

be attributed to the job opportunities offered by this meatpacking industry. Apparently, workers are recruited by immigrants already working at the plant. Once these workers are recruited, they illegally cross the border, obtain a false identity, and begin work. As workers are injured, or the plant is raided by the INS, new workers are hired to fill the empty positions. This process ensures a continuous demand for workers which has been so steady that it has reportedly spawned a sort of underground railroad from Mexico to the town of Storm Lake, IA.

It is because of situations like these—the meatpacking story in Storm Lake and the murder of Justin Younise in Iowa—that the illegal immigration conference report is being discussed here today. Provisions in this act address illegal immigration problems at every level, from Border Patrol to deportation. The act takes direct steps to reduce crime associated with illegal immigration and provides States with incentives to do the same.

Among the hundreds of provisions in this bill are a number of initiatives that I fought for as a member of the Judiciary Committee and, as well, as a conferee. For instance, this bill allows the Attorney General to enter into agreements with local law enforcement, permitting, as I said, for the first time since 1977 local authorities to apprehend, detain, and transport illegal aliens. This is an especially important step for the interior States, such as my State of Iowa, that are distant from the borders.

Just a few weeks ago local police had to release a truckload of illegal aliens because the INS wouldn't—or, as they might say, "couldn't"—respond just then. But they used the argument that there were less than 20 illegals in the group. So it was too small of a group for them to mess around with. Obviously, it is better from that judgment to wait until they find their way into a job and into the underground economy, get lost, and then spend thousands of dollars more to apprehend the very same people. But they were in the custody for a short period of time of these local law enforcement people.

So it is obvious that local law enforcement needs more tools like we are now providing to fight illegal immigrants.

In addition, because of my insistence, the conference included a guarantee that each State will have at least 10 agents. This will help States like Iowa that do not have any agents right now when illegal immigration is growing at a rapid pace.

The conference committee also included a provision of mine to exempt nonprofits and churches from the time-consuming and costly paperwork of verification and deeming. Unfortunately, the administration made the mistake of demanding the provision be changed in the last-minute negotiations last week on title V.

I might say at this point that my staff got a call about 1:30 Saturday

morning to discuss some changes in this language. That is not a very good way to write a piece of legislation. And we are going to pay the consequences for it on this because this resulting language is inferior to what I had agreed to in conference, and that was a bipartisan agreement.

At least on the face of it, nonprofits will be exempt from the new provision. But the question of when and how people can be served by nonprofits and any resulting paperwork requirement will unfortunately be left to regulations promulgated by the Attorney General. The former conference language that we had worked out provided protections from regulations. But the administration language does not. I think this will have to be remedied in legislation next year because we are going to have potential problems on this.

Nevertheless, I am satisfied with another provision concerning congressional participation.

This provision requires that when we proceed with the verification pilot projects for employers, Congress and the Federal Government will be a part of those projects. The only way that we are going to know if these really work or not is if we, in the Congress, are a part of them. That is a followup of my legislation, the first bill passed by a Republican Congress in 40 years, the first bill signed by President Clinton going way back to January of 1995, a bill where after 6 years we finally ended the exemption that Members of Congress as employers had from Federal law—civil rights, labor and safety legislation, among others, which we had exempted ourselves from that apply to the rest of the country.

That legislation has passed, so we are no longer exempt from those laws. There is no longer two sets of laws, one for Capitol Hill and one for the rest of the United States. There is one set of laws that applies equally.

When it comes to this verification pilot project for employers, it seems to me that we in the Federal Government ought to be participating in these projects and then we are going to know firsthand the redtape that small business or large business even has to go through to meet the requirements of our immigration law. Then in a few years when we go down the road to making a final decision whether or not this new verification procedure goes into place, we are going to do it not from the standpoint of just what our constituents are telling us, as so very important as that is, we are also going to know firsthand what is involved with this project and the impact it is going to have upon employers of America because we are employers in the sense that we, as Members of Congress, hire staff. And if the small business people ought to go through a certain process under this project, we ought to as well so we know firsthand what the situation is.

In conclusion, Mr. President, anyone who does not support this bill is just

not serious about dealing with illegal immigration. Although many of the provisions of this bill could have been tougher, there has been a strong effort to achieve bipartisan support. I look forward to this bill becoming law, and I commend Senator SIMPSON for the incredible job he has done with this legislation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. 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. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes as if in morning business.

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

#### “CHOOSING GOOD GOVERNMENT”

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, as we have launched into the high-pitched rhetoric and the harsh charges and countercharges of the fall political campaign season, I found it very interesting when I heard a sermon preached by Dr. Craig Barnes, the pastor of the National Presbyterian Church, on Sunday. It so happens that his sermon topic was “Choosing Good Government.” I asked Dr. Barnes if he would mind if I shared this with my colleagues and with those who are interested, because I think Dr. Barnes laid down some very good principles for people of faith, people who contend they are religious believers, regardless of their particular sect or denomination or even their religion, to consider in choosing those who seek to represent us in November.

Dr. Barnes is not one to recommend one party or another or one candidate or another, nor have I heard him in his sermons attempting to influence the choices that those of us in the legislative bodies make when we deal with controversial issues, but I think he had a couple of very good points to consider and to apply based on our tenets, our beliefs and judgment as to how these standards should be applied. He gives us a framework for making the choices that are very important to all of us in this election year because, as he points out, we are subject to the rule of man by reason of the authorization from God for man to establish laws and rules over one another.

Dr. Barnes points out that we have to choose a system which is in conformity with God's will if we are to choose a government that is consistent with the principles that have been laid down by our God and by our faith.

The two main points that Dr. Barnes makes are, first, to choose God's leader is always to choose godly character. And he points out that we live in an

era when character and integrity have sometimes gotten off the table for consideration. You try bringing up an issue like personal morality and they say that is nobody's business.

Dr. Barnes points out that as King David discovered,

People who do not make good personal choices are compromised in their ability to make good public choices. Biblical leadership is never seen as a job. It is a calling. It is a way of life for which the leader is a symbol. People who choose to live by the Bible," or by the other directives that they have receive from that higher being in whom they have belief, "are given rather clear standards of ethical behavior. Some things are right. Some things are wrong. [It is] not wrong because it is ineffective or unpopular. But [it is wrong] because it isn't the right thing to do. To choose God as your authority is to resist the current privatization of morality and to choose a leader who is clearly trying to be led by God in his or her own life.

The second point that Dr. Barnes makes is that choosing a leader is always a choice about a particular vision for our life together. And we have heard lots of talk about vision: Do we have vision in the campaign? What is the vision?

We all know the maxim that, "Without a vision, the people perish." But, according to some polls, almost 90 percent of us claim to believe in a God, and to pray. But we seem to be spiritually empty. And the reason we may be that is because we are no longer able to call for the sacrifice or discipline necessary to live by the teachings.

We, as Americans, cherish not only our freedom but our vision of life under God. That is what brought the pilgrims and the Puritans here. That was what native Americans and Hispanics had before we came, life under God. Slaves that were dragged here found a vision, that they could build a new life in the Biblical stories of God's deliverance.

So those who will now lead us have to offer some vision of our life together. This has to be more than just helping each person to get a piece of the pie. It has to be something that will, again, inspire sacrifice and commitment to the common good, something that will make us refuse to accept "the way it is said" and commit ourselves to "the way it can be."

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues who may be interested, and anyone else who is concerned about choices we make this fall, to read and ponder this sermon.

I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon is ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHOOSING GOOD GOVERNMENT  
(By Dr. M. Craig Barnes)

Americans have always been ambivalent about authority. We know we need it. We honor and respect it. But we are still suspicious of it.

This is not surprising for a nation whose founding documents include a Declaration of Independence, which we cherish. But that independence has also been written on our hearts. It was what propelled us to explore

the frontier and tame it with our hands. It was what almost split the nation in two over a Civil War. Our spirit of independence has led us to honor innovation and creativity, and a competitive economy where we are free to improve ourselves. It has even sent us overseas to fight tyranny and aggression, because we cannot stand the thought of people not being free. Every healthy American teenager knows about the longing to be free, and that longing never goes away.

So we are very careful about giving even some of this freedom away. But we know we have to. We give it to parents and teachers, to employers and to the elders of the church, and we give it to the government who can tell us what to do. They can restrict our activities with laws and regulations and they can direct us toward a particular future. We give these leaders power over our lives because we know we cannot live together without some authority. But we don't really like it.

One of our favorite American beliefs is that the real authority still lies with the individual who at least chooses the people to lead us. Very conscious of this, leadership today has tried to move beyond the hierarchical models of the past where the person at the top ran the show. Now, the last thing anyone wants to be accused of is being authoritarian. So we have developed a new emphases on "participative management" and "building consensus." But we are discovering this can digress into little more than servicing complaints. In essence, many leaders today are saying, "I'm must here to give you what you want." ("So I can stay here.") This has led many social and political commentators to ask who really has authority in a free society? The leader or those who are led?

According to Romans chapter 13, the answer is neither one. "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities; for there is no authority except from God." Now that is a rather strong statement. And just in case we want to gloss over it, Paul says the same thing three times in this passage. "There is no authority except from God . . . Those authorities that exist have been instituted by God . . . Whoever resists authority resists what God has appointed."

At first we want to object by asking what about tyrants like Hitler or Stalin? What about the boss or teacher who abuses their power. Is there authority from God? But then we remember that the Apostle Paul, who was inspired to write these words, lived under incredible tyrants like Claudius and Nero. Paul knew about leaders who abused authority, but he also knew about the sovereign power of God.

As a Jew, Paul was steeped in the Old Testament understanding of God's Kingdom—God's reign on earth which is greater than the kingdoms of earth and uses the kingdoms of earth for his own purposes. Which means all governments are under God. To the degree that human leaders obey God they are being faithful to their calling. To the degree that human leaders break God's commandments they are stepping outside of their authority, which can only come from God.

Actually the Bible is filled with illustrations of people who because they obeyed God could not obey their leaders. When Pharaoh ordered the midwives to kill all the Hebrew babies, they began to hide them and Moses' life was preserved. When Nebuchadnezzar ordered everyone to bow before his image. Meshach, Shadrach, and Abednego refused to obey. When Darius outlawed praying, Daniel continued to pray. When Herod ordered the death of the children in Bethlehem, Jesus' parents fled to Egypt with their son. When Peter was told by the Sanhedrin to stop

preaching, he told his religious leaders, "We have to obey God rather than man." In everyone of those cases, people of faith were making heroic choices about who would govern them. And in every case, the choices were guided by a prior commitment to serve God the only real authority we have.

The Bible says nothing about either covenants or contracts between people and their leaders. That makes for good social and political theory, but it is not how the Bible orders our life together. The Bible claims both the people and the leader are under a common obligation to live under God, and the leader is but an instrument of divine purposes. Thus, we must help our government succeed in its calling to serve God. We cannot disregard the laws and direction of our leaders just because we had other preferences. We must still honor good leaders even when they make bad mistakes. In the words of B.B. King, "Only a mediocre man is always at his best." The only time we can refuse to obey our government is when in a great crisis in conscience we become convinced it has determined to lead us away from life under God's authority.

Rev. Michael Cassidy, a leader of the South African church's resistance to apartheid tells about the time he was summoned to appear before President P.W. Botha in Pretoria. When he entered his office, the president stood and began reading Romans 13. Botha claimed the passage called for unequivocal support of the Nationalist Government apartheid policy. Rev. Cassidy responded by reminding the president he too had read the Bible and began quoting from Revelation 13, which describes governments that become dragons when they devour God's people. The authority doesn't lie in the leader. The authority lies in God, whom the leader also serves.

Here in the land of the Free, we are given a wonderful opportunity to make choices about who will lead us. We can elect leaders. We can choose an employer, or a church, or a politician. Behind each of those choices, for people who believe in God, is a decision about which leader will bring us closer to the reign of God. Let me offer two guidelines to help us in our choices about who will lead us closer to God's kingdom.

1. To choose God's leader is always to choose Godly character. We live in an era when the issues of character and integrity have somehow been taken off the table for consideration. Try bringing up the issues of personal morality of a leader at work and you are likely to be told, that is a private issue. The question is can he or she do the job." But as King David discovered people who do not make good personal choices are compromised in their ability to make good public choices. Biblical leadership is never seen as a job. It is a calling. It is a way of life for which the leader is a symbol.

People who choose to live by the Bible are given rather clear standards of ethical behavior. Some things are right. Some things are wrong. Not wrong because it is ineffective or unpopular. But wrong because it isn't the right thing to do. To choose God as your authority is to resist the current privatization of morality and to choose a leader who is clearly trying to be led by God in his or her own life. The evidence of that is not only in things like sex and money, but also in the morals we don't talk about as much in Washington—like humility, and graciousness, and the refusal to become mean just because it helps you survive.

2. Choosing a leader is always a choice about a particular vision of our life together. In a recent article in the journal *First Things*, Thomas Reeves asks why does our country seem to be so spiritually empty when according to the Gallup poll 90% of us

claim to believe in God and to pray? One of his suggestions is that our religious leaders no longer have a vision of another way of life. Thus, we are no longer able to call for the sacrifice or discipline necessary to live by the Spirit. So the prayers of the people have become self-indulgent expressions of consumerism, where we keep asking God to give us something we can't get for ourselves.

John Updike's novel, *In the Beauty of the Lilies*, begins with a Presbyterian preacher named Clarence Wilmot who loses his faith at the turn of the century. For Rev. Wilmot it seems Christ is still hiding in the beauty of the lilies across the sea from us. He cannot find the Savior. He's overwhelmed by urban poverty and the injustice of his own parishioners. He finds no answers in the new liberal theology that adores scientific and cultural potential, but has little to say about God. Eventually he drops out of the ministry and becomes an unsuccessful encyclopedia salesman. No longer able to proclaim truth, he now peddles information.

The novel then traces how this loss of faith and vision is visited upon his children and grandchildren. Clarence's son becomes frightened of life. The author writes, "Nothing made Teddy indignant. He was curious about the world but never with any hope of changing it. He had no faith to offer. Only the facts of daily existence." Clarence's granddaughter became what the author calls a ego-theist who is preoccupied with herself. She doesn't seem to be troubled by morals, but finds it useful to pray to God for success. His great grandson became so lost and disillusioned that he fell easy prey to a cult leader who destroyed his followers in a fire.

Throughout the novel, the reader watches these characters make one bad choice after another. The book ends without any redemption or hope, but simply with two words, "The children." I was so upset, I slammed the book shut and threw it across the room. It was an awful book. But it's true. Without a vision of life, without something more than our current preoccupation with information and success, we are destroying not only ourselves, but our children.

To be American means to cherish not only our freedom, but also our vision of life under God. That was what brought Pilgrims and Puritans here. That was what Native Americans and Hispanics had before we came—Life under God. Slaves that were dragged here, found the vision to build a new life in the Biblical stories of God's deliverance. Immigrants that piled into the land came with the vision that there was a life here for them too—as Americans under God.

So those who will now lead us have to offer some vision of our life together. This has to be something more than just helping you get your piece of the pie. It has to be something that will again inspire sacrifice and commitment to the common good, something that will make us refuse to accept the way it is and commit ourselves to the way it can be.

Where will our leaders find a vision with that kind of authority? From their own faith in God. The only authority we have.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

#### THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO BATTLING METHAMPHETAMINES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, in recent years, there has been one

issue that, perhaps more than any other, has sent waves of fear through our communities—the scourge of illegal drugs and the threat they pose to our children and families. As the 104th Congress comes to a close, I want to reflect on one aspect of this growing threat: the increasing use and manufacture of methamphetamines.

The use of this drug is increasing among youth and young adults. According to the most recent Drug Abuse Warning Network, methamphetamine-related deaths increased nationally by 145 percent between 1992 and 1994 and methamphetamine-related emergency room cases are up 256 percent since 1991. In addition, methamphetamine-related hospital visits more than tripled between 1991 and 1994, with the largest increases occurring in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, and Denver.

In case my colleagues are not familiar with this drug, it is commonly called, in its various forms, speed, crank, ice, and meth. It's cheap, easy to get, highly addictive, and very, very dangerous.

This drug can be inhaled, injected, ingested, or smoked. Its effects include feelings of alertness, euphoria, self-confidence, and impulsiveness. It can lead to rage, depression, paranoia, delusions, weight loss, abnormal heart-beat, insomnia, confusion, and auditory hallucinations. It has increased its purity in recent years and its effects can be sustained for up to 8 hours. Abusers may remain awake for days or weeks after a binge, then enter the most dangerous phase, known as tweaking, where they are most likely to suffer hallucinations, dramatic mood swings, and extreme violence.

While all drugs are cause for concern, the increase of methamphetamines pose unique problems for law enforcement and communities, namely clandestine labs.

In recent months, I have met with groups of law enforcement officials including Washington State Patrol Chief Annette Sandberg, U.S. Attorney Kate Pflaumer, and representatives of many local law enforcement agencies, including Shoreline Police Department, Snohomish County Sheriffs Department, Lynnwood Police Department, Everett Police Department, Marysville Police Department, and Mukilteo Police Department. Without exception, all mentioned the increasing numbers of clandestine laboratories used to manufacture methamphetamines.

These labs are easily assembled in hotel rooms, trailer homes, or other small structures in both rural and urban settings. Using a quick, easy and cheap method, dubbed the Nazi method because of its invention by the Germans to keep soldiers alert in World War II, legal ingredients are harnessed to create a potent form of methamphetamines.

Once these labs are located, local law enforcement officers must disassemble them, often at great risk to themselves. The chemicals used to make

this synthetic drug include red phosphorous, iodine, hydrochloric acid, and, most importantly, ephedrine. These chemicals or their combination create hazardous waste and can be deadly if officers are overexposed to them.

According to the Drug Enforcement Agency, the clandestine nature of the manufacturing process and the presence of ignitable, corrosive, reactive, and toxic chemicals have led to explosions, fires, toxic fumes, and irreparable damage to human health and the environment. The so-called cooks or chemists in these clandestine labs simply dump hazardous chemical wastes on the ground, into streams or lakes, into sewage systems or septic tanks, or underground.

Law enforcement officials or firefighters require special training in health, safety, and disposal methods to deal with these labs. The cleanup of these dangerous sites is complex, expensive and time consuming. The contaminated materials and evidence can weigh up to several tons. The substances to which these law enforcement officers are exposed present very real health risks.

In addition to the danger posed to officers and the environment, unwitting future tenants of the motels, homes, or trailers may be exposed to toxic vapors that have permeated plaster and wood of buildings. Children may play in the soil or water onto which these chemicals have been carelessly or intentionally dumped. Passersby also may inhale these vapors as they pass a clandestine lab. Finally, chemicals may be stored in rental lockers or other semi-public places that lack proper ventilation or temperature controls. These improperly stored chemicals increase the likelihood of fire, explosion, and human exposure.

So, Mr. President, what should we do? I am in strong support of S. 965, the Comprehensive Methamphetamine Control Act passed by the Senate 2 weeks ago and the House this weekend. That bill takes a multifaceted approach to the problem by addressing, among other things, importation of chemicals used to make the drug; increased penalties for manufacturing, possession of manufacturing equipment, and trafficking; higher civil penalties for firms that knowingly supply precursor chemicals; restitution for cleanup of clandestine lab sites; development of an interagency task force; public health monitoring; and public-private education programs.

I congratulate Senators HATCH, BIDEN, and FEINSTEIN on their efforts to help this Congress address the problem. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Senators HATCH and BIDEN be printed in the RECORD.

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