Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Well, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) so much for the opportunity to join the gentleman tonight, and thank the gentleman for his leadership. As I have said, I have learned a lot from the gentleman. Actually wrote the book on trade agreements called the Myths of Free Trade. You can get it at a book store. If they do not have it, order it. It is a good read and educational.

What we are seeing right now is a growing bipartisan consensus that CAFTA is not a good idea.

□ 2045

I realize there are all kinds of pressures going on on the side to get Members to vote for it, and I think the reason is very simple.

Why do we have trade agreements? Well, of course, we have now an increasing global economy. That is inevitable. It is going to happen as the world gets smaller, because of technology, because of our capacity to trade with each other across borders, and that is a good thing. But we are at a point now where we have to decide what are the beneficiaries, who are going to be the winners and the losers of this international trade.

Clearly, we are talking about businesses being able to sell their products and import products and to set a level playing field, but we want to make sure that it is not just multinational corporations, the huge companies that benefit from this global marketplace, but that it is consumers, that it is workers, and that at the same time we are not damaging our environment. The thing about trade agreements is that it is possible to craft trade agreements that are not only good for business, but they are also good for workers and that they do take into consideration the environmental impact.

We had a trade agreement with Jordan that, if we used it as kind of a template for how we write these agreements, could have been a model for how we do it around the world, but instead, this trade agreement speeds up or at least contributes to what we call the race to the bottom; that is, the kind of agreement that does nothing to lift the wages or the living standards of people in the Central American countries and the Dominican Republic, and makes it easier to actually lower the standards of workers here in the United States. It starts pushing down wages, pushing down working conditions, and that is not the kind of globalization we want, where the whole world is diminished in terms of its workers by these trade agreements.

I went to Cuidad Juarez right across from El Paso at the 10th anniversary of NAFTA, and it was a trip that was organized in large part by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). When I went there, what I saw were workers living in the packing crates of the products that they were manufacturing, often American companies, who had crossed the border and set up shop there so that they could pay very low wages to Mexican workers who were benefiting hardly at all.

I mean, yes, they wanted some kind of a job, but their standard of living was to live in packing crates without health care, without certainly any kind of a living wage. In fact, we saw children who looked pretty sick, but they could not afford to take them to the doctor or even to send their children to school.

Is this the kind of world that we want to help create with these trade agreements? Is this good for the people in Mexico? Is this good for Americans? Because then those jobs go to places where there are low wages and where it is dangerous to try and organize for higher wages and higher benefits. It is dangerous to talk about unions. In our country, every 23 minutes a worker gets fired for trying to organize a union. In some of those places, you can get killed if you try to organize a union. It can be very, very dangerous.

So the United States is the richest country in the history of the world. It could be a leader in saying we want to establish rules that lift all people, that make it possible for our workers to have a living wage here at home, to have our consumers be able to buy products from other countries where the people who produce them are not living in slave or near slave labor conditions. I feel bad because often it is posed, you are either for trade agreements or you are not; you are an isolationist; you do not want to.

It is not that at all. We could craft an agreement. We could go back to the drawing board, and we could craft an agreement that would work for workers here and workers there, too.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY). She is exactly right. I think the point she made is so important.

First of all, at the beginning of her comments, she said there is a growing bipartisan group, and it is clearly way larger than a majority of this Congress, large numbers of people in both parties, who do not like our trade policy, who see that we have seen this incredible growth in the deficit from $38 billion to $618 billion in 12 years. It is clear our policies are not working.

We have seen the kind of job loss that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and others have talked about, particularly in these red States, with losing 200,000 jobs.

She talked about that we are not against trade agreements; we are against this Central American Free Trade Agreement. We are against this trade agreement because we know who the winners and losers are. The winners have been the drug companies, the largest most powerful corporations. The losers are small manufacturers that are from my district and in Chicago or in the upper peninsula of Michigan. The losers are workers all over the country.

When these workers lose, it is not just 216,000 Ohioans who lost their jobs. It is the families. It is the children. It is the school districts, the police and fire protection, and the safety of these communities.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that we can simply do better, that we should reject the Central American Free Trade Agreement as presented to us for this vote; renegotiate CAFTA; come back here and pass a trade agreement that lifts standards up, that lifts workers' standards up in our country and Central America; that protects and preserves the environment; that speaks to food safety and all the things that matter in our lives.

In closing, I would add both comments from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) about what do we stand for as a Nation, what kind of values, and when I look at the fact that religious leaders in all seven of these countries, the six countries south of us and our country, religious leaders have spoken out saying they are not against trade either, but they can do better, they believe we can do better and come up with a negotiated trade agreement so that working families and the poor in these countries, the environment benefits, food safety benefits. We do better with all of those things that we care about.

So I thank my friends for joining us tonight, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), and just again saying we should renegotiate CAFTA, start again. It has been a year and a month since this agreement was signed by the President. We can do better. Let us start again and do it right this time.

BYRNE-JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REICHERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in favor of the Byrne-Justice Assistance Grant, JAG, amendment that we will debate and discuss in tomorrow's appropriation, Justice appropriations tomorrow.

This is a grant that our local police and sheriffs have relied on to form task forces, multijurisdictional task forces to fight our drug problems in our communities, particularly meth. At least in Nebraska, the State that I have the responsibility and honor to represent, meth is by far the number one drug of choice. It started mostly as a rural drug where the ingredients were fairly easy to get, anhydrous ammonia, pseudoephedrine from your local grocery store or pharmacies. The Sudafed that they can break down, the components, and using a variety of other

chemicals, even ammonia, they would be able to manufacture in small labs using basic chemistry sets to make this drug.

This drug has spread throughout the rural communities across our Nation, devastating these communities, devastating families. The drug is highly addictive. Part of the symptoms of the drug while you are high on this drug is the tendency to be violent, staying up for long periods of time, and in fact, because of the toxicity of this, it even breaks down your skin. It breaks down your gums and your teeth and your hair. You can have open sores. As I mentioned a minute ago, the consequences of this highly addictive drug run deep in our social and family infrastructure.

I am pleased that we have so many Members on both sides of the aisle that are coming forward to help our local police and sheriffs with their part being on the front lines in the drug war.

I have the honor now of recognizing the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) who represents the Law Enforcement Caucus and is a great supporter of our local law enforcement, and I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) for yielding and thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

We have had this issue a couple of times come before the Congress, and each time we have been pretty successful in trying to defeat the changes and the cuts in the appropriations to the Byrne grants because, as all my colleagues know, the Byrne-Justice Assistance Grants are of great importance to all of our States, to our local, our city police, especially in the fight against drugs because of the drug task force that they do fund.

Our law enforcement officers who are in our communities who serve and protect us every day have asked repeatedly that we not cut this one vital program, which gives them discretion at the State level on where to put these justice grants, these Byrne grants, if you will, and how to use them in their States.

Unfortunately, this program is grossly underfunded in the bill that we will have up this week, and it is going to cut funding from $634 million that was provided last year to $348 million for this fiscal year. That is about a 40, 45 percent cut.

So, tomorrow, I look forward to joining with my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTEAD), my other co-chair of the Law Enforcement Caucus, and others to offer this important amendment.

Our amendment will ensure that our local law enforcement has the resources it needs to control and eliminate drug threats, keep our court systems up and running smoothly and provide funding for anti-terrorism training. As a former city police officer and a Michigan State police trooper, as well as the co-chair of the Law Enforcement Caucus, I understand how much our local communities need and rely upon the Byrne grants. In fact, we had hearings in the Law Enforcement Caucus earlier this year about what these Byrne grant cuts would mean to law enforcement, and law enforcement from Maryland, Illinois and all over the country came and testified the devastating effect it would have.

So what our amendment would do to tomorrow is restore the $286 million that is being cut out of the Byrne grants by making a .448 percent cut, that is less than a half a percent, from every agency in this bill to fully fund Byrne grants. Why should every agency take a hit? Because this is how important the Byrne grants are to law enforcement and our continuing fight against drugs in this country.

So I am hopeful that the entire House of Representatives will take to heart the importance of the funding of the Byrne grant program and vote for this amendment.

Most of us are well aware that the funding this grant provides is instrumental to our law enforcement teams, but this Byrne grant does so much more that is often overlooked.

In fact, the Byrne grants actually provide funding for 29 different programs, vital programs such as anti-drug education programs, treatment programs, alternative sentencing initiatives, giving the States the ability to choose the programs where funding would be most useful to them back at home.

The Byrne grants also fund programs important to our court and prison systems. It provides funding to improve the operational effectiveness of the court process by expanding judicial resources and implementing court-delay reduction programs such as automated fingerprint identification systems.

□ 2100

The Byrne grants provide long-range corrections and sentencing strategies and fund programs that teach inmates to acquire marketable skills and to make restitution payments to their victims.

Byrne grants can also be used to implement antiterrorism training programs, enforce child abuse and neglect laws, improve the criminal justice system's response to domestic and family violence, and, finally, the grants can also be used to establish cooperative programs between law enforcement and the media, such as the AMBER alert system, which we use when there is an abduction or a missing child or young adult. We flash it across the highways, the byways, the TVs, and radios. That is all funded by the Byrne grants. So why would we put a 40, 45 percent cut in that system that we seem to be relying upon, unfortunately, more and more each day?

As most of us have been hearing from our local drug enforcement teams back home, and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) certainly articulated those needs, we have to provide the funding so our drug enforcement officers can do their jobs. We can do this only by fully funding the Byrne grants. We have a list we are putting out, and the gentleman from Nebraska has worked on this, and all of us who are supporting this amendment tomorrow. If you look at California, our largest State, it has 58 drug enforcement teams, task forces. If these cuts go through, they will be down to 32. They will lose 26 drug task forces; Georgia, 16; Louisiana, 17; New York will lose 34 of their 76 teams; Ohio will lose 14 of their 32; Texas will lose 21 of the 46 drug enforcement teams; and Wisconsin, my neighboring State, will lose 15 of their 34. Basically, of the 828 drug enforcements teams we have across this Nation, we will lose 373, or 45 percent of them.

So really, if we are to keep our communities safe and drug free, we really have to fund this. Local drug enforcement teams are crucial to keeping our communities drug free. If the Byrne grants are funded at the level currently in the bill, as I said, our teams would not be able to hire the officers they need to sustain drug enforcement teams. In my home State of Michigan, we would lose 11 out of our 25 drug enforcement teams. Losing the task forces would have a devastating and far-reaching effect on Michigan, especially in rural communities like I represent.

Let me be clear. When it comes to drug abuse, no community, urban or rural, in this country is immune from the problem. The methamphetamine problem alone, as the gentleman from Nebraska just spoke of, is destroying families and taking lives in rural America.

To highlight how important these drug enforcement teams are, there was a recent article in one of my little local newspapers in the First Congressional District of Michigan which cites that back 2 months ago, on April 13, HUNT, the Huron Undercover Narcotics Team, HUNT as we call them, seized 3,000 OxyContin tablets from one home in rural Presque County. This critical seizure is just one example of the work our narcotics teams do each and every day to keep our communities safe.

These local agencies, like HUNT, who do so much for our local communities, will take the brunt of the Byrne grant cuts. It is a scary thought, considering that 90 percent of the drug arrests nationwide are made by States and local law enforcement. Ninety percent of all drug arrests are made by local and State. And where do they get the bulk of their money? The Byrne grants.

Our country's drug problems are not going away. In fact, with the emergence of prescription drug use, methamphetamines, and OxyContin, some would argue our problem is only getting worse. So my question is why

would we, as a Congress, cut the funding that enables teams like the HUNT undercover narcotics team to exist and combat this problem that is only becoming more severe?

I know we have other Members who wish to speak, but I am hopeful as Members take to the floor tonight, they will keep in mind and urge their colleagues to support the Terry-Stupak-Ramstad amendment tomorrow to restore the funding to this critical program. Again, we talk about drugs tonight, but there are 29 different programs. It is one of those few programs where we say to the States, here is some money, we want you to do it for law enforcement, and do what is best for your State. We do not mandate it, but here is a pot of money you can take it from, and we hope you do what is best in your State. After all, you know what is best.

The State and Antidrug Task Forces are just one example that we all deal with day in and day out, and I would hope people would support our amendment by cutting less than ½ of 1 percent from the other agencies in this bill to fully fund the Byrne grants.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman and thank him once again for his leadership on this issue, and I look forward to arguing this amendment with him tomorrow on the floor.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's assistance and help on this.

The gentleman from Michigan did make one point that I want to highlight before I call on my next speaker, and that is the cuts in funding.

Remember, about 2 years after I got here, we were funding our criminal justice grants to our local police and sheriffs at about slightly over $1 billion. In 2005, we condensed several of those grant programs, like local law enforcement block grants, Byrne and JAG, into one, and lowered that to 600-, and it was zeroed out. And chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), did a good job of doing what he could to get 300- of that 600- put back. But as the statistics that the gentleman from Michigan just read off, that means even at the current level of funding that will come to the floor tomorrow, of about $300 billion, a 60 percent reduction, a 70 percent reduction from just 4 years ago, at the time that meth problems are increasing in our communities, I cannot fathom the impact it is going to have to eliminate these drug task forces.

The gentleman also mentioned that local police officers make over 90 percent of the drug arrests. And it just astounds me that we are, in this war against drugs and meth, taking our front-line people off the front line. It would be like fighting the war on terrorism by just funding the Pentagon and not funding the Army and the Marines and the Air Force and properly equipping them. So I do appreciate those comments.

It is now my honor to call to the microphone my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), who has been a continuous fighter in his terms here. He has raised the meth issue and been consistent in bringing the message to all of us here of how to fight and why we should fight methamphetamine.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman yields to our colleague, may I comment on one point that he brought up, if I may?

Mr. TERRY. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I yield once again to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. If my colleague would be so kind, and I appreciate our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), being down here to work with us on this issue.

These local teams understand they are not just getting Federal money, and the Federal Government is funding the whole thing. Whether it is Presque County or the little city of Escanaba, where I was a police officer, or whether it is the big city of Detroit, the local units of government must put in money. It is a matching grant program. They have to put in resources. So it is a unified effort between local, county, and State police working together, and the seed money is really the Federal Government. Without the seed money, there is no incentive or urging of the county board of commissioners to fund an officer to work on the undercover task force team, because there will not be any.

So it is always a fight every year to keep these teams together and keep them properly funded and staffed with personnel. And if we lose the Federal funding, a 45 percent reduction, the problems that I am sure the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and I have spoken about will only get 45 percent worse within the year. So I appreciate the gentleman's leadership and the Members now with us.

Mr. TERRY. And just to take that thought and put it in context for someone like our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), who represents 68½ counties, this funds the multijurisdictional aspects that the local jurisdictions would not be able to fund because of their rules on funding. So this allows intra-agency and counties in the district of the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) to actually work together.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. OSBORNE. I thank the gentleman, and particularly thank him for organizing this Special Order and for his leadership on this issue. And it is great to see my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), and any others who will speak tonight.

Just a little background. Methamphetamine first came into prominence during World War II, and was used probably most prominently by kamikaze pilots. If you want to put a guy in a plane and give him enough fuel to hit a target, but not enough to get back, you had to maybe alter his thinking a little bit. And that is really where methamphetamine was first used and made prominent. At the present time it is rather easy to make and relatively cheap.

The good news is that in many areas we see cocaine and we see heroin decreasing. The bad news is the reason for this is that methamphetamine is so much more powerful and so much more addictive, it simply runs those other drugs out of business. So we are really alarmed by what is happening.

We find methamphetamine is available almost everywhere in our country. In 1990, California had 20 meth labs, Texas had 20, and the rest of the country was relatively unscathed from the meth problem. We will see the progression very rapidly here. In 1998, you can see that about two-thirds of the country had at least 20 meth labs in each one of these red States. It was still relatively uncommon on the east coast and parts of the Great Plains, the northern plains, were not affected.

Now we will look at what has happened more recently, and we see that in 2004, just a corner of the Northeast was pretty much left unscathed. And some of these States, for instance, Missouri, had 2,700 meth labs last year; Iowa, 1,300; Tennessee, 1,300; Oklahoma, 500; Arkansas, 800. Most of these States had 300, 400, 500, or 600 labs. And the important thing to remember is that a high percentage of these labs are not detected. So when we are detecting 400 or 500, that means there are probably three or four or five times that many out there, and these are simply indicators of the use of methamphetamine and how quickly this has spread.

Methamphetamine creates a euphoric state that lasts from 6 to 8 hours. It dumps a huge amount of dopamine, the chemical in the brain that enables us to feel pleasure, and may create as much as 1,000 times the amount of dopamine released into the system as a normal pleasurable experience; like making a free throw or asking somebody out for a date and being accepted, or whatever it may be.

The reason that people get hooked on this stuff is that many times you are addicted on the first occasion. And there are quite a few people who accidentally run into this thing. Maybe they are drinking; maybe somebody gives them something they are not even aware of what it is, and they are hooked. And it takes only, in many cases, one time.

People who are ofttimes addicted are young mothers who are overwhelmed by the chores of taking care of their kids, maybe working two jobs. Sometimes college students are staying up late at night to study; truck drivers. And quite often alcohol is the gateway drug. When somebody is inebriated, sometimes they will take almost anything somebody gives them, and, as a result, they are hooked.

However, what goes up must come down, and the fruits of the continued

use of methamphetamine are anxiety, depression, hallucinations, and, in many cases, it actually results in psychosis. One person who is an expert in this area said it hard-wires the brain to become a paranoid schizophrenic. And if anyone knows much about mental illness, they realize paranoid schizophrenia is probably the most difficult mental illness to kill.

Ofttimes people experience crank bugs. They assume that there is some type of a bug under their skin, so they begin to pick their skin, trying to get the bugs out. So usually people on meth have huge skin lesions and oftimes do not look very attractive, and, of course, ultimately the final end is death itself.

So why is it important to address this at this point? It is so powerful, it is so addictive, and it always damages the brain. For instance, if you take a brain scan of someone who has been on methamphetamine for 1 year, let us say an 18- or 19-year-old young person has been on meth for 1 year, you will find the brain scan will look almost identical to an 80-year-old Alzheimer's patient. There are that many brain lesions that have been created. Unfortunately, in most cases, those lesions have resulted in irreparable harm. There is nothing you can do to reverse it.

It is cheap and readily available almost everywhere, and this is the result of methamphetamine use. This is a young lady who was first arrested for using meth at about age 30, and then she was arrested each year for the next 10 years. You see the progression of what has happened to her. It was along about in here that the police assumed that she may have began to inject the drug, and from that point she went downhill very, very fast. Usually, the teeth are gone after a period of time. This was the final picture that was taken. It was taken in the morgue. And so she lasted roughly 10 years on this drug, and that is a little unusual. A lot of people who get into it use it heavily and do not last that long. So it is a devastating picture.

Just a few other things I would like to say before I turn it back over to my colleague. Actually, these meth labs are tremendously toxic. It costs about $5,000 to clean up one meth lab. As we said, many of these States have 1,000, 2,000, almost 3,000 meth labs a year to clean up.

□ 2115

One-third of the homes with meth labs in Nebraska were also homes where there were children. So almost all of these children suffer some type of harm from exposure to these chemicals. Much of the child abuse in Nebraska, I would say at least one-half of the child fatalities due to homicide are related to meth addiction. And we had roughly 3,000 young people, kids, in our country this last year who were harmed because they were in a situation where methamphetamine was being manufactured.

Roughly 40 percent of our Federal prison cells are occupied by those people who have been involved in the meth industry. In the State of Nebraska, each meth addict will commit 60 crimes a year to support that habit. So if a small community has 10 meth addicts, that is 600 crimes. So a lot of these communities where at one time left your keys in your car, left your doors unlocked, the whole atmosphere, the whole culture, has had to change.

I ran into a couple of farmers who called the hotline and said they were perplexed. They were having a hard time making it in farming, and somebody dropped by their farm and said if you stay away from your farm this year, do not show up much, you are going to make more money, we will pay you more money than you can ever make farming. They were going to use the barn or a couple of sheds to make methamphetamine. That is how insidious this whole thing is out in the countryside.

We have talked a lot about meth labs, and meth labs may comprise 25 to 30 percent of the total meth used in the United States. Most of it comes from super labs. At one time some came down out of Canada. This has been fairly well shut off, and now most comes from the southwest, most out of Mexico. It is critical that we get a handle on these superlabs, and particularly the pseudoephedrine used to make meth. There are only 7 or 8 countries where pseudoephedrine is made.

In Mexico, there is way more pseudoephedrine coming into that country than they will ever use in cold medicines. Somehow if we can get a handle on where that is going, I think we can begin to get a handle on the superlabs.

Lastly on the Byrne funding, the local law enforcement officers are the first line of defense. They break up the meth labs, but they also pick up the methamphetamine that is coming across Interstate 70, Interstate 80, and I–29. These are the people that have to intercept and interdict methamphetamine or it is not going to be done.

A lot of rural counties in Nebraska, 70 to 80 percent of law enforcement dollars are eaten up by the meth issue. It has become overwhelming. If we do, as is suggested in our upcoming appropriations bill, if we reduce this spending by one-half, and it was already cut in half, so we are down to roughly $300 million instead of $1 billion, we are simply going to be awash in methamphetamine.

I hate to oppose the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) on this issue because he has done a remarkable job of working with limited resources. He has been a great friend of law enforcement, but his hands have been tied. Maybe at this point the gentleman's amendment is the only resource that we have, which is to take one-half of one percent of that funding and at least get back to where we were last year, and we are still only half of where we were 2 or 3 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his amendment and thank the gentleman for hosting this Special Order tonight, and hope we are successful tomorrow.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE). The gentleman did a great job of laying it out. The Justice Department provided statistics, and last year we saw a decrease in the numbers of labs. There is one way of looking at that, that these Byrne grants have done their job by helping local law enforcement.

The reality is that while it is our local law enforcement that is finding these labs and breaking them up, and there is one that just moved away from my house, and a month or so before that they found one in the trunk of a car at super department store in a very affluent neighborhood in west Omaha, so these can be anywhere.

But what my local police officers are telling me is while the labs are a major part of the supply or a significant part of the supply, it is actually more now from the gang drug network coming in from the superlabs in Mexico that the gentleman spoke about. So as we are fighting the good fight and shutting down the labs, the drug dealers have found a new way to create supply in a different country across the border. They are using the already existing cocaine distribution system, and are using our kids to do that, which I think is one of the most horrible things that has happened in our society.

Mr. Speaker, with that I yield to the gentleman from western Iowa (Mr. KING), also a member of the meth caucus, and has been one of the loyalists in our fight to protect our families from this horrible drug.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) for organizing this Special Order tonight. I also thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) for his work on methamphetamines and drug interdiction, and for his work in this battle for our children and save and preserve the human resources that are our young people in this country.

Something that I think brings methamphetamine to the Midwest ahead of many places in the country is because we have a strong work ethnic. We have people who want to put a lot of their energy and their time into working, and they do not feel so guilty about using some drugs to get behind the steering wheel of a truck or do some other things. We have cleaned up a lot of that with the commercial drivers' licenses and the drug testing that is part of it. It is far safer on the road than it used to be. But the culture remains.

As the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) said, we also have access to the materials, especially anhydrous ammonia in the corn belt. That access to the materials to make drugs and that kind of culture that encourages people to use it has caused us to be more sensitive.

I watched it come into Iowa 10 years ago. I have spent my life in the construction business running bulldozers and scrapers and excavators and loaders and trucks, and out in the sun, heat, cold and rain. We have some element that comes into that industry that does use drugs. I have hired a lot of people over the last 28 years that I spent in business. We were not without a problem or two in our crew. We were not without a confrontation of me inviting that employee into my office, closing the door, setting my chair in front of the door and taking a stand that no one will leave this room until we come to an agreement that there is going to be some rehab, some therapy, there is going to be some treatment, and you are coming out the other side of this thing a productive human being again.

I have invested in this from a human standpoint, from a financial standpoint, and from a policy and legislative standpoint. In fact, the one single bill that I worked the hardest on in my entire legislative career was 2 years in the Iowa Senate to pass a good workplace drug testing law that we have in Iowa today. It took 2 years to get there, and it took nearly 12 months out of every year of relentless pounding to get that last vote, and we passed it by one vote. It has been in law since St. Patrick's Day of 1998. It allows private sector employers in Iowa to guarantee a drug-free workplace.

We are invested in this Iowa. We are invested in this in an intensive way. We understand the loss of human resources. In fact, if I had a magic wand, if God granted me the power to do a single thing today, and his message was to pick one thing, cure either cancer or eliminate illegal drugs, particularly methamphethamines, in a heartbeat I would say Lord, get rid of the illegal drugs. We will find a cure for cancer eventually. We are coming along cure by cure; but drugs steal human potential. They go into a person's life when they are young and full of potential, and they change the course and direction of that life, sometimes to the morgue, as the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) pointed out. That lady was from Iowa, by the way. And sometimes it ruins their potential. Their children suffer.

I believe that we need to do a lot of things to bring this drug scourge under control. One of them is to step up and do the funding necessary to support our law enforcement in their interdiction efforts.

I brought along this chart, this chart is similar to the chart that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) pointed out. It fits the same numbers. It is a little different way of presenting it, but it works out like this. The Byrne and the local law enforcement block grants fit in these categories in these previous years. And then we got to 2006, rolled them all together under the JAG grant, the Justice Assistance Grants, cut the funding and rolled them into one grant.

Our President, a man whom I admire, made a proposal that we go to zero on this. I agree with the gentlemen that the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) has done good work to get us where we are today. Going from the President's recommendation of zero on up to $348 million is no small thing. But we have a big, big problem all across this country, and we need to address it with the resources. So this increase in funding is necessary. It is unusual for an individual like me to come down and say we need to increase spending, but if it is invested in anything that provides return on that investment, it is going to be in fighting and interdicting drugs.

The effect on Iowa would be, as near as we can calculate, this: There would be 14 fewer multi-jurisdictional drug enforcement task forces. There would be only 11 left of 25. So there would be 41 fewer counties that had operations in them, 31 where there are 72 counties today. Out of 99 in Iowa, 72 have functioning operations. That would cut that 72 down to 31. We would have 57 fewer drug task force officers. That would be officers, prosecutors, treatment providers and other jurisdictional personnel.

So we would 36 out of 93. And the volume of illegal drugs confiscated in Iowa would be reduced by 1.4 tons due to fewer task force operators and officers, and the law enforcement agencies responses to protect the public from toxic meth labs would be delayed by 709 cases. All in all, 1,919, a calculated estimated number, fewer individuals would be brought forward for assistance for substance abuse treatment and adjudication for their crimes.

We know associated with illegal drugs are a whole series of crimes. These crimes include larceny, armed robbery, burglary, assault, raped, domestic abuse, child abuse and homicide. There will be fewer Iowans, fewer Americans alive a year, 2 years from now if we do not get this funding back up to where we can provide the proper resources for our law enforcement personnel.

In fact, I want to say a few words about the Regional Training Center in Sioux City, Iowa, which has done a magnificent job of training law enforcement officers. They were first put into place with the assistance of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) from the fourth district, the north central part of Iowa. They have reached out and done some exceptional things. I bring this sheet along to point out far the Regional Training Center has reached. They have trained 19,308 law enforcement officers from 38 different States and several foreign countries. If you step into that Regional Training Center, there are arm patches from police departments from all over the country and foreign countries.

They bring the officers in, teach them the technology, the infrared technology, the sensor technology, the means to apply their law enforcement. They put them through the gymnasium. They are working out in 90 and 95 degrees, working up a sweat, working out the physical part of their job that sometimes is necessary to arrest and bring the drug users to justice.

Also, they have implemented a new course there, a new course in the Regional Training Center that has for years trained law enforcement officers, over 19,000 of them. They have graduated 10 of the canine corps. I met all 10 of the canine corps one day. They were all lined up at attention. The dogs sit at attention, and they speak a foreign language.

□ 2130

They do that so they listen to their officers. Their officers speak a foreign language to them, and they respond to that so no one else can control the dogs. These dogs all graduated with good records and fine grades as far as I could tell and by the reports that they gave me.

By the way, the return on drug dogs is the best return on an investment dollar that I have seen in law enforcement with regard to dealing with drugs. The dogs are there all the time. They are essentially available 24 hours a day. It takes an officer to handle them, an officer to be trained with them. They are not cheap in their purchase and in their training, but once they go out into the field, they bring another element to them. They can sniff out drugs, they can sniff out bombs, they can control violent intruders, and they are trained to do all of that.

Additionally, there is just the intimidation effect. There is the effect of when there is a dog there that is sniffing everything you have, you are not likely to bring drugs through there, and he will find them.

I am looking forward to the next class to graduate. I understand that the next class is a class of 20. That will be the size of the canine corps so we can keep filling up the Midwest and the rest of the country, if all goes well, training drug dogs continually along with training officers. We will soon be over 20,000 officers. But that budget was cut last year from a $2 million previous appropriation and a $2.5 million cut, was cut down to $250,000. Some thought the decimal point just inadvertently fell in the wrong place in middle of the night with a bleary-eyed staffer, but there are not a lot of coincidences. They need their appropriation. I will be speaking with the chairman about that.

I want to thank also the chairman for including that line item for the regional training center at least in the budget, although there are no earmarks for this budget, and each, according to the way it is proposed, will have to compete for those grants. I am hopeful that the Regional Training Center in Sioux City will be able to do that. They certainly have served 38 countries. It qualifies them as a national center. In fact, the name has

just recently been changed to the National Training Center.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for bringing this subject before us. I look across at the speakers that have spoken so far and those to speak yet tonight. You can tell that this is a nationwide effort that we have. We care about our young people, our human potential. We want to give the tools to the people that have their lives on the line protecting us.

Mr. TERRY. I appreciate the gentleman's efforts on this cause. It is a great training center, by the way. He mentioned the patches. I happen to know that at least several, if not every one, of the departments that I have the pleasure of representing from the Second Congressional District have patches up there.

Mr. KING of Iowa. We will see if we can get those dogs to shake hands with you.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), who also is the head of the Speaker's Drug Task Force and probably the most impressive person in this body on his granular knowledge of the war on drugs.

Mr. SOUDER. I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his continued leadership over the past few weeks in trying to help make the rest of Congress aware of this and the importance of the votes we have this week, and to try to address the devastating proposals that came out of this administration that just flabbergast those of us who are Republicans, in particular who support this President, have supported this administration. And it is just unbelievable that a conservative President of the United States would have proposed to nationalize and take away the dollars that were going to local drug law enforcement and the years of effort that we put together to get State, local and Federal cooperation and, in one budget, attempt to wipe out this by zeroing out category after category.

First, I want to thank Chairman WOLF for putting some of this back, but clearly there is a revolution going on in the House of Representatives, in the United States Senate, that is furious at this administration's proposals.

Before I make a few comments here, I wanted to make Members and their staff and others aware that if you want to learn, the best source of information right now on meth is ironically by a reporter named Steve Suo from the Portland Oregonian newspaper. He has spent and deserves a Pulitzer Prize. He has dug into this. He has identified that China and India are the primary precursor chemical countries, as well as Mexico, the amount that is coming in from Mexico; details more of this over the last 2 years; has covered hearings throughout the country, the different problems around the country. You can get through their home page a lot of information, the best information that exists currently on meth.

Also, for Members in their districts, while our national ad campaign has been very disappointingly silent on meth, silent on meth, the Partnership For a Drug Free America has, in fact, created a number of ads that have started to run around the country. They have offered that any Member who would like to run these in their districts or figure out how to get them in the schools, they will make those available to any Member for free, produced by the top ad guys in the country. They are going to continue to develop additional ads because in spite of the Federal Government not responding aggressively enough on meth, at least the Partnership For a Drug Free America is.

A lot of times people say, How come you guys can't work together across the aisle? Why isn't there bipartisan effort? A few years ago, probably now about 6 years ago, I would guess, Congressman Doug Ose of California was the first to raise this question of the superlabs and meth in California. It was just starting to move. It may have even been 8 years ago now that we had our first hearing. I chair the narcotics subcommittee over in Government Reform. We had our first hearing in California. I was not chairman at that time. I think the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) was chairman.

At this point we have held multiple hearings through our committee. Two Members, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE), which is historically, along with California, the oldest State to face the meth problem, and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), which is arguably, along with southwest Missouri, the hardest hit right now in the congressional districts with the number of labs combined with the superlab material coming in, asked for hearings, and we did those, the gentleman from Hawaii being a Democrat, the gentleman from Arkansas being a Republican. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY), who is here on the floor, has asked for a hearing in Minnesota along with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), four Members from Minnesota. We are having a hearing in St. Paul at Congressman KENNEDY's request next Monday on meth. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), who chairs the Committee on Homeland Security, has a tremendous coordinated effort to try to address meth and OxyContin in Kentucky. We are going to be going down there and looking at theirs. We have hearing requests in from at least 10 congressional districts on this hearing, including from the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), where we have a lot of pressure, as well as Washington State.

I say that because this is bipartisan. When you see a bipartisan effort coming out of the House of Representatives throughout the entire Nation, why in the world would the President's budget propose to zero out the meth hot spots program, to zero out the Byrne grants, to zero out and transfer the money, basically wipe out the HIDTAs and move that to the Federal Government, to zero out program after program that was addressing this question and as an alternative propose nothing except the nationalization and say, well, this problem isn't at the local level. It is fine to say that, but as we have heard earlier, and this is from the FBI reports, 95 percent, I heard earlier 90, according to the FBI, 95 percent of the arrests of drug violators are at the State and local level, not at the Federal level.

If you think about it, we are working so aggressively on border security right now, but what happens the other week? A guy comes across the Canadian border, even though he was supposed to be at a hearing, so the RCMP said that he should have been held, comes across with a bloody chainsaw, with knuckles, with knives and guns, and he comes across. How does he get picked up? The information goes out, but he was not caught by the FBI, he was not caught by the DEA, he was not caught by the Department of Homeland Security; he was caught by a State and local official, because when the Federal Government put out the announcements, that is who picks them up.

If you are looking for major drug dealers, often you get them like Al Capone. You get them on some other count. You do not get him on murder. You get him on an IRS charge.

In the case of drug violators, gang violators, the State and locals get notified by the Federal system, but ultimately they are the people to pick them up. But if there are no State and local drug task forces, if they do not have any money, nobody is going to be picking them up. And so what if you have a bunch of great task forces sitting here in Washington. Nobody is going to be out there to coordinate and arrest them and get the information. You can send out all the bulletins you want, but if there are not any drug task forces in America, nobody is going to go find the criminals that you sent your notices out about.

Let me make a couple of comments. We held a hearing on the HIDTAs and the Byrne grants in my subcommittee. Sheriff Jack Merritt of Greene County, Missouri, suggested by our majority whip, Congressman BLUNT, his hometown sheriff, said this, that he would not be able to maintain the joint DEA, State and local antimeth task force in his county if these funds were cut. Vital equipment such as bulletproof vests and in-car cameras, which his officers need to protect themselves while carrying out meth traffic investigations, could not be purchased because the administration proposed to get rid of the CPOT funding. He spoke eloquently of the children he and his officers find at meth lab sites, children

who are at severe risk. He stated that if his task forces are forced to shut down, he wonders how many more generations of children will be condemned to the same fate.

Mr. Mark Henry, president of the Illinois Drug Enforcement Officers Association in the Speaker's home State of Illinois, said that Byrne grants help local police departments fill a critical gap which exists between Federal drug enforcement programs. The overwhelming majority, 87.6 percent, of all police departments in the United States have less than 50 officers, and Byrne grants play a critical role in supporting multijurisdictional drug task forces which are the backbone of law enforcement agencies. So we had asked Mr. Henry, and he came to our hearing with a list of comments from the State of Illinois that said the following: If Federal funds under the Byrne program are eliminated, our unit will lose three agents. The loss of these agents will cripple our ability to continue effective narcotics investigations. Narcotics trafficking will go unchecked and spread. We might as well turn the keys to our communities over to the gangs.

Another sheriff said, Although the local law enforcement agencies, the business and education community rely heavily on the task force expertise in combating the fight against drugs, without the existence of the task force, violent crime and burglaries will likely increase dramatically.

Another sheriff said, The elimination of the Byrne grant would have a catastrophic effect on the metropolitan enforcement group of southwest Illinois.

Another sheriff in Illinois said, Without the funding that we currently receive from the Byrne grant, our mission would be all but nonexistent.

Another sheriff said, and this is the Illinois Narcotics Officers Association polled their State membership, The elimination or reduction of Byrne funding would force police officers off the street to do clerical work, eliminate communication equipment such as pagers and cell phones, and eliminate Federal funding to reimburse a portion of officer overtime cost.

Yet another department said, The elimination of the Byrne funding will have a very negative impact on our ability to address the drug problems in the Lake County area of Illinois. The loss of funding will cause us to eliminate the staff positions. This will cause the jobs they now perform to be reassigned to police officers.

Yet another department said, Task Force 6 is the primary drug enforcement entity in this area and has been a fixture in this area since 1983. Proposed Byrne cuts will result in the closure of this unit. Narcotics-related crime will increase dramatically, and drug dealers will operate at will without the presence of Task Force 6.

Yet another department said, The elimination or reduction of this grant would have a very severe impact on the task force. At the present time the funding accounts for 50 percent of the task force funds, with the remaining 50 percent made up from fines and forfeitures. I strongly believe the elimination of this funding will force the task force to close its doors. That is from the Speaker's home State of Illinois.

From my home State of Indiana in Fort Wayne, Indiana, we do not have a HIDTA. We did not apply for a HIDTA because we have Byrne grants. Our task force has told me in northeast Indiana, it will shut down without the Byrne grants. Fifty percent means only 50 percent shuts down.

We have tremendous budget pressures in the United States, and all of us know we have these tremendous budget pressures. But the people back home are not telling us, Let the criminals go free. Let's concentrate on foreign aid. Let's concentrate on all sorts of different programs. What they believe is the minimum standard out of the Federal Government is that we should be shutting down crime, controlling our borders, getting rid of the threats to their daily lives.

It is just incredible to me that a conservative administration would propose bringing the power to Washington rather than leaving it at the grassroots where we are having an effect, where drug use in the United States has been declining. And where is our drug czar? Where is our administration? As we are making progress, they are proposing to go backwards.

I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his leadership and the others here tonight because we have to stand up and say, you cannot forget the people back home and say, we are going to turn you loose, and good luck in fighting all these criminals.

Mr. TERRY. Absolutely. I really appreciate your forceful and passionate words on the floor tonight and just how staunchly you have stood on this fight. I thank you for those efforts.

Just one little bit of trivia. You talked about how our own police officers on the front lines have to be trained to deal with meth. In fact, one of the new things adopted by the Omaha Police Department, they are now having the emergency response or the snipers go with the officers when they exercise a warrant on a meth bust now because usually when you break into somebody's home or you are smashing the door down exercising a warrant, these people are so extraordinarily violent that we have had to go to those level of measures in the metropolitan area.

Mr. SOUDER. The gentleman brings up a very critical other point. That is that the map we saw earlier that Coach, Congressman, maybe Governor OSBORNE had up here showed all these States where meth has been in. But it has been predominantly in the rural areas. But what we are seeing is that it is starting to come into towns like Fort Wayne, a town of 230,000, in Omaha, and if this stuff hits the major cities, if it gets into Minneapolis and St. Paul, as it comes in from the rural areas and into the suburbs and into those cities, we are going to see an epidemic in America like we have not seen in a long time. Things like what you are talking about with the snipers, in one place in Hawaii, they are now charging people to go in, I think it is $200, to get their apartment cleaned before they come in because if somebody has been cooking in Honolulu and a kid gets into that, they can get sick and die. So now there is a charge in some apartment complexes to be able to go in.

Mr. TERRY. I am pleased to have as one of our last speakers for tonight the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY), who has also been a very forceful fighter against meth and is a member of the Meth Caucus and actually one of the coauthors of the amendment that has been referenced several times tonight.

□ 2145

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) for holding this Special Order. I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman SOUDER) for his leadership on all of this.

It is going to take all of us together to make sure that we address this very important issue. We have concerns that we are not putting enough resources into funding to help out local law enforcement address the very challenging issues that are tearing up our communities with methamphetamine and drugs. And as the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) pointed out, this started out in just a few States, but it has really spread all way from San Diego to the Shenandoah Valley. That is why we have to support these good, working anti-drug programs.

One key, though, is that these drug task forces need to be supported. There are 800 around the country. If we go through with what the President proposed or even what the good work of the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and his committee have resulted in, we are going to be losing those drug task forces that have been doing such great work.

As we think about what this is all about, I am thinking about a tragic story of a young girl named Megan from a beautiful town in Minnesota. She started on meth when she was in seventh grade at the age of 13, when some of her friends offered her the drug. And in her words, she liked meth so much that she knew she would use it over and over again. But when she could not afford the addiction, she, like so many other female addicts, was exploited into becoming a prostitute to pay for the meth she craved every second of the day.

After hitting rock bottom at the age of 18, Megan is managing to pull her life back together now after 5 years have been stolen from her by meth. But she has too much company in the

treatment and addiction programs because about one in five of those treated for meth use in the State of Minnesota are 17 years old or younger. But just as Megan is finding a way out of this black hole, we are thinking about cutting the funding for Byrne grants that help local police address the meth issues.

These cuts are wrong. They will cut task forces in our State and across the country, and who will be there to protect the children from those making and pushing the poison if this House approves such a devastating cut in the Byrne-Justice Assistance Grant program?

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that there has to be a better way, and there is. We can help young people like Megan reject meth before they even try it by restoring Byrne grants to the fiscal year 2005 funded level. Doing so will send a strong signal that Congress is serious about fighting the scourge of the meth. We must send a signal that the Byrne grant program is important to Congress and that we do support the work of the local officials. We must send a signal to the pushers of this poison that they are not welcome in our communities. Most importantly, we must send a signal to our law enforcement officers who wake up every morning to protect our families that we stand with them in fighting against drugs and we will work with them to give them every tool they need to be successful.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) and I have helped to put forth. Let us stand with law enforcement. Let us protect the Byrne grant program.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his comments.

And this is Angela from Iowa. Like the little girl in Minnesota, this is her school picture. I do not know if our C–SPAN cameras can get tight on this or not. This is her 12-year-old picture, her school class picture. This is her at 13, a year later, after similar friends turned her on to meth. And this had a little different, tragic end. This little girl, after her mother found her and tried to clean her up, could not kick the habit of meth and committed suicide. And, unfortunately, that is the way that many of these tragedies end.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for sponsoring this legislation.

Based on my experience as a judge and prosecutor for almost 30 years combined, this epidemic of methamphetamine is a disease that is affecting a lot of people. It crosses all barriers, all social economic barriers, all races, all ages, both sexes. And it is incumbent upon Congress to make sure that our local law enforcement officials have the ability to fight the war on drugs, to fight it the way they understand best, and the nationalization of this whole process is a very bad idea.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's coming over to the floor and speaking in favor of this amendment against meth, and he certainly has had some worldly experiences that he can speak from.

HAS THE SUPREME COURT LOST ITS WAY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JINDAL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to ask a question, and that question is relatively simple. By what legal authority do justices of our Supreme Court use foreign world tribunals, global opinion, and the philosophy of European elites in making their decisions, those decisions that affect all Americans of this Nation? By what license, by what authority do members of America's highest court ignore our Constitution, the Constitution they took an oath to defend, and why do they cite foreign court decisions at all, decisions from England, the European Union, the World Court, Belgium, and numerous other nations? The Constitution clearly does not give them the power to abandon the scriptures of the Constitution. So where do they obtain such authority? Mr. Speaker, has the Supreme Court lost its way?

I imagine that these justices wonder who I am to question them and their use of foreign court decisions in making laws that apply to the rest of us. With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I am a citizen of the Republic just as they are. I am an elected representative of this House that represents the people. Furthermore, I possess a loyal and lengthy relationship with the law. I am a former instructor in constitutional law. I was a trial prosecutor for 8 years, trying every type of criminal case from theft to kidnapping to capital murder, including cases where the death penalty was assessed and executions were actually carried out.

But more recently, I spent 22 years as a felony court trial judge in Houston, Texas. I heard over 20,000 criminal cases. In fact, I suspect I heard more criminal cases in 1 year than all the nine judges of the Supreme Court decided in an equal amount of time. As a criminal court judge, I used the Constitution, particularly the first 14 amendments, every day. I made decisions that affected people, real people, defendants, victims, and the community. Those decisions affected those individuals for the rest of their lives. I determined whether individuals should lose their property, their liberty, and their freedom. Sometimes the decisions I made even resulted in those individuals losing their life. Yet every one of those 20,000 cases was rooted in the United States Constitution.

Individuals who came to my court, whether they were defendants, victims, or members of the community, knew that the basis of all American law is in the Constitution. Not my personal opinion, not the rulings of foreign nations, and not the World Court. Not even what the French think. It is the Constitution that gives all courts from trial courts to the courts of appeal their foundation, their identity. If I had used any other law but that of the Constitution, I would have been removed from the bench.

In the jury trials over which I presided, the jury too would take an oath to follow the law and the evidence. They were to internalize the law of the Constitution and make their decisions. They were expected to decide the case with domestic law, our law, not the law in some other nation.

Mr. Speaker, if our Supreme Court uses foreign court decisions, why cannot our trial courts use foreign court decisions in their opinions? If the Supreme Court justices are our example, why cannot that example be followed by other judges in America? Is it not good for the gander what is good for the goose?

Using foreign court decisions across the board would create, of course, judicial chaos, judicial anarchy. But yet the Supreme Court does exactly this. Why should the Supreme Court be left to its own devices? If there is any other standard other than the Constitution, than what is next?

Mr. Speaker, looking to foreign court decisions is as relevant as using the writings in ''Reader's Digest,'' a Sears and Roebuck catalogue, a horoscope, my grandmother's recipe for the common cold, looking at tea leaves, star gazing, or the local gossip at the barber shop in Cut N' Shoot, Texas. Mr. Speaker, has the Supreme Court lost its way?

Also, how do our justices know which foreign decisions they will embrace and which ones they will reject? Why have they discriminated and not used the decisions of our neighbors in South and Central America or even Mexico? I have personally witnessed trials in Russia and in China. Why not use those courts' decision in determining American jurisprudence? Who exactly decides what will be used to decide? Is there any longer predictability or uniformity in our legal system?

Mr. Speaker, many of the judicial matters for which our justices consult the opinions of other nations deal with the issue of cruel and unusual punishment. That is a concept addressed in our very own Constitution. Just like the provisions for a jury trial are in our Constitution. Now, I ask this question: If the Supreme Court justices look to foreign courts to define what should be cruel and unusual punishment in our Nation, then I ask what is to restrain them from determining that our guarantee of a jury trial should not be modified? After all, many of the international entities that these