

on the ground to meet a standard of 20 troops per 1,000. This number is more than three times the number of foreign troops now deployed in Iraq."

Paul Bremer writes: "I found the conclusions persuasive and troubling. That afternoon, I had a summary of the draft copied and sent down the corridor to Don Rumsfeld. 'I think you should consider this,' I said in my cover memo. I have never heard back from him about the report."

Now, I am not here to help sell books for Paul Bremer, but the President's top man asked for more troops to succeed in Iraq and never got an answer from either the President of the United States or from the Secretary of Defense. When Secretary Don Rumsfeld completely ignores the man who is in charge of America's most important policy mission, we have a problem.

A few days later, Paul Bremer got a chance to air his concerns to the President: "There is one other important issue, Mr. President. Troop levels."

Troop levels never increased. The troop level never got up. In Iraq, Bremer's worst fears were realized, and he writes: "According to CENTCOM briefings in Qatar, we didn't yet have enough troops in Baghdad to secure key tactical objectives, traffic circles, bridges, power plants, banks and munition dumps, and also patrol the streets."

We will never know for sure if more troops would have secured Baghdad in time to prevent the insurgency we see today, but we do know that the President's top man had asked for help and the President failed to respond, and the Secretary of Defense failed to respond; and today we are seeing the results of that failure. And we do know that 136,000 men and women who are there now do not have the support that they need.

If you look today in the New York Times in a poll done by Mr. Zogby, the American troops don't think we have enough troops. They also don't think we should continue to stay there at the level that we are there.

Retired Army Lieutenant General Bill Odom, former head of the National Security Agency, said that the invasion of Iraq "will turn out to be the greatest single strategic disaster in U.S. foreign policy."

Lawrence Wilkerson, former Secretary of State Colin Powell's chief of staff at the State Department, said President Bush's foreign policy was "ruinous" and said that "we have courted disaster in Iraq, North Korea, and in Iran."

Mr. Speaker, it is time for a change in policy.

#### RETAIN BYRNE-JAG GRANTS

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, while police

officers representing law enforcement organizations with over 100,000 members from every congressional district in the country were on Capitol Hill lobbying to save Byrne-JAG formula grants, police officers just outside the town of Monticello in my district in Minnesota were proving why the short-sighted elimination of the Byrne-JAG program must be rejected.

During a mid-afternoon traffic stop involving several individuals from Washington State in a vehicle likely stolen in California, a Minnesota State trooper noticed the smell of meth coming from a car.

After a brief search of the car with a trained drug dog, an elaborate trunk-latch device wired to the car's air conditioning knob was discovered and eight sealed packages and one large ziploc bag of meth were located in the car's passenger-side air bag compartment. In all, more than 11.5 pounds of meth worth over \$1 million was taken off our streets, along with several traffickers who profit from dealing this poison.

Mr. Speaker, 11.5 pounds of meth is the equivalent of over 45,000 hits. One hit of meth is enough to form an addiction more difficult to break than even heroin.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the police officers who made this bust and kept this staggering amount of meth out of the community in my district and likely those of many of my colleagues. However, Mr. Speaker, imagine how much meth they were not able to catch because of the devastating cuts to the Byrne-JAG program.

For the second year in a row, the administration has singled out the Byrne-JAG program for elimination, despite the fact that local police and the communities they protect praise the valuable source of crime-fighting grant money it provides.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join Representative LEE TERRY and me in our letter to the Budget Committee urging in the strongest terms that the President's proposal to eliminate Byrne-JAG grants not be followed and that this critical program to protect our communities from drugs and violent crime be funded at no less than \$900 million in the fiscal year 2007 budget cycle.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to my colleague who has been a leader on this issue, Representative DAVIS of Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Congressman KENNEDY has been a real leader and a fighter for the Brynes-JAG funding and methamphetamine issues in general. I applaud his efforts and his continued concern about our families and our Nation and certainly the States that we represent.

Mr. Speaker, methamphetamine abuse continues to be a growing plague

on America's families, communities and our economy. Abuse of this drug has swept across our Nation like a terrible storm that leaves in its wake broken families, endangered children, overcrowded jails, degraded environment and communities begging for help.

I cannot overstate the problems this drug creates. As Attorney General Alberto Gonzalez said in July of 2005, in terms of damage to our children and to our society, methamphetamine is now the most dangerous drug in America. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I was terribly disappointed to see that the President's budget for fiscal year 2007 completely cut funding for the Byrnes Justice Assistance Grants.

This program has been cited by State and local governments across the country as critical in their efforts to combat meth. In essence, it represents the combined effort among Federal, State and local governments to create safer communities. In my State the funding has helped fund the State's drug task force and helped fund local community crime prevention projects.

State officials back home have informed me that eliminating this program could reduce criminal justice funding to Tennessee by a total of \$11 million and eliminate 170 much needed individual projects across our State.

That is why I have joined with Representative KENNEDY and many of our other colleagues in urging the House Budget Committee to include at least \$900 million for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2007, which is still \$200 million less than the program's authorized level of \$1.1 billion.

We must fight this illicit drug head on. Just as we need to give our soldiers serving in Afghanistan and Iraq the tools and resources needed for success, so too must we give our local law enforcement officials the tools they need to fight the war on drugs.

This program is a tool our local law enforcement officers desperately need. Congress must restore the funding. The risk in not doing so is simply too scary and the threat to our children's future is too great.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

#### THE STATE OF BEGGARDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the "why" question tonight. Why would the United States allow itself to be reduced to a state of beggarmdom in the Dubai ports deal?

The definition of a beggar is a person, in this case a country, that lives by asking others for help or charity. So why would the United States allow itself, a nation that created Social Security, won World War II, landed a man

on the moon, why would our Nation let itself be reduced to beggary and the Nation, to beggards?

Why would any level of our government seek foreign ownership or leasing of any of America's key assets, our ports, airports, railroads, turnpikes, industrial plants, even endowments to Presidential libraries? Why would we do it, ever? But why would you do it particularly when we are a nation at war?

The answer is simple. It appears our Nation cannot afford to stand on its own two feet anymore. We beg foreign investment because we cannot pay our own way. Our jobs and productive wealth and manufacturing and agriculture are being shipped offshore every day. Our piggy bank is empty.

So our assets are being sold or leased to foreign interests. Our savings are drained. Our national debt is skyrocketing. So our society is selling off, releasing our crown jewels.

I do not agree with this. I have been fighting it ever since our Nation started to sell more and more of our U.S. debt securities to foreign interests, who now own half, half of the debt of this Nation, and we pay them over \$300 billion a year in interest and it is skyrocketing.

Some people who get elected, even Presidents, do not think that there are certain fundamentals in accounting that you must follow. They think that you can avoid responsibility in borrow-and-spend abandon. They think you can avoid responsibility. They mix up their love of money, frankly anybody's money, even foreign interests' money, with freedom's discipline. They somehow think it will all work out.

Well, America has been pushed to the edge of its financial resources with over \$7 trillion in debt, which is rising. The war in Iraq has cost billions too much. We were told we would be out of there in 6 months.

We are lectured by a President that we should become energy independent, yet during his presidency he has made us more dependent on foreign sources of oil, so we borrow and spend to make up the difference. And we are paying more and more for imported fuel and going deeper into debt with oil imports, now the largest share of our trade gap.

Budget numbers do not lie. Trade statistics do not lie. Who do you think is financing America's beggards? Foreign interests. The kind of folks who own Dubai Ports World. Trade deficits are exploding as we witness the import deluge into our country. Last year nearly a trillion dollars in trade debt, staggering, hard to find anything made here anymore.

So now we are in the fire sale phase. Rent out the ports, lease the Indiana Turnpike, sell off the auto industry, print the stationery in China. To live so recklessly and to spend so wildly does exact a price. It forces America to be reduced from our birthright of independence and the discipline that that entails to a sorry state of beggards.

Curious developments happen too. Why did George Bush, Sr. accept a million-dollar contribution to his Presidential library in Texas from the United Arab Emirates? Who was buying favor with whom and for what?

What is so shocking is that the vast majority of Americans oppose beggards, oppose the leasing of U.S. ports to any foreign interests, surely by those who could not prevent infiltration of their citizens to this country on 9/11.

Americans want to be independent. They love freedom, not beggards. The World Ports debacle is the latest evidence America's corporate and political elites, sometimes the same people, are selling out America's independence, making deals with undemocratic kingdoms.

Seven sheiks run the United Arab Emirates. It is not a democratic country. Dubai World Ports is a government-owned enterprise. Why should it compete with free enterprise in this country? That country does not recognize Israel, and it does not allow Christian crosses to be erected anywhere inside the borders of that nation. Who could believe that a nation that sent two terrorists into our Trade Towers and whose banks laundered money for 9/11 will now manage some of our major ports. Insanity.

Some people say our intelligence services failed us. I say our elected leaders have failed us, starting in the Oval Office. They fail us time and again because they are blinded by their own beggary. They used to say you could buy people here in Washington for a lunch. Wow, has the bar been raised.

America, awake. Patrick Henry's clarion had it right, give me liberty or give me death, no beggary, no beggards, no sellout of our Republic.

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

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

#### THE COMBAT METHAMPHETAMINE EPIDEMIC ELIMINATION ACT

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, much of what we do here in Congress is very contentious. Our 1-minute and 5-minute tend to reflect a lot of those deep divisions. And while we sometimes share basic views, I think that they get carried to extremes sometimes on House debate.

I want talk about something we have actually done in a bipartisan way. We often hear that we do not do anything here in a bipartisan fashion and that all we can agree on are naming post of-

fices. But this week when the PATRIOT Act passes, inside the PATRIOT Act is the Combat Methamphetamine Epidemic Elimination Act, the largest and most comprehensive legislation ever done by a United States Congress on methamphetamine.

Nearly 20 years ago there were some attempts to regulate some of what was then called "crank" and some variations of methamphetamine that had already started in Asia and had been in Hawaii and had trickled in, even a decade ago or a little longer, into the West Coast, in Oregon and Washington State and California, but had not really hit the United States in full force.

Then over the last several years, Members of Congress have been coming here frustrated with the fact that our administration, from the Republican standpoint and from the Nation's, our present administration had not been responding aggressively enough to the Methamphetamine Act, and how to address the control of pseudoephedrine in the United States, as well as the ephedra and pseudoephedra that was coming into the United States that was making and going into the mom-and-pop meth labs, as well as the crystal meth.

Senators TALENT and FEINSTEIN introduced a bill on the Senate side to do what many States were doing, and that is, put pseudoephedrine behind the counter. Majority Whip BLUNT introduced similar legislation in the House.

In addition, Members from both parties introduced many different bills. Congresswoman HOOLEY and Representative KENNEDY, in particular, led the effort to try to go beyond just putting something behind the counter, but to try to regulate international legislation; and their bills were incorporated in a more comprehensive bill that then also absorbed the Blunt-Talent-Feinstein bill.

This all was attached to the PATRIOT Act. And I would have just as soon had a free debate here on the House floor and dealt with this, but part of the thing is that as we moved this meth bill through, we came under tremendous counterattack from the pharmaceutical industry that did not want any limitations on pseudoephedrine in the United States.

We came under heavy attack from the China lobby and the Mexico lobby that did not want the threat of decertification on them if they did not cooperate on controlling pseudoephedrine.

What this bill will do is limit the daily purchase, it will limit the monthly purchase, require purchasers to show ID and sign in a log book.

Therefore, as Indiana passes a law, people will no longer be able to go to Michigan and Ohio to get their pseudoephedrine and continue to kind of supply the raw material for all of the mom-and-pop labs, 900 last year in the State of Indiana, whereas Ohio only had 300, which, by the way, was a growth from 30.

But we go beyond just the control of pseudoephedrine and the few remaining