Mr. President, we will do it together. And that is why I hope this vote of the Senate is a clear message to our friend and neighbor to the south that we want to work together and we want results for

the sake of both of our future generations.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. I would like to yield 3 minutes of my 5 minutes to the Senator from California, Senator BOXER.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I want to thank the Senator from Georgia, my colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN. Both of them worked so hard on this.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, on February 28, the administration, pursuant to the requirement of the international narcotics trafficking statute, made a decision regarding our Nation's fight against illegal drug trafficking. The decision was made to certify that Mexico has, in the past year, taken all appropriate and necessary actions in the fight against international narcotics trafficking.

I respectfully disagree with this decision, and I would like to explain why.

Under our international narcotics trafficking statutes, in order for a country which is known to be either a major source of narcotics or a major drug transit country to continue to receive U.S. aid, the President must certify by March 1 that the country is either performing adequately in cooperating with the United States or is taking steps on its own in the fight against international narcotics trafficking.

The law gives the administration three choices:

First, certification that the country is either fully cooperating with the United States or has taken adequate steps on its own to combat the narcotics trade.

Second, decertification of the country, concluding that the country has failed to meet the requirements of cooperation or action.

Third, no certification, but a vital national interest waiver—essentially a finding that the country has not met the standards of the law, but that our own national interests are best protected by continuing to provide assistance to the country.

The question of Mexico is complicated. Mexico is the leading transit country for cocaine coming into the United States: 50 to 70 percent of all cocaine shipped into the United States comes through Mexico. It is also a significant source of heroin, methamphetamines, and marijuana.

President Zedillo seems to be strongly committed to rid the Mexican law enforcement system of corruption and to fight the Mexican drug cartels. However, the reports and events of the past few weeks have made it clear that cor-

ruption in police ranks—even up to the very top ranks—is still rampant in Mexico.

Just a few weeks ago, it was revealed that the man hired to be Mexico's drug czar—the head of their anti-narcotics agency—was fired abruptly after being accused of taking bribes from one of Mexico's most powerful drug lords.

It would be as if our own drug czar, Gen. Barry McCaffrey, were found to be in league with drug gangs in our country. Why didn't the Mexican Government tell us they were investigating their drug czar? Why did they let our own drug agency brief him and give him important intelligence about our antidrug efforts? I do not call that cooperation.

Mexico has also failed to take its own steps to meet the standards of the certification law. It has not acted boldly to root out corruption in its law enforcement establishment; it has extradited to the United States only a few Mexican nationals suspected of involvement in United States drug activities; it has failed to implement new anticrime laws enacted last year.

Given these facts, I do not believe Mexico qualifies to be certified in full compliance with the drug law. I do believe that the President would have been justified in granting a vital national interest waiver for Mexico so that sanctions would not have to be applied, and I wish that he had followed that course.

Granting a waiver would send a message to Mexico that its actions in the past year were inadequate, but it would also allow the United States to continue its efforts to work with President Zedillo and others in his administration who are committed to the drug fight. Unfortunately, our parliamentary procedures do not permit a vote on such a measure, because that is not what the President supported.

The resolution before the Senate today makes some good points. It finds that, in several areas, Mexico's actions against narcotics trafficking have been inadequate:

First, evidence of significant corruption among Mexican officials, especially law enforcement;

Second, Mexico's failure to fully implement new anti-money laundering laws;

Third, drug cartels operating with impunity in Mexico;

Fourth, Mexico's failure to grant our extradition requests concerning Mexican nationals who have been indicted in United States courts; and

Fifth, decline in the number of cocaine seizures and arrests of drug traffickers in Mexico in the past few years.

These findings put Congress on record stating that Mexico is not doing enough to fight narcotics trafficking or to cooperate with the United States in doing so.

In addition to the findings, there is a sense of the Congress section stating that there has not been enough progress in halting the production in

and transit through Mexico of illegal drugs.

The meat of the resolution is contained in subsection (d), which requires the President, by September 1, to submit a report to Congress on the extent of progress made by the United States and Mexico in ten areas:

First, bringing down the drug cartels;

Second, strengthening United States/Mexico law enforcement cooperative efforts;

Third, strengthening bilateral border enforcement;

Fourth, improvement of extradition matters between the United States and Mexico;

Fifth, simplifying evidentiary requirements for narcotics and related crimes;

Sixth, full implementation of money laundering laws;

Seventh, Crop eradication;

Eighth, screening backgrounds of law enforcement officials;

Ninth, increasing support for Mexico's efforts to prosecute corrupt public officials; and

Tenth, strengthening overall bilateral cooperation.

The resolution does not specify a process for congressional review of the President's report. However, as Senator FEINSTEIN said earlier, many of us will be keenly interested in the details of the report, and of course, Congress may respond in any way it deems appropriate.

So I conclude that while this resolution is not what I had hoped to vote for, I must support it, as it is the only vehicle we will have on which to make a statement concerning the Mexico drug certification question.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly on another subject concerning our relationship with Mexico. That is the United States embargo against Mexican tuna and the efforts by some, including the Mexican Government, to lift this embargo.

The current embargo—which was imposed in 1990 against all countries that do not have environmental policies that protect dolphins from unsafe tuna fishing practices—prohibits Mexican tuna vessels from selling their products in the United States market.

Lifting the embargo would undoubtedly lead to an increase in the number of Mexican vessels operating in the eastern tropical Pacific. I believe that, given the current power and reach of the drug cartels in Latin America—particularly Colombia and Mexico—and their frequent reliance on maritime vessels to make drug shipments, now is not the time to open up a whole new avenue of maritime trade from Mexico.

Cartels are using fishing boats and cargo ships more and more often to smuggle cocaine from Colombia to Mexico where it is then shifted to trucks and other vehicles for transport across the border into the United States.

The risk of capture for these vessels is low in an ocean so large. And even

when the ships are stopped, it is hard for law enforcement to find the drugs, which are hidden in secret compartments. Many fishing vessels have sophisticated radar equipment that allows them to keep ahead of law enforcement.

According to an article in the January 30 Washington Post, our own Coast Guard admits that the eastern Pacific is "one of the most difficult places for us to interdict drug shipments. It's a vast ocean. There are no choke points, no places to hide and lots of places to search—including 2,000 miles of coast."

So why, at this time when narcotics trafficking in and through Mexico into the United States is threatening to undermine our two countries' relationship, would we deliberately make it harder to bring these cartels under control?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two documents relating to this question—one, the Post article to which I just referred, and two, a recent report by the Humane Society of the United States on the predicted impact on narcotics trafficking of lifting the tuna embargo at this time.

And I trust that we will not act in any way to increase opportunities for drug smuggling.

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 30, 1997]

LATIN DRUGS FLOW NORTH VIA PACIFIC—  
TRAFFICKERS' SHIPS HARD TO INTERCEPT

(By Molly Moore)

MEXICO CITY.—The crew of the Ecuadorian ship Don Celso claimed to be fishermen, but, hundreds of miles off Ecuador, the 150-foot vessel's fishing gear looked as if it had not been used in months. And when a U.S. Coast Guard law enforcement team yanked open the fish hatches, it found 50,000 gallons of diesel fuel instead of tuna on ice.

If there was fuel where there should have been fish, Coast Guard Petty Officer 2nd Class Keith Thompson wondered what he would find in the fuel tanks. It took his team six days of hard searching to find out—nearly seven tons of cocaine crammed into secret containers inside the fuel tanks, the second largest maritime cocaine bust in history.

The massive cocaine discovery last October, along with three other record-breaking seizures in just the last 18 months, illustrate how quickly sophisticated Colombian and Mexican drug cartels are adjusting to law enforcement efforts and finding new trafficking routes to the United States despite the billions of dollars the U.S. government is spending on its war against drugs.

Even as the United States has increased interdiction efforts in the Caribbean and Mexico has forced curtailment of incoming flights of huge cargo planes stuffed with cocaine, traffickers have made the vast open waters and virtually unpatrolled shipping lanes and coasts of the eastern Pacific Ocean the primary trafficking route for cocaine entering the United States, Mexican and U.S. law enforcement officials say.

"When you press the balloon in one area, it pops up in another," said Vice Adm. Roger T. Rufe Jr., U.S. Coast Guard commander for the Pacific area. "We've been putting a lot of stumbling blocks in their way in the Caribbean. It's a market economy; with demand

as it is in the U.S., they have plenty of incentive to try other routes."

Most of the cocaine travels by ship from South America to Mexico's Pacific Coast, where it is unloaded onto trucks and vans and transported across Mexican land borders into the Southwest United States.

Officials estimate that as much as two-thirds of all the cocaine destined for the United States, or at least 275 tons a year, now travels by ship via the eastern Pacific in what law enforcement authorities describe as the most formidable interdiction battle they have faced in recent years.

Only 23 tons of cocaine was intercepted by U.S. maritime operations in the region in the past 2½ years—most of it in just three seizures, according to the U.S. Coast Guard.

"The eastern Pacific has been one of the most difficult places for us to interdict drug shipments," said Adm. Robert E. Kramek, commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard and interdiction coordinator for President Clinton's anti-drug efforts. "It's a vast ocean. There are no choke points, no places to hide and lots of places to search—including 2,000 miles of coast."

The cocaine traffickers of Colombia and Mexico are not the only drug organizations that have discovered the eastern Pacific trafficking lanes. Illicit drug shipments are pouring into Mexico's Pacific ports by the ton, hidden in secret compartments of commercial vessels or mixed with legitimate cargo in huge metal containers—hashish from Pakistan; precursor chemicals for methamphetamines, or speed, from Asia; and huge hauls of marijuana from South America.

The drug cartels believe the risk of getting caught is so small that they are loading shipments of up to 12 tons of cocaine on fishing vessels and commercial container ships, which can slip largely undetected from South America and up the western coast of Mexico. Moreover, the cartels use sophisticated radar equipment and surveillance techniques as a means of countering search and seizure efforts of drug enforcement agencies.

Even the most primitive-looking fishing boat is often equipped with radar and electronic equipment to help smugglers determine if they are being followed, as well as scanners that can eavesdrop on military frequencies, according to U.S. law enforcement officers involved in maritime interdiction. In addition, the cartels also frequently send aircraft to fly over the trafficking routes to be used by their ships in an effort to identify anti-drug operations.

The discovery of 11 tons of cocaine on the Panamanian ship Nataly I off the coast of Peru in July 1995—the largest maritime cocaine haul ever—was the first tip-off that traffickers were shifting operations to the eastern Pacific, according to the Coast Guard's Kramek.

Last August, a Honduran ship intercepted 50 miles off the coast of Colombia was found to be carrying two tons of cocaine, a seizure followed by confiscation of the Don Celso's seven tons in October. And last Thursday, U.S. Coast Guard and Mexican authorities detained a fishing vessel 250 miles off Mexico's Pacific coast whose fuel tanks were hiding almost 3½ tons of cocaine.

Late last year the U.S. Coast Guard, which works with the U.S. Navy, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Customs Service and other agencies, launched Operation Caper Focus off northern South America and up the Pacific coastline northward to Mexico in an effort to identify and intercept drug trafficking shipments closer to their departure ports.

"Once they've loaded and are proceeding into the ocean, it's very easy to hide," said Capt. Robert Wicklund, chief of the Coast Guard's law enforcement section for the Pacific area. "There are no natural choke

points that a vessel has to pass through where we can sit and wait for them to come to us."

And often even large-scale deployments do not result in seizures. In November 1995, after a two-year intelligence-gathering operation by anti-drug agents, a U.S. Coast Guard cutter was dispatched to the eastern Pacific to monitor a fishing vessel believed to be carrying—or preparing to load—20 tons of cocaine.

The ship left Panama and headed for fishing grounds west of the Galapagos Islands. The Coast Guard cutter tailed the vessel for 2½ months but was never able to determine if it was carrying cocaine and did not stop it.

"We had the ability to know when he was fishing, when he was doing his laundry, but we didn't know whether he had drugs on board," a Coast Guard official said.

The most difficult drug shipments to detect are those secreted in the cargo containers aboard commercial vessels. Without informants at ports of departure or arrival, it is virtually impossible to detect such drug shipments, according to law enforcement officials.

"At our two main ports of Veracruz and Manzanillo, 200 containers arrive daily," said Francisco Molina Ruiz, until recently the chief of Mexico's Institute to Combat Drugs, the Mexican equivalent to the U.S. DEA. "To check one container, we need anywhere from 10 hours to three days. Some containers are frozen; others contain toxic substances, and often the dogs can't sniff for drugs."

Mexican law enforcement agencies recently have discovered several large drug stashes in container shipments, usually after receiving tips or noticing irregularities in shipping manifests.

Problems of drug interdiction in the eastern Pacific are exacerbated because the United States has few bilateral agreements with Pacific Coast nations on law enforcement cooperation, such as those it has developed over the years throughout the Caribbean.

As a result, until a few recent diplomatic breakthroughs with some nations, U.S. law enforcement officials frequently spent days in bureaucratic tangles attempting to get permission to stop or pursue suspicious vessels.

And despite the large increase in the number of drug shipments off the Mexican Pacific coast, the United States and Mexico have not conducted joint operational exercises in a year. Mexico declined to take part in the latest scheduled exercises after former defense secretary William J. Perry embarrassed Mexican officials by discussing the operations before they had been announced to the Mexican public.

#### LIFTING THE TUNA EMBARGO AND CHANGING THE DOLPHIN-SAFE LABEL: THE PREDICTED IMPACT ON NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING

(A Confidential Report of the Humane Society of the United States, National Investigations, March 5, 1997)

Three U.S. laws are under attack from several Latin American nations who want to regain access to our lucrative tuna market: 1) the embargo provisions contained in the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA); prohibiting the importation of yellowfin tuna from countries whose tuna fleet kills over 25% more dolphins than the U.S. fleet; 2) the International Dolphins Conservation Act (IDCA); prohibiting the sale of dolphin unsafe tuna in the U.S.; and 3) the Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act (DPCIA); prohibiting the use of the "dolphin safe" label on any tuna caught by chasing and setting nets on dolphins.

Since the establishment of the "dolphin safe" label and the embargo against purchas-

ing tuna caught by setting nets on dolphins, the number of vessels fishing for tuna in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean (ETP) has decreased substantially. Lifting the embargo and changing the "dolphin safe" label to allow its use on "dolphin-unsafe" tuna will most likely result in a substantial increase in the number of vessels fishing in the ETP. We are concerned that this will—in addition to causing increased injury and death to dolphins—create conditions that may lead to increased and easier narcotics smuggling into the United States.

#### THE FLOW OF NARCOTICS INTO THE UNITED STATES

Most of the world's cocaine—an estimated 80%—originates in Colombia. In recent years, Colombian traffickers began to funnel their cocaine through Mexico. Mexican drug smugglers became the key transporters of Colombian cocaine, a service for which they were paid in cash. Through the development of successful networks and trans-border relationships, and the ability to easily bribe local police, they became more and more powerful. Eventually, they started taking their pay—50% of each load—in cocaine. This development, and the weakening of the Colombian cartels through arrests and deaths, allowed Mexican traffickers to gain greater control over narcotics trafficking in the Americas.

According to the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), over 70% of all cocaine entering the U.S. comes through Mexico. In 1994 and 1995, approximately 200 of the 300 metric tons of cocaine that entered the U.S. each year transited Mexico. At least two-thirds of the cocaine that enters Mexico is shipped in maritime vessels from other Latin American countries. It is then smuggled into the U.S. over various land routes into California, Arizona, and Texas.

#### GOVERNMENT CORRUPTION EASES SMUGGLING

Narcotics trafficking is, arguably, Mexico's biggest business. Drug sales account for as much as \$30 billion a year in illegal proceeds to Mexico—more than the country's top two legitimate exports combined. Traffickers take in tens of billions of dollars every year from the sale of cocaine, and they spend millions of dollars—at least \$500 million each year by some estimates—to ensure the protection and cooperation of government officials. Officials with the U.S. State Department's Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs have stated, "Drug traffickers used their vast wealth to corrupt police and judicial officials as well as project their influence into the political sector."

According to testimony obtained during the trial of drug lord Juan Garcia Abrego, the Gulf Cartel (one of Mexico's four major cartels) spends millions of dollars every month buying the support of corrupt government officials. Garcia himself has been charged with paying at least \$25 million in bribes to high-ranking Mexican officials. One of his aides has testified that some of this money went to buy Javier Coello Trejo, the Deputy Attorney General in charge of drug enforcement during the Salinas administration. The use of bribes to ease smuggling is not limited to the Gulf Cartel: José Gutiérrez Rebollo, the head of Mexico's National Institute for Combatting Drugs (Mexico's DEA), was recently arrested for allegedly accepting bribes from the Juarez Cartel, considered to be the most powerful of Mexico's cartels.

Corruption in the Mexican government extends all the way from the highest government officials, such as Coello and Gutiérrez, to federal and state police, who have reportedly participated directly in cocaine smuggling. According to a recent report from the

General Accounting Office (GAO), Mexican federal and state personnel were caught unloading a jet carrying 6 to 10 metric tons of cocaine in November 1995. In June 1995, federal judicial police were arrested for protecting a major narcotics trafficker. In March 1995, officers of the National Institute for Combatting Drugs were arrested for accepting cocaine and cash to allow a shipment of over a metric ton of cocaine to pass unimpeded. Mexican and American officials have also acknowledged that, during the Salinas administration, at least half a dozen traffickers, including the Juarez Cartel's Carillo, were "quietly" arrested and released by corrupt police and/or judges.

Drug corruption is found on both sides of the border: U.S. government agents have been swayed by the promise of easy money as well. In February 1996, a U.S. Customs inspector was convicted of scheming to allow 2,200 pounds of cocaine in from Mexico through the Texas border in exchange for \$1 million.

Corrupt government officials in the right positions can ease the transporting of narcotics in shipments of tuna and other foodstuffs. According to witnesses in a pending U.S. civil trial of a key Salinas administration political figure, both former president Carlos Salinas de Gortari and his brother Raul had ties to the Gulf Cartel during Salinas' presidency. Raul Salinas is alleged to have received millions of dollars from drug lords and to have distributed bribes to other political figures. During this time period, Raul Salinas directed the Mexican government's food distribution organization, a position which he could have taken advantage of to aid his narcotics-trafficking associates.

#### NARCOTICS TRAVEL VIA EASTERN TROPICAL PACIFIC OCEAN

In recent years, as counternarcotics forces have become more adept at intercepting drugs in the air, Latin American drug traffickers have shifted their preferred method of transporting cocaine to Mexico to the sea. Department of Defense records show that since 1992, known drug-trafficking events involving aircraft decreased 65 percent, while those involving maritime vessels increased 40 percent.

Maritime vessels, such as fishing trawlers and cargo ships, are becoming more widely used by drug cartels to smuggle cocaine because the risk of capture is so low: The vastness of the ocean makes intercepting ships nearly impossible. Even when ships are apprehended, actually finding the drugs is extremely difficult, because the illicit cargo is hidden in hard-to-find secret compartments. In one recent seizure, it took authorities six days of searching to discover a seven ton load of cocaine on board a vessel of the type used for tuna fishing. Moreover, many fishing vessels are equipped with radar and scanners that allow them to determine if they are being followed, giving them an edge over law enforcement officials.

Law enforcement officials state that, without informants, drug shipments in maritime vessels are essentially impossible to detect. Drug interdiction in the Eastern Pacific is made more difficult because the U.S. has few law enforcement cooperative agreements with Pacific nations.

Officials estimate that at least 275 tons of cocaine transit the Eastern Tropical Pacific (ETP) every year. The ETP is the preferred tuna fishery of many Latin American tuna fleets that continue to fish by chasing and netting dolphins. A class 5 or 6 tuna vessel—the type used to set purse-seine nets on dolphins—is capable of concealing multi-ton shipments of cocaine with much less risk of discovery than other smuggling methods. Class 5 and 6 tuna vessels fish on the high

seas for months at a time. Although they may embark for specific fishing areas, these areas cover hundreds of square miles. Furthermore, unlike a cargo vessel, which generally travels directly from point "A" to point "B," a fishing vessel may traverse an area many times—creating unique opportunities for transporting illegal goods.

The following information describes several recent incidents in which tuna vessels and other fishing-type vessels were apprehended carrying shipments of drugs. The section also discusses the arrests for alleged drug-related activity of persons with involvements in fishing businesses. In some instances, our sources identified the vessel or business in question as involved specifically in tuna fishing; in others, the sources did not specify whether the particular fishing enterprise was a tuna operation. In addition, the sources sometimes made it clear that the vessels or business were not actually engaged in fishing, but were merely false fronts. Our discussion reflects these distinctions where they apply.

During the last eighteen months, four "record-breaking" seizures of cocaine on fishing vessels have been made: in July 1995, the *Nataly 1*, a Panamanian tuna vessel, was caught off the coast of Peru with more than 12 tons of cocaine; in August 1996, the *Limerick*, a Honduran-registered fishing ship crewed by Colombians and Ecuadorians, was seized off the Colombian coast with 2 tons of cocaine; in October 1996, the Ecuadorian tuna-type vessel, *Don Celso*, was captured off the country's coast with almost 7 tons of cocaine—cargo which took a U.S. Coast Guard team 6 days to find; in January 1997, the *Viva Sinaloa*, a Mexican fishing vessel operating out of Mazatlan, was intercepted off Mexico's Pacific coast carrying 3.5 tons of cocaine.

In September 1996, Manuel Rodriguez Lopez—believed to be tied to the Cali Cartel—and owner of Grupo Pesquero Rodriguez, which includes tuna companies in Baja California, was placed under house arrest at the port of La Paz on charges of money laundering. Rodriguez's close ties with PRI officials (the ruling party in Mexico) were also under investigation. Assets confiscated during his arrest—including six tuna vessels—were valued at \$15 million. Rodriguez also owned the *Nataly I* and administered the fishing companies *Pesquera Carimar S.A. de C.V.*, *Pesquera Santo Tomas*, *Pesquera Kino*, and *Pesquera Cipres*—all fishing companies believed to be involved in drug trafficking and money laundering.

Colombian Cali Cartel trafficker José Castrillón Henao—allegedly partners with Mexico's Rodriguez—was believed to have a fleet of 100 vessels at his disposal for transporting drugs. He owned the Panamanian-registered fishing company, *Pesquera Azteca*, to which the *Nataly I* was registered. The fleet's long range fishing boats were used to transport cocaine to islands off the Mexican coast, where the drugs were then loaded onto smaller boats for distribution along the Mexican coast. Castrillón helped finance Colombian President Ernesto Perez Balladares' 1994 campaign; the President's party said they had assumed his tuna business was legitimate when he made the contributions.

Victor Julio Patino Fomeque, a leader for the Cali Cartel, allegedly in charge of its naval smuggling operations, was recently captured by Colombian officials. A former police chief, he has been accused of using false fishing businesses to smuggle tons of cocaine to the United States from the Pacific port of Buenaventura.

#### THE IMPLICATIONS OF LIFTING THE EMBARGO

The current embargo on tuna from countries whose fleets set on dolphins in the ETP

prohibits Mexican tuna vessels from selling their products in the U.S. market. After the embargo was imposed in 1990, the number of Mexican vessels fishing for tuna fell from 85 to 40. Lifting the embargo will most likely lead to a greater number of vessels operating in the ETP. More fishing vessels in the ETP will lead to conditions that may provide greater opportunities for drug smuggling and a reduced risk of being caught. An increase in the number of vessels, combined with the likelihood that Latin American tuna vessels would have more reason to approach the U.S. coast, would render our interdiction efforts even more difficult.

The long term potential for the well-financed narcotics smugglers to establish facilities for "tuna" processing at U.S. ports is a significant additional incentive. The existence of family connections on both sides of the border has proven to be a significant aid to narcotics trafficking, and the extension of the same methodology to smuggling via the tuna industry is possible, should the embargo be lifted. Direct coastal access to the U.S., either through offloading at sea to small fast boats which can complete the journey to our shores, or through direct unloading at tuna processing facilities at U.S. ports, may expedite smuggling by eliminating the need to cross the land border.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I thank my friend from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I believe, according to the previous unanimous consent, the next 5 minutes is allotted to my colleague from California.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank you.

I would like to thank again the Senator from Georgia. It has been a great pleasure to work with him and Senator HUTCHISON. We began this effort over a week ago. It has been a very intensive effort. I believe it has resulted in a resolution which will have dominant support from this body, pass the House, and be signed by the President of the United States.

More importantly, I think this resolution will become the law and will have teeth. And those teeth are: Administration: Report on September 1 the progress that has been made. Here are the specific areas in which we wish you to make progress. If there is inadequate progress made, it leaves no alternative really but to fuel up for a massive decertification battle in a year.

I want to say one thing about America's demand problem. Because the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY, who spoke on this issue, I think had it right. One of the things that I have found is that we have programs in this country that work and programs that do not work. And I would just like to recommend to everybody that might be watching this a program that does work, a program which has no Government funds, a program with whom my colleague from California and I are very well familiar.

That is a program called Delancy Street in San Francisco which takes

the hardest core drug addicts, with about a 4-year stay, and puts them through an intensive program—changes their environment, changes their lifestyle, and does rehabilitate. As mayor, I helped Delancy get some land right on the waterfront. The Delancy people built their own facilities, which are stellar. They run their own businesses. They pay for their program through their labor.

And I would just like to invite—Delancy does not know I am doing this—anyone, anywhere in the United States that has an interest in replicating a program to rehabilitate American drug addicts that works, to go to San Francisco, to call Mimi Silbert, the director, and take a look at a program that works, does not take dime one of public money and does it all on their own. It is one of the most impressive programs anywhere in the United States.

If we had more Delancys and more kinds of permeations of Delancy, Delancy Streets for young children, children 14, 15, 16 years old, I think we could turn this Nation around. If we had more programs like Facts on Crack from Glide Memorial Church in San Francisco, we could begin to turn this Nation around. But in the meantime, we have to retard the supply of drugs. And that is a major first step.

So again, I say thank you to everyone that has participated. I look forward to the vote. I thank the Chair and I yield back the balance of my few minutes.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, we are about at the hour to bring to a conclusion a very long and arduous effort to produce a positive result as we struggle with the ravages of drugs in our country and in Mexico and in the hemisphere.

I want to acknowledge Senator KYL of Arizona who has made a contribution in terms of border agents. Again, I want to thank the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator HELMS of North Carolina, for his great work and, of course, my immediate colleagues in the work, Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator HUTCHISON and the staffs that have worked so long and late to produce this resolution.

This resolution is a renewal statement. It is a new place and it changes the dynamics of the debate with regard to the drug cartels in the United States, in Mexico, and the hemisphere.

I would simply close by reiterating my statement earlier. I hope all of our colleagues in the hemisphere, Mexico and the other countries, will understand that this is a new statement, it is an honest appraisal of a war that is ravaging the opportunities before us as we come on the new century, and see it as a new statement, a statement of renewal and reinvigorated alliance.

Mr. President, the hour of 3 o'clock has arrived, and by the previous unanimous consent, I believe that moves us to the vote. I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 3 o'clock having arrived, the question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 25. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 35 Leg.]

#### YEAS—94

Abraham	Faircloth	Lieberman
Akaka	Feingold	Lott
Allard	Feinstein	Lugar
Ashcroft	Ford	Mack
Baucus	Frist	McCain
Bennett	Glenn	McConnell
Biden	Gorton	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Gramm	Moynihan
Boxer	Grams	Murkowski
Breaux	Grassley	Murray
Bryan	Gregg	Nickles
Bumpers	Hagel	Reed
Burns	Harkin	Reid
Byrd	Hatch	Robb
Campbell	Helms	Roberts
Chafee	Hollings	Rockefeller
Cleland	Hutchison	Roth
Coats	Inhofe	Santorum
Cochran	Inouye	Sarbanes
Collins	Jeffords	Sessions
Conrad	Johnson	Shelby
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Smith, Gordon
Craig	Kennedy	H.
D'Amato	Kerrey	Snowe
Daschle	Kerry	Specter
DeWine	Kohl	Stevens
Dodd	Kyl	Thompson
Domenici	Landrieu	Thurmond
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Durbin	Leahy	Wyden
Enzi	Levin	

#### NAYS—5

Brownback	Smith, Bob	Torricelli
Hutchinson	Thomas	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Warner

The amendment (No. 25) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on passage of joint resolution, as amended.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58), as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

Amend the title to read as follows: "A joint resolution requiring the President to submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the United States and Mexico to achieve results in combating the production of and trafficking in illicit drugs."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair will now recognize the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

#### EASTER

Mr. BYRD. "The year's at the spring; the day's at the morn; morning's at seven; the hillside's dew-pearled; the lark's on the wing; the snail's on the thorn; God's in his Heaven—all's right with the world."

Mr. President, the Senate is preparing to recess at the close of this week. Some Senators will use this time to travel to distant and exotic locations. Others will return home for busy rounds of meetings. Schools around the nation are also closing their doors for spring break. For many college students, spring break has become a beach vacation ritual, replete with loud parties, little self-restraint, and the overconsumption of booze—alcohol. At home, spring sales are in full force, with stores luring credit-happy buyers away from the outdoor pleasures that warming days and budding gardens invite. The celebration of winter's passing and the rekindling of life all around us has been lost, for many, in the materialistic and hedonistic whirlwind of everyday life. Only the pastel colors of paper flowers link the climate-controlled interior of the shopping malls with the greening of the spring earth.

But today is also the vernal equinox, that chiming peal on the celestial clock that marks the turning of the seasons, the day on which the periods of light and dark are again of equal length following the long, cold, dreary nights of winter. In 325 A.D., during the reign of that great convert to Christianity, the Emperor Constantine, the council of Nicaea met. With the help of the Archbishop of Alexandria and the astronomers of that distant day, the Council decreed that Easter should fall on the first Sunday after the first full moon following the vernal equinox. So, today we may look ahead with certainty toward the Sunday after next for the enduring celebration of that central mystery of the Christian faith, the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Mr. President, although in recent years the trend has been to strip every religious overtone from our calendar and from our schools—and thank God the Constitution protects my right to stand on this Senate floor and talk about whatever I may please. Let it be religion. The Supreme Court cannot do anything about it.

So the trend has been to strip every religious overtone from our calendar and from our schools to rename the Christmas holiday a "winter break" and the Easter holiday a "spring break." I am not sure that the result—a nation more interested in consumption, department store sales, junk television, and professional sports performances, than in church, community and family—is a happy one. I still believe that there is a deep wellspring of religious belief that sustains our Nation as it does in the close-knit and caring

communities in which I grew up. The community churches which still thrive in West Virginia were the focal point of towns and communities of my childhood.

And contrary to the beliefs of some of our sophisticated brethren in Washington and some of the other great metropolitan centers in this country, they do not have rattlesnakes in all of those churches. As a matter of fact, I have never been in a church where there was a rattlesnake—a few two-legged ones perhaps, but that is where they ought to go, to church. Social life revolved around Sunday services and activities sponsored by, or otherwise intimately linked with, the church and celebrations of faith. But as I witness the slow unraveling of our communities, their weave frayed by casual greed and picked apart by drugs and violence, I worry that the clear-flowing waters of family, church and community that nourished me and millions like me are becoming fouled and turbid. The erosion of Easter into a crass and commercial "spring break" is but one sad example of the materialistic trend in this country and in this age. More media coverage is awarded to the excesses of Mardi Gras on Fat, or Shrove, Tuesday—also called Pancake Day—than on the entire forty days of Lent. I wonder how many people who dress up and masquerade in that carnival parade recall that the original purpose of Mardi Gras was to prepare for the Lenten fasts by using up the available cooking oil and fat in a pre-fast eating binge? The binge was fun, but it did not blot out the central religious purpose of the repentant fast to follow.

Mr. President, Easter Sunday ends forty days of religious observance beginning with Ash Wednesday, set as the beginning of Lent by Pope Gregory at the beginning of the sixth century. This coming Sunday is known as Palm Sunday, in observance of the palm-strewn entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem. The following Friday, or Good Friday, marks the day that Jesus suffered on the Cross and died. It is a solemn day indeed, yet I fear that, for too many people, it is just another day off from work, filled with errands, or shopping, or travel, with not a passing thought given to the suffering of God's only Son on the cross.

I am not a minister. I do not profess to be worthy of the title. But I grew up in a Christian home. My foster father was a coal miner and my foster mother was the only mother I ever knew. They were religious people. They were not of the religious left or of the religious right. They were not of the Christian center or the Christian left or the Christian right. Neither am I. They just were plain, down-to-Earth, God-fearing, God-loving Christian parents.

And, so it is that I come to the Senate Chamber today, as I say, not as a cleric or as a minister. I probably could not be one. But I do believe in the Bible and its teachings, even though I have