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 Armey, 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. Armey 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.