

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 as 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 Polices Department, Snohomish County Sheriffs Department, Lynnwood Police Department, Everett Police Department, Marysvill 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. 1965, 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:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, September 25, 1996.

Senator ORRIN HATCH,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee.

Senator JOE BIDEN,
Ranking Member, Judiciary Committee.

DEAR ORRIN AND JOE: Last week, the Senate passed a bill you sponsored, the Comprehensive Methamphetamine Control Act of 1996. I understand the House intends to make up a similar bill this week. I strongly support the Senate bill, S. 965, and urge you to work to ensure it becomes law this year.

In these last two months, I have visited with representatives of local, state and federal law enforcement. Over and over, these officials voiced concerns about the increasing manufacture, potency, and availability of methamphetamines. Local and state law enforcement officers said they felt particularly ill-equipped to safely and cost-effectively deal with clandestine labs and the hazardous chemicals they contain. The high cost, technical expertise and time required to investigate and eliminate these labs are hampering law enforcement's ability to protect our young people and communities from the threat not only of methamphetamines, but of other illegal drugs as well.

I pledge my support in any way I can to helping ensure this bill, S. 965, becomes law. I also intend to work within the Appropriations Committee to see that coordination efforts are strengthened and our law enforcement officials have the tools they need to combat this growing threat.

Thank you for all of your work to date on this issue. I look forward to working closely with you on this important public safety issue.

Sincerely,

PATTY MURRAY,
U.S. Senator.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor of S. 965.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Another important piece to solving this puzzle in the Pacific Northwest is designation of a high-intensity drug trafficking area. I am happy to announce that contained in this bill is \$3 million for the newly created Pacific Northwest HIDTA. This will help enormously as we try to coordinate our efforts among Federal, State, and local law enforcement to fight not only methamphetamines, but all other illegal drugs and drug trafficking in our region.

The Department of Justice has also developed the National Methamphetamine Strategy—April 1996. This report is referenced in a colloquy I will have, in conjunction with this omnibus spending bill, with Chairman HATFIELD and Senator HOLLINGS about the need to address methamphetamines. This plan, which will be partially implemented when S. 965 becomes law, lays out a legislative, law enforcement, training, chemical regulation, international cooperation, environmental protection, public awareness, educational, and treatment strategy. The multidisciplinary, multijurisdictional program provides the needed comprehensive approach to this problem.

Finally, money is critical. While I do not support simply throwing Federal dollars at this problem, the need for

Federal support to help in coordination activities, technical assistance, and training cannot be minimized. In the bill we have before us, we make some major improvements in our war against these and other drugs. The DEA's budget was increased by 23 percent—that's a start. The U.S. Attorneys Office received funding for additional attorney's, which are critically needed. The Office of National Drug Control Policy received new money and additional HIDTA's. So, I believe this budget moves us in the right direction.

As I have suggested in the colloquy, I intend to work with my colleagues in Congress and in the administration to develop a funding and technical assistance strategy to address the unique problems posed by methamphetamines and clandestine labs. Our local and State law enforcement officials simply must have adequate money, training, and technical expertise to address the costly and dangerous threats posed by clandestine labs. I will then work to ensure funds are targeted to this vital area in the fiscal year 1998 budget.

Mr. President, as with all social and criminal problems, change can only occur if and when we all do our part. I pledge to work with Federal, State and local law enforcement, community leaders, my colleagues, and others to find a way to stop the spread of illegal drugs, including methamphetamines. I am committed to improving the quality of life, safety, and security of our children and communities. I look forward to continuing this important work in the 105th Congress.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The clerk will call roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for a time period not to exceed 15 minutes.

FEDERAL EXPRESS ANTI-LABOR RIDER TO FAA REAUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support the FAA reforms, but I strongly object to the anti-labor rider that the Republican leadership has attached to this bill.

This controversy is a good example of why the sun is setting on the Republican majority in Congress. As their parting shot at American workers in the closing hours of this Congress, the Republican leadership is demanding that an unacceptable anti-labor rider

be attached to this needed aviation security bill.

That riders is special interest legislation of the worst kind. It is designed to help Federal Express Corp. block the ongoing efforts of its truckdrivers in Pennsylvania to join a union.

Federal Express is notorious for its anti-union ideology—but there is no justification for Congress to become an accomplice in its union-busting tactic. I intend to do all I can to see that this anti-worker rider does not become law. It has no place on the FAA bill, and it deserves no place in the statute books.

I believe that as the facts of this controversy become widely known, working men and women across America will be shocked at the lengths to which the Republican majority in Congress is willing to go in their attempt to enact their anti-worker ideology into law.

Why is Federal Express willing to go to such drastic lengths to force this rider into law? Because they see the sun setting on the Republican anti-worker majority in Congress, and they know there is no hope that their special interest provision will be enacted by a Democratic proworker majority in Congress.

On September 26, under the guise of a technical correction to the Railway Labor Act, an unacceptable special interest provision was attached to the FAA reauthorization bill.

This provision is in no sense a technical correction. It makes a significant change in Federal law to give the Federal Express Corp. an edge in its blatant attempt to stop some of its employees from joining a union.

Under present law, airline employees are covered by the Railway Labor Act, which requires employees to form a nationwide bargaining unit if they wish to have a union. Truck drivers, however, historically have been subject to the National Labor Relations Act, which allows smaller bargaining units to be established on a more local basis.

This split coverage makes sense. It has been national labor policy since the 1930's, when the National Labor Relations Act was passed and the Railway Labor Act was amended to cover airlines as well as railroads.

United Parcel Service, which has both airline and trucking components of its business and competes with Federal Express, is covered by the Railway Labor Act for its airline operations and by the National Labor Relations Act for its trucking operations. UPS truck drivers formed local unions decades ago pursuant to the National Labor Relations Act, and are members of the Teamsters Union.

Federal Express truck drivers are not unionized. However, truck drivers at the Pennsylvania facilities of Federal Express have been trying for nearly 2 years to organize and become members of the United Auto Workers. The drivers filed a petition for a union election with the National Labor Relations Board in January 1995.

Federal Express challenged the petition, arguing that the entire company,