

border state of Nuevo Leon was forced to resign following accusations of mismanagement and drug-related corruption.

In some respects, northern Mexico should have had the best chance of any region of the nation to shake off decades of political corruption and offer tough resistance to the rise of the drug kingpins.

It was the first region of the country where members of the conservative opposition National Action Party (PAN) broke the stranglehold of the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), winning governorships, mayoralties and municipal seats with promises of fighting entrenched corruption.

Instead, the drug cartels are more powerful than ever.

One of the first PAN governors in the north, Ernesto Ruffo Appel, former governor of Baja California, said he found drug-based corruption too institutionalized to clean up from the governor's office.

"The system doesn't work," said Ruffo, who works at the national party level. "Everybody's on the take. There's just too much money."

According to many law enforcement officials and political specialists, the institutionalization of corruption is a key milestone in northern Mexico's journey toward becoming a drug fiefdom.

"In the past, you had specific protection rackets that were between particular people," said a U.S. law enforcement official who monitors drug trafficking on the border. "Now you increasingly have protection [for the cartels] regardless of who sits in a particular law enforcement job."

At the low end, police, because of their poor pay, traditionally have been thoroughly corrupted by drug cartels. Police frequently act as bodyguards and assassins for the kingpins, and raging gun battles among local, state and federal police units—some in the pay of the cartels, the others trying to arrest them—are commonplace.

Late one night a few weeks ago, a Wild West-style shootout exploded on the streets of Juarez—police were fighting it out with police.

Carloads of federal police surrounded city police headquarters and within minutes shooting broke out, leaving one federal officer dead on the bloodied pavement and several city police wounded in what many officials described as an outgrowth of simmering tensions between rival drug protection rackets.

"I know I have policemen who are paid by the drug dealers," said Mayor Galindo. "I pay 2,200 pesos [\$297] a month. A drug dealer can give \$1,000 a week for protection. I can't compete. When I listen to the politicians in Mexico City talk about the drug struggle, they don't know what they're talking about. Where can I hire police I can trust?"

A few months before the shootout, Juarez city police—frustrated that their federal counterparts, charged with enforcing drug laws, were taking no action to stop the proliferation of drug shooting galleries in the city—leaked the addresses of 90 known drug houses to a local newspaper. The paper published the list and confronted the federal police, who said they had never been given the list. "We published the list as proof that they'd received it," said an editor. "And they did nothing."

Ruffo and others say even the judicial system has become co-opted, by money or fear. "Judges are afraid they might be killed. It's very risky to confront this," Ruffo said. On that, he shares the pessimism of many in northern Mexico: "If we can't even trust the judicial system, we have nothing."

THE MEXICAN FEDERATION

Four organizations dominate the international drug trade in northern Mexico. To-

gether with about a dozen smaller groups, they have been dubbed The Mexican Federation by the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration and gross an estimated \$10 billion to \$30 billion annually in narcotics sales in the United States. Family ties are important to the groups, most of which can trace their lineage back decades to the cross-border smuggling of contraband such as stolen cars.

THE TIJUANA CARTEL

Currently the second most powerful cartel. Considered the most violent of the Mexican organizations. Best known for the ambush of Catholic Cardinal Juan Jesus Posadas Ocampo at Guadalajara Airport in May 1993.

Leaders: Arellano-Felix brothers—Benjamin, Ramon, Javier and Francisco (currently jailed in Mexico)—who are the nephews of Guadalajara Cartel co-founder Miguel Angel Felix Gallardo.

Activities: Controls most of drug smuggling across the California border; has recently diversified to become one of the main suppliers of methamphetamine, consolidating its position through a violent turf war in San Diego.

THE SONORA CARTEL

Also known as the Caro Quintero organization; made up of remnants of the old Guadalajara Cartel, best known for the brutal 1985 torture and killing of DEA agent Enrique Camarena.

Leaders/co-founders: Rafael Caro Quintero, under arrest. Miguel Angel Felix Gallardo, arrested in 1989, remains a major player from prison.

Acting leader: Miguel Caro Quintero, brother of Rafael.

Activities: Among the first Mexican organizations to transport drugs for the Colombian kingpins. Main trafficking routes through Arizona border area known as "cocaine alley" with movements also coordinated through the Juarez Cartel in the territory controlled by that organization.

THE JUAREZ CARTEL

Currently the most powerful of the Mexican cartels.

Leader: Amado Carrillo Fuentes, about 40; took over in 1993. Shuns flamboyant lifestyle of his competitors, and is said to represent a new breed of kingpin who believes in compromising with rivals.

Activities: Carrillo Fuentes pioneered the use of Boeing 727s for bulk shipments of as much as 15 tons of cocaine between South America and northern Mexico. Cartel operates primarily through Juarez-El Paso and surrounding desert along the west Texas and New Mexico borders.

THE GULF CARTEL

Once undisputed champ of the Mexican organizations. Cartel's fortunes began to fade about a year ago after its alleged kingpin, Juan Garcia Abrego, 51, had to go underground. He was arrested in January and deported to the United States, where he is standing trial in Houston.

Leader: Oscar Malherve, one of Abrego's top lieutenants and money-launderers.

Activities: Moves drugs primarily through the Texas border region, particularly Matamoros-Brownsville, and along the Gulf coastal shores.●

CITY OF MUNISING'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of the city of Munising, MI. In the Chippewa language, Munising means Place of the Great Island.

Munising was first founded in 1850 when the Munising Co. bought 87,000 acres of land on the eastern shore of Munising Bay. The land changed hands for the next 20 years as businesses opened and closed in the area.

In 1870, the beginnings of a thriving town were seen. The village of 30 homes was centered around the blast furnace which had just begun producing iron. The village had a blacksmith shop, sawmill, dock, and a government light-house. The village continued to thrive until 1877, when a fire destroyed the whole community.

By 1895, the lumber baron Timothy Nester had acquired 184,000 acres in Munising Bay. He quickly began work on a railroad to connect Munising to South Shore. A town was planned and several buildings were built from the nearby lumber. In January 1896, a post office was opened to serve the town's 500 residents. In March 1896, the village was incorporated and Nester was named president. The new town expanded rapidly and after a year its residents numbered 3,500. The lumber industry would continue to drive the expansion of the village for many years to come.

Today, Munising is a small and vibrant community. Many people from Michigan and around the country come to Munising to experience the many activities its natural beauty has to offer. I know that my Senate colleagues join me in congratulating the city of Munising on its 100th anniversary.●

RISE IN DRUG USE

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, earlier this week I and several of my colleagues—Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. KYL, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. FRIST, and Mr. CRAIG—came to this floor to discuss the disturbing rise in drug use in this country since the beginning of the Clinton administration. Yesterday, the Wall Street Journal editorialized on the same subject. I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

WAITING TO EXHALE

Now, in April 1996, with eight months left on a four-year term, Bill Clinton flies the press into Miami so he can be seen standing shoulder to shoulder with General Barry McCaffrey, a decorated war hero he's enlisted to lead a war on drugs. Standing among schoolchildren Monday, the President poured his great rhetorical heart onto the drug war. Along the way came these key words: "Make no mistake about it, this has got to be a bipartisan, American, nonpolitical effort." Translation: Don't blame me for this problem, especially during an election campaign.

In fact, Bill Clinton's retreat in the drug war is among the worst sins for which his Administration should be held accountable. After years of decline in drug use, recent surveys make it clear that a younger generation of Americans is again at risk. The number of 12-to-17-year-olds using marijuana increased to 2.9 million in 1994 from 1.6 million in 1992. Marijuana use increased 200% among 14-to-15-year-olds during the same period. Since 1992, according to

large surveys of high school students, there has been a 52% increase in the number of seniors using drugs monthly. One in three report having used marijuana in the past year. Private anti-drug advocates such as Jim Burke of the Partnership for a Drug Free America and Joe Califano of Columbia University's Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse have been running alongside this drug fire, yelling for help to anyone who'd listen.

Better late than never, of course, and it is good that Mr. Clinton wants to mend his ways with General McCaffrey. We applaud the appointment and think General McCaffrey has sounded many right notes. Legalization, he says, "is out of the question."

A quarterly regional analysis put out by his office brings the problem up to date: "A recent New York State high school survey reports that 12% of New York teens said that they smoked marijuana at least four times a month, double the number in the 1990 survey." Discussing "Emerging Drugs," the report notes methamphetamine's popularity in the San Francisco area: "in addition to its use by young users who combine it with heroin ('a meth speedball') it can also be found in 'biker's coffee,' a combination of methamphetamine and coffee popular among young, fairly affluent urbanites." Additionally, the report notes that "Club drugs, a name which generally includes MDMA, Ketamine, 2c-B, LSD, psilocybin and a range of other hallucinogens, are increasingly mentioned in this quarter."

These recent events are not a coincidence. The drug retreat was the result of a series of explicit policy decisions by Mr. Clinton and those around him. Which is why we think it is worth focusing on the meaning of his wish that the anti-drug war be "bipartisan, American, nonpolitical." This means that between now and November's election no one is allowed to utter the phrase "didn't inhale." No one is allowed to remember Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders talking about drug legalization, even as her own son was arrested and convicted on drug-sale charges.

Nor should anyone be allowed to bring up White House deputy personnel director Patsy Thomasson's admission to a congressional committee that some dozen White House employees, including senior staff, had been "requested to be part of an individual drug testing program" because of their prior drug history. Ms. Thomasson's experience in these drug mop-up duties extends back to her days in Arkansas when she took over the business of Dan Lasater—Little Rock bond dealer, Clinton campaign contributor and friend-of-brother Roger—while Mr. Lasater served prison time for "social distribution" of cocaine. This week Mr. Lasater is testifying before the Senate Whitewater Committee, and we assume he will be asked to enlighten the committee about the millions of dollars of mysterious trades that his firm made through an account without the knowledge of the account's owner, Kentucky resident Dennis Patrick.

On matters of pure policy, among Bill Clinton's first acts was to cut spending on the war. The staff of the Office of National Drug Control Policy was cut to 25 from 146. Drug interdiction funds were cut. The number of trafficker aircraft seized by Customs fell to 10 from 37 in FY '93-'95. Drug czar Lee Brown wandered the nation's editorial pages seeking the public support he rarely got from his President. New York Democratic Congressman Charles Rangel announced: "I really never thought I'd miss Nancy Reagan, but I do."

Finally, about a year ago, Mr. Clinton received a stinging letter from FBI Director Louis Freeh and DEA director Tom Constantine, charging that the President's anti-drug effort was adrift. So now we have Gen-

eral McCaffrey, who says, "There is no reason why we can't return America to a 1960s level, pre-Vietnam era level of drug use."

Sorry, General, but pre-Vietnam America is not coming back. General McCaffrey's current President is a founding member of the generation that transformed America in the years of Vietnam and those that followed. It bequeathed to all of us a culture and ethos of such personal and moral slovenliness that we must now enlist a battle-hardened soldier to save the children of the anti-Vietnam generation from drugs. It is perhaps the most perfect, bitter irony that when these parents now exhort their children to stop using marijuana (of a strain that is significantly more potent than anything they dabbled in), the kids reply: "Why should we? We're not hurting anyone."

Basically, we'd very much like to know exactly why Bill Clinton took a powder on the drug wars after he became President. There was in fact a rationale of sorts offered at the time for the change in tone and direction. In contrast to what was thought to be the Republican approach of throwing people in jail for drug offenses, the Clinton approach would emphasize prevention and treatment. There is a case to be made for prevention and treatment, but the heart of our complaint with this President's attitude on drugs has to do with what we would call it character, its moral content.

Unlike the Reagans, you will never see the Clintons articulating the war on drugs as an essentially moral crusade. With its emphasis on treatment and programs and prevention, it is mainly the kind of effort that the sociologist Philip Rieff identified as the triumph of the therapeutic. Rather than the schoolmarmish Nancy Reagan, the Clintons, like the generation of liberal constituencies that they lead, are going to be rhetorically correct, believers in the powers of bureaucratic healing—and nonjudgmental. In their world, no one is ever quite caught for disastrous personal behavior or choices. Instead of absolutism, there are explanations.

This, in our opinion, is the real reason the drug war waned when Bill Clinton became President. The message this new President sent to his young, yuppie, MTVish audiences was that he was just too cool to go relentlessly moralistic over something like recreational drugs. Sure he had an anti-drug policy in 1992 and a czar and speeches, but Bill Clinton wasn't going to have any cows over the subject. Surely, the drug-testing White House staff understood that much.

We don't doubt that a lot of people in this country, especially parents of teenaged and pre-teen children, would very much like to rediscover General McCaffrey's pre-Vietnam world of less constant cultural challenge. But the people who turned that culture upside down, making it a daily challenge for parents, have at last been given the chance to run the government. But this death-bed conversion on drugs simply lacks credibility. As much as we applaud General McCaffrey's new offensive, only a triumph of hope over experience could lead anyone to believe it would be sustained past November if Mr. Clinton and his crowd are returned to the White House. ●

WHY NO HELP TO LIBERIA?

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the tragedy of Liberia should be of concern to all Americans.

I have twice visited that battle-scarred country which has more ties to the United States historically than any other nation of Africa.

And the United States bears a partial responsibility for what is happening there.

I'm pleased that the latest reports show that there is relative stability temporarily, but I am confident that this relative stability will be broken once again unless the nations move together effectively under U.S. leadership.

The ECOMOG forces have brought some stability but there needs to be a stronger indication of interest outside of Africa also. Bishop John H. Ricard, chairman of the board for Catholic Relief Services, had an op-ed piece in the Washington Post, which I ask to be printed in the RECORD after my remarks. I hope his article will stir policymakers a little more.

He eloquently pleads for help to this needy, desperate country.

The article follows:

WHY NO HELP TO LIBERIA?

(By John H. Richard)

When the leaders of Liberia's warring factions signed a peace agreement in Abuja, Nigeria, last August, they did not ask for American troops to back it up. They did not ask us to broker the peace or shed our blood. What they did ask for was a credible force of properly equipped peacekeepers to persuade combatants to give up their weapons.

They knew that this relatively modest assistance would provide stability and give the country an opportunity to rejoin the rest of the world. The signatories to the agreement had hoped that Liberia-like Bosnia, Haiti, Kuwait and Somalia—might qualify for the type of aid necessary to give the nation a chance.

Rejected by the international community, Liberians were left to face the formidable tasks of nation-building without the assistance that might have seen them through those tasks. Perhaps the violence we witnessed last week would have happened anyway. The sad truth is we won't ever know whether a stronger American and International commitment might have helped Liberia avoid this bloodshed.

Liberian warlords cannot be excused for the terror inflicted in Monrovia over the past week, but neither can we place the blame entirely on Africa's doorstep. Liberia's West African neighbors, committed to bringing peace to the region, brought the warring parties to the negotiating table more than a dozen times since fighting broke out in the fall of 1990, and scores of African peacekeepers have given their lives to end the war. When the accord was signed, the feuding leaders established a functioning government that all parties upheld for nearly five months.

As skirmishes flared up-country, one or another of the Liberian leaders traveled to the point of conflict to settle it. It was not exactly a constitutional system, but the Liberian Council of State represented the resolve of a critical mass of Liberians to achieve peace. They were willing to continue, and they need our help.

It is impossible to say whether there would be peace in Liberia today if the United Nations Security Council had made the sort of commitment there that it has made in other parts of the world. But the international community never gave the African peace agreement a chance.

A week ago, international donors meeting in Brussels agreed that it would take \$1.2 billion to begin the reconstruction of Bosnia. Last September, the same international donors rejected a \$110 million U.N. appeal to finance demilitarization, resettlement and economic rehabilitation in Liberia, demanding that African nations shoulder more of