

our Government to pay for the security of this Nation.

When you are spending taxpayer money for bridges that go nowhere, funding fish hatcheries and wasting precious dollars on foreign give-away programs, we must be responsible to the country by securing the air. That is the first duty of government.

Mr. Speaker, when the next airline files for bankruptcy, we will all bemoan the tragic news, but unless we change our policy the Federal Government will be responsible for putting an institution, the airline industry, on the road of economic ruin, and then we will ask the question what happened to the airlines in our skies.

REDUCE OUR DEPENDENCE ON FOSSIL FUELS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, if we want to reduce the threat of terrorism against the United States, we must rust reduce America's dependence on foreign oil. Nothing threatens our country and our security more than our reliance on oil from repressive Middle East regimes like Saudi Arabia and Libya.

Of the 21 million barrels of oil consumed by the U.S. each day, 14 million are imported from other countries. Most are imported from the Middle East, where as we know democracy is not pervasive. This lack of democracy allow the authoritarian leaders of many Middle East countries to pocket billions of dollars each year from American oil purchases.

So while the leaders of these countries are becoming increasingly wealthy, the rest of their people fail to benefit from the oil proceeds. Sadly, this economic disparity allows the powerful elite to tighten their hold over their people.

This repressive power structure allows the conditions which give rise to terrorism, resource scarcity, extreme poverty, and lack of education to run rampant. It is quite clear that we need to decrease our dependence on foreign oil in order to keep America safe from the threat of terrorism.

But there is a right way, and there is a wrong way to accomplish this goal. Many Members of Congress have suggested, today in fact, that we can simply drill for gas and oil off the coasts of our shores, or in places like the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska to solve our energy crisis.

Unfortunately this suggestion is just plain wrong. In fact, drilling for oil in the United States would do little to immediately reduce our dependence on foreign oil, because it would take at least a decade to get a drilling operation up and running in ANWR or off our coasts, and even then there is no telling whether there is usable oil.

That does not sound like a comprehensive energy strategy to me. No.

Drilling for oil just is not the answer. We need to accept the fact that fossil fuel is a thing of the past. To solve the current energy crisis and to prepare for a secure and successful future, we need to invest in conservation and renewable and efficient sources of energy.

For example, providing tax incentives for the construction of energy efficient buildings and manufacturing energy efficient heating and water heating equipment could save 300 trillion cubic feet of natural gas over 50 years.

By failing to take advantage of renewable energy technologies, we are continuing to promote our national insecurity by providing billions of dollars each year to repressive regimes.

That is why I have reintroduced the smart security resolution, H. Con. Res. 158. SMART is a sensible multilateral American response to terrorism.

SMART will help secure America for the future by preventing the threat of terrorism, by reducing nuclear stockpiles, eliminating the possible use of nuclear weapons through diplomatic means, and establishing a new Apollo project to secure America's energy independence.

Many Members of Congress understand the importance of reducing our dependence on foreign oil to ensure our national security, and that is why 49 of my colleagues signed on as original co-sponsors to the SMART security resolution.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's energy and foreign policies are interconnected. One cannot address one without addressing the other. That is why SMART security promotes a new Apollo project that will ensure our Nation's energy security within the next 10 to 15 years.

If we fail to address this problem, we will only ensure the continuation of deep disparities of wealth in the Middle East. These misguided policies will encourage future acts of terrorism, which will encourage future warfare.

And speaking of warfare, do we know for sure that our reason for attacking Iraq was not to take control of Iraqi's oil? Until we are independent of our need for foreign oil, we will always be suspect. It is time to get serious about our reliance on foreign oil, which will lead directly to a smarter security strategy.

METHAMPHETAMINE PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to discuss a major problem that is moving rapidly across the country. That is the problem of methamphetamine.

Methamphetamines first came into prominence during World War II. Many Japanese kamikaze pilots were given methamphetamine to allow them to finish their mission.

From that point on it spread to Hells Angel and other biker groups on the West Coast and has been slowly spreading its way from west to east across the country. It is the most highly addictive drug that is known at the present time, often causes complete addiction after only one usage.

It creates a euphoria that lasts between 6 and 8 hours. There is a huge dopamine release in the brain, and it is cheap. It costs much less than heroin and cocaine, provides increased energy. Many young mothers who have two or three kids and have a tremendous energy drain become drawn to this particular drug.

People who are working two jobs, sometimes truck drivers who want to stay awake for 2 or 3 days on end find that methamphetamine serves their ends. Often it always results in fairly rapid weight loss.

However, whatever goes up must come down, and we find that those who are using methamphetamine usually will experience, at times, extreme anxiety, depression, hallucinations, many times will actually sink into a psychosis.

Violent behavior is often a side effect. Many methamphetamine addicts experience crank bugs. These are the hallucination that there is a bug underneath the skin. As a result, in order to get those bugs out, they will pick at their skin. That will cause rather extreme skin lesions to result.

Also, when they use it orally, their teeth disintegrate very rapidly, extremely quick aging, and usually death ensues within a few years of methamphetamine use.

It always causes brain damage. And much of this brain damage is irreversible. An 18-year old who has been on meth for a year will have a brain scan that will look very like an 80-year old Alzheimer's patient. There is so much brain tissue that has been destroyed, that the two brain scans are somewhat indistinguishable.

It is very common to see a great deal of meth abuse in rural areas. And this is due to the fact that when you manufacture meth, there is a very strong odor of ether. And as a result, if you manufacture in the city, sometimes that odor is easily detectable.

The chief ingredient of methamphetamine is pseudophedrine, a common cold medicine. Oklahoma has done a fairly effective job of eliminating the meth labs by making pseudophedrine a class V substance. And that puts it behind the pharmacy counter.

But many other States have failed to follow suit. Other ingredients of methamphetamine are lithium batteries, drain cleaner, starter fluid, anhydrous ammonia, and iodine.

It is a tremendously toxic mix, and of course it lease a lot of toxic waste. In order to clean up a methamphetamine lab, it will cost anywhere from \$5 to \$6,000. Many of the suits that are worn by those cleaning un those meth labs cost about \$500, and they can only be used one time because of the toxicity.

Some areas of middle America have had as many as 1,500 to 2,000 meth labs per year in these States, so it a huge expense to clean up, and a huge problem in terms of addiction.

The average meth addict, in my State, Nebraska, will commit roughly 60 crimes a year to feed that habit. So if you have ten meth addicts in a community that is 600 crimes a year. If that a small town that is a huge impact.

Much of the child abuse, child neglect, homicides, suicides that we see in these areas are due directly to methamphetamine abuse. Many counties in these areas spend 70 to 80 percent of their law enforcement dollars and their manpower on meth issues.

Our jail cells and our prisons are filled. We simply cannot keep up and take care of the methamphetamine problem. So the question is, what can Congress do with this huge problem? Currently our Byrne and our HIDTA funds, which are high intensity drug trafficking funds have been drastically reduced. We need to restore these funds. This is a huge problem in terms of funding.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and also the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) have introduced legislation that regulates the sale of pseudophedrine that is necessary in the manufacture of methamphetamine. And also they would provide extra funds for meth lab clean-ups.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER's) bill tracks manufacturers of pseudophedrine worldwide. And of course the pseudophedrine goes to many of the super labs, they are only seven or eight factories for pseudophedrine worldwide. And so if we know where those drugs are going, where the pseudophedrine is going, we have a pretty good idea where the super labs are.

So these bills would be tremendously helpful. So I call attention to the meth problem, call attention to the reduction in funding, and we really need to do everything we can to stamp this problem out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2115

THE DAY HAS COME TO EXIT IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in this week's Conservative Chronicle, William F. Buckley has a column entitled "Day has come to Exit Iraq."

He refers to the U.S. casualty figures, now over 1,600 dead and 11,000 wounded, and we continue to lose about 50 dead a month, and says, "Moreover, the Iraqi deaths have increased substantially since the national election in January."

Mr. Buckley writes, "We are entitled to say to ourselves: If the bloodletting is to go on, it can do so without our involvement in it."

He adds, "The day has come where we say that our part of the job is done as well as it can be done. It is Iraq's responsibility to move on to wherever Iraq intends to go."

Of course, several months ago, Mr. Buckley said that if he known in 2002 what he knows now, he never would have supported the war in Iraq in the first place.

These words are from William F. Buckley, a man author Lee Edwards described as the "godfather" of the conservative movement.

There never was anything conservative about the war in Iraq. I said from the start that it would mean massive foreign aid, huge deficit spending, and that it was not far to place almost all the entire burden of enforcing U.N. resolutions on our taxpayers and our military. Conservatives have traditionally been the biggest critics of the U.N., and the worst part of all, of course, is all the deaths.

All to bring do not an evil man, but one whose military budget was 2/10ths of 1 percent of ours and who was no threat to us whatsoever.

Two months before the House voted to authorize the war in Iraq, our then-Majority leader, Dick Arme, said, "I don't believe that America will justifiably make an attack on another Nation. My on view would be to let him, Saddam Hussein, rant and rave all he wants and let that be a matter between he and his own country. We should not be addressing any attack or resources against him."

Mr. Arme understood there was nothing conservative about the war in Iraq.

I voted in 1998 to give \$100 million to the Iraqi opposition to help them remove Hussein. We should have let the Iraqis remove Hussein instead of sending our troops to fight and die there. Iraq had not attacked us or even threatened to attack us, and they were not even able to attack us.

By the end of this year, we will have spent \$300 billion in Iraq and Afghanistan, with probably 85 to 90 percent of that being in Iraq.

But are we following the latest advice by William F. Buckley in getting out? No. Unfortunately, we are doing just the opposite.

Paul Wolfowitz, the father of this war, told the House Committee on Armed Services several months ago that we would have to be in Iraq for at least 10 years.

Last week, a Congressional Quarterly headline said, "with ink just dry on War Supplemental, more spending expected before August."

The Congress has just approved \$82 billion more and now we are told we will be asked for even more as early as this coming August.

Instead of getting out, as William Buckley has recommended, Congress Daily reported last week that a Congressional Research Service study "portends a more permanent presence" in Iraq and the Middle East.

The report noted approval of \$2.2 billion for additional military construction in the Middle East, supporting activities in Iraq, including \$75 million for an airfield in Kuwait, \$66 million for an air base in the United Arab Emirates, and \$43 million for a new runway in Uzbekistan.

At a time, Mr. Speaker, when we are closing down bases in the U.S., we are building like crazy all over the world, especially in Iraq and the Middle East.

I am pro-military and pro-national defense, but I do not believe we can shoulder the defense of the entire world.

Our Founding Fathers would be shocked at what we are doing, and most of what we have done in Iraq is pure foreign aid, rebuilding roads, several thousand schools, power plants, bridges, water systems, free medical care and on and on and on. I believe in having a strong Department of Defense, but I do not believe it should be a department of foreign aid.

Syndicated columnist Georgie Ann Geyer wrote, "Critics of the war against Iraq have said since the beginning of the conflict that Americans, still strangely complacent about overseas wars being waged by a minority in their name, will inevitably come to a point where they will see they have to have a government that provides services at home or one that seeks empire across the globe."

Seventeen American soldiers were killed in Iraq over the last two weekends and a few others during the week.

Some have said if we pull out a civil war would erupt there. Well, what do my colleagues think we have there now?

We should at least stop the killing of American kids, heed the advice of William F. Buckley, Junior, and begin a phased and orderly withdrawal.

We cannot afford to stay there for years either in terms of lives or money.