

Now, across the aisle we have some folks who want to be part of the blame America first crowd. They want you to know, gee, we are so bad, we are so terrible, look at Abu Ghraib. I asked my good friend SAM JOHNSON that serves here in the Congress what he thought about if he had been given a choice between the absolute horror that he went through in the North Vietnam prison compared to what happened at Abu Ghraib. It was a no-brainer.

What happened there was abuse. The people have gone to prison. They have been punished. What happened to American prisoners in North Vietnam, North Korea, what happened to American prisoners among those killers, those just blood-sucking, killing democracy, wanting to destroy people, terrorists, jihadists, cutting our people's heads off with dull instruments on camera, and that is who you want to embrace? There are even some people here in Washington that before Saddam went down, he flew over there. Never mind that Saddam was a murdering, blood-sucking thief who killed thousands and thousands. We go over and embrace Saddam and then come back and call our President the one in the wrong? My goodness, the blame America first crowd.

Those who want to blame Bush and Rumsfeld for the terrorist acts have missed the whole point. Since 1979 there has been a war going on. We just did not know it. We had a President then who allowed an act of war under international law, the attack of our embassy in Iran, to go unpunished, and for over a year, all we did was beg them to please release our hostages. It sent a bad message.

We were hit again in 1983 with the barracks. We were hit all through the 1990s with acts of war, including the first attack on our own continent at the World Trade Center in 1993. What did the Democratic administration and Democratic Congress do? Well, they wanted to prosecute them in civil court here in America instead of treating it as an act of war.

This President understands we are in war. Now we have a Supreme Court that has expressed concerns about Guantanamo. I went to Guantanamo, and having been a judge and chief justice, I have toured a lot of prisons. That was the nicest prison I have ever visited where the prisoners are being kept. But you know what we noticed? We were told do not let the prisoners hear you because they will think you are with the Red Cross or somebody. One of the people with us, and they heard somebody there and they started all of sudden going from laughing and being giddy and funny between themselves to, oh, please help me, I am being tortured and all this baloney. Well, they are playing to the crowds. That was obvious.

I would submit if the Supreme Court is all that concerned, we need to put that hurricane fence back around the Supreme Court building that was there

during construction recently and move those people from Abu Ghraib so they can watch them directly and they can look out their windows, maybe let them use their restroom facilities so they can supervise more closely what this administration is trying to protect us from.

You cannot blame President Bush and Rumsfeld for the current terrorist attacks unless you are squarely willing to put the blame for 9/11 on the Clinton administration because that is when it was planned, that was when it was prepared and almost completed, and then it carried over and was finished during this administration. This President saw it for what it was, an act of war that had to be addressed.

The price for liberty, as our forefathers said, is eternal vigilance. We cannot keep blaming America first, as our friends across the aisle want to do. We have to recognize, as this President and this Secretary of Defense has, we are in a war against us, and we finally have an administration that recognizes that and is out to protect us and protect the Constitution. Thank God for this democracy and those protecting it.

□ 1615

IRAQ POLICY

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the honor to visit a group of folks gathered on the Mall as part of Camp Democracy, a nonpartisan camp for peace, for democracy and for the restoration of rule of law.

Those who gathered are relentlessly working to promote peace and justice. They bring great passion to our shared struggle. They have led one of the most important and powerful grassroots movements in recent memory, and because of the pressure they have applied and the eloquence with which they have made the case, the immorality of the Bush Iraq policy has been exposed.

Mr. Speaker, in a few months, our troops will have been in Iraq for as long as their grandfathers fought in World War II. But unlike the struggle against Nazism, this has been an unmitigated disaster, a national tragedy and a moral outrage. More than 2,650 soldiers of our own are dead, nearly 20,000 wounded by the Pentagon's own count and countless more psychologically traumatized. And for what? So we could make the world a more dangerous place and increase the terrorist threat? So we could create more jihadists and inspire more hatred for Americans among Muslim extremists? So we could foment a bloody civil war and rip a nation apart at its seams, killing tens of thousands of innocent civilians for the cause of their so-called liberation?

Like the people at Camp Democracy, I have been speaking out against this war and this occupation even before they began. I have held forums, forced votes on resolutions and joined demonstrators at rallies across the country. Most recently, I introduced a bill that would rescind the President's authority to use force in Iraq, authority that was granted in 2002 under what we now know are false pretenses. I will not give up this fight until every last American soldier has been returned home to his or her family.

But even after that, we will have plenty of work to do, because Iraq is only a part of the problem. The real problem is a foreign policy that uses too much brawn and not enough brains. The real problem is an approach to national security that says might is always right; that says, when it doubt, shoot first and ask questions later. What we need is to completely overhaul the way we handle global conflict and prevent wars from starting in the very first place.

Working with the Friends Committee, working with WAND and working with Physicians for Social Responsibility, I created the SMART Security plan, which was introduced in the House in 2005. SMART would do just what I was talking about. SMART stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. It emphasizes peacekeeping and diplomacy instead of invasion and occupancy. It rejects war in all but the most extreme circumstances. It fights terrorism with stronger global partnerships and with sound diplomacy, with better intelligence, with tough weapons inspections but without violating our civil liberties and fundamental freedoms.

SMART would put more resources into securing loose nuclear material and ensuring the United States lives up to the commitments we have made in our Nation on nuclear nonproliferation. SMART would wean us off Middle Eastern oil. It would invest in renewable energy technologies instead of Cold War weapon systems that have outlived their usefulness. SMART would dramatically increase development aid and debt relief for the poorest countries in the world to combat the deprivation and despair that often gives rise to terrorism in the first place. It protects not by wreaking violent havoc around the world but by staying faithful to the most honorable American values.

Armed conflict around the world is destroying our bodies and our souls. I am particularly troubled by the devastating impact this war is having on our children. Our children are the war's most tragic victims. Children represent a disproportionate number of civilian deaths in conflicts worldwide. And for many who survive, their education is disrupted, their communities destroyed and their families separated.

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

(Mr. POE 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 Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2007 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2007 THROUGH FY 2011

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2007 and for the 5-year period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and sections 401 and 501 of H. Con. Res. 376, which is currently in effect as a concurrent resolution on the budget in the House under H. Res. 818. This status report is current through September 1, 2006.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by H. Con. Res. 376. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2007 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 376 for fiscal year 2007 and fiscal years 2007 through 2011. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts

committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2007 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2008 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 401 of H. Con. Res. 376. This list is needed to enforce section 401 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

The fifth table provides the current level of the nondefense reserve fund for emergencies established by section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376. The table is required by section 505 of the budget resolution, and is needed to determine whether an increase in the reserve fund, allocations and aggregates will be necessary for any pending legislation that contains emergency-designated discretionary budget authority.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2007 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONFERENCE RESOLUTION 376

(Reflecting Action Completed as of September 1, 2006—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal years—	
	2007	2007–2011
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	2,283,029	(1)
Outlays	2,325,998	(1)
Revenues	1,780,666	10,039,909
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,376,976	(1)
Outlays	1,712,503	(1)
Revenues	1,787,468	10,182,129
Current Level over (+) / under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	–906,053	(1)
Outlays	–613,495	(1)
Revenues	6,802	142,220

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2008 through 2011 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2007 in excess of \$906,053,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2007 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 376.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2007 in excess of \$613,495,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2007 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 376.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would reduce revenue for FY 2007 in excess of \$6,802,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 376.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011 in excess of \$142,220,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 376.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2006

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2007		2007–2011 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Armed Services:				
Allocation	45	45	45	45
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	–45	–45	–45	–45
Education and the Workforce:				
Allocation	0	1	0	30
Current Level	16	119	178	–1,733
Difference	16	118	178	–1,763
Energy and Commerce:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Financial Services:				
Allocation	0	0	2	2
Current Level	0	0	–3	–3
Difference	0	0	–5	–5
Government Reform:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
House Administration:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
International Relations:				
Allocation	1	1	5	5
Current Level	0	–5	0	–12
Difference	–1	–6	–5	–17
Judiciary:				
Allocation	19	16	116	113
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	–19	–16	–116	–113
Resources:				
Allocation	0	0	6	6
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	–6	–6
Science:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation	13	13	22	22
Current Level	0	–3	–4	–19
Difference	–13	–16	–26	–41
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	–3	–3	0	0
Difference	–3	–3	0	0
Ways and Means:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	1	–4	–3
Difference	0	1	–4	–3

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

(In millions of dollars)

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) suballocations as of June 6, 2006 (H. Rpt. 109–488)		Current level reflecting action completed as of September 1, 2006		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
	Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	17,812	19,497	7	5,827	–17,805