Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce an important piece of legislation, the Methamphetamine Elimination Act. This bill will take great strides in ridding our Nation of the dangerous drug, methamphetamine.

Methamphetamine, or "meth," is truly a terrifying drug. It is highly addictive and, when repeated use, can cause extreme nervousness, paranoia, and dramatic mood swings. Unfortunately, meth use goes hand in hand with brutal child abuse and domestic violence. Often, children, the innocent bystanders, are neglected, abused by parents who are involved with meth production or use.

Methamphetamine is fast becoming the crack epidemic of the 1990's. Meth production and use is a nationwide problem, cutting across all income and racial divisions; the impact, however, is disproportionally felt in California. The Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) has identified California as a "source country" of methamphetamine with literally hundreds of clandestine laboratories, or "clan labs," located throughout the State.

Clan labs have proliferated at such a pace that California officials now consider them major threats to the public, law enforcement and public communities, even the environment. In just 1996, the Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement [BNE] raided 835 clan labs in California, up from 465 in 1995. Just think of that 835 labs seized in California in 1 year—almost one every 10 hours. Clearly, California is on the front line in the war on methamphetamine.

As a result, California is in desperate need to help to fight this wicked drug. The Methamphetamine Elimination Act would provide $18 million to the Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement to fight meth through a 5-point strategy. Specifically, funds from this legislation will be used to hire, train, and equip 126 sworn and nonsworn law enforcement staff to do the following:

First, establish enforcement teams to target chemical sources and major traffickers/organizations.

Second, establish an intelligence component to provide strategic and tactical support to meth enforcement teams.

Third, establish a forensics component within the BNE to provide on-site laboratory services. Lab site analysis—in addition to providing for the immediate safety of law enforcement personnel—will allow BNE to bring pending investigation to bear law enforcement services not currently available.

Fourth, develop lab training for law enforcement officers. Training involves basic classes covering the danger of the labs and the use of chemically used agents in the manufacture of meth.

Fifth, establish a community outreach program to promote public awareness, the primary focus of which will be young people.

This strategy is designed to coincide with the National Methamphetamine Strategy, which was based upon work by Federal, State and local law enforcement officials during the National Methamphetamine Conference held in Washington, DC last year. There is widespread support for the implementation of this strategy, including the support of the California Sheriff's Association, the California Chiefs of Police Association and the District Attorneys Association.

The time has come to devote significant Federal resources to this nationwide problem. In the last Congress, we passed comprehensive legislation over the objections of the Administration. Now, we need to assist States like California that are on the front lines of this battle. Therefore, I strongly urge support for the Methamphetamine Elimination Act.

STOP FORCE-FEEDING THE PENTAGON

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, it is a new era in the Pentagon. The argument for new priorities must stop. Space race, Cold War, Vietnam, the Pentagon got everything it wanted. The United States, in the past month, has spent more on the military than the rest of the world combined. It is time to remember that the United States is no longer in a position to afford this folly; the military does consume more than entitlements and interest on the national debt.

National security challenges, the costs of its mismanagement, and the Pentagon's budget are serious. We must make choices. We should not provide the Pentagon more than it asks for.

We are not in a zero-sum game. We no longer have the luxury of simply adding funding. We must make choices. We should not provide the Pentagon more than it asks for.

The editorial follows:

[From The Nation, Mar. 24, 1997]

PENTAGON OR BUST

There are many reasons to cut Pentagon spending. The United States already consume about one-third of the global military budget, spending more than five times as much as any other country. The Pentagon remains the largest source of the abuse in the federal government. While it issues about two-thirds of all federal paychecks and makes about two-thirds of all federal purchases of goods and services, it is so haphazard it can't be audited. The General Accounting Office just reported that the Pentagon was storing $41 billion in excess inventory. Billions more are lost in undocumented payments, misplaced funds, mismanaged programs. Yet the Pentagon remains immune from both Republican efforts to dismantle government and Democratic attempts to rein it in.

Not even our nation's security is well served by current policy. The Administration is extending military commitments while closing embassies, slashing aid budgets, stifling international institutions, thus crippling the U.S. ability to lead in addressing deteriorating international and social conditions. At home, the military remains our primary industrial policy and public works program, while investments in our economy, education, training, infrastructure, nonmilitary research and development—are starved.

The United States currently is rich enough to afford this folly: the military does consume a smaller portion of our gross national product than at any time since before World War II. But as Representative Barney Frank observes on page 21, the bipartisan commitment to balance the budget in five years while cutting taxes and protecting Social Security and Medicare will force brutal cuts in discretionary spending (everything other than entitlements and interest on the national debt). Choices must therefore be made.

The military, which already captures more than half of all discretionary spending, has exacted a pledge for a 40 percent increase in personnel over the next 5 years. The Pentagon's Quadrennial Defense Review report, due in May, is timed perfectly to reinforce its claim to the money: The brass hope to lock in their budgets and build walls around them in the bipartisan budget agreement widely expected this year.

But going soft on the military will require cuts of 25 to 30 percent or more from domestic programs. The argument is no longer about cutting the military to invest at home but how much will be cut from poor schools, toxic waste cleanup, Head Start, roads and mass transit and how much from the Pentagon.

The argument for new priorities must begin with a renewal of investment—children, cities, mass transit, health care and education, in clean water and clean air. As Republicans found in the last election, Americans do not favor deep cuts in education, environmental safeguards or health care.

As we make the case for reinvestment, the Pentagon can be brought down to size. As the debate, the military-based definition of U.S. security challenged, the costs of its misplaced priorities detailed, Frank suggests a path to what he calls a "location," a small group working to preserve a domestic program to educate its members about the stark...