

FISCAL YEAR 2006 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF SEPTEMBER 2, 2005—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (P.L. 109-59)	3,444	36	9
Appropriations Acts:			
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L. 109-13) <sup>2</sup>	-39	-21	11
Interior Appropriations Act, 2006 (P.L. 109-54)	26,211	17,301	122
Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2006 (P.L. 109-55)	3,804	3,185	0
Total, enacted this session:	33,736	20,924	-450
Entitlements and mandatory:			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	449,649	424,049	n.a.
Total Current Level <sup>3</sup>	1,354,534	1,665,799	1,607,200
Total Budget Resolution	2,144,384	2,161,420	1,589,892
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	17,308
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	789,850	495,621	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2006-2010:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	9,176,258
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	9,080,006
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	96,252
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

1. The effects of an act to provide for the proper tax treatment of certain disaster mitigation payments (P.L. 109-7) and the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-8) are included in this section of the table, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

2. Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes \$30,757 million in outlays from funds provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L. 109-13), and \$7,750 million in outlays from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act to Meet Immediate Needs Arising from the Consequences of Hurricane Katrina, 2005 (P.L. 109-61).

3. Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

Notes. n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law; \* = less than \$500,000.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

## IRAN

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, as the International Atomic Energy Agency meets on Monday to determine whether to refer Iran to the Security Council, the United States must clearly and firmly state its position on Iran.

Iran's clandestine nuclear weapons program has been in the works for the past 2 decades. As a member of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, all of Iran's nuclear activities must be constantly monitored by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Since 1987, Iran has pursued a hidden nuclear program in flagrant violation of its treaty obligations.

Mr. Speaker, Iran's actions over the past 18 years are clearly directed toward building a nuclear weapons capability. Yet Iran calls upon the western countries to trust Iranian intentions. But how could we possibly do that, Mr. Speaker? Iran claims its nuclear program is intended only for peaceful purposes, but that claim is simply not credible.

Iran has the world's second largest proven natural gas reserves and huge crude oil reserves as well. It is neither cost effective nor expedient to develop nuclear capabilities for Iran's energy needs.

The world must not be so naive in this grave situation. We must look at Iran's past and present actions as the most reliable indication of its true intent.

For years, since the early 1990s, Iran has persistently stated its need for nuclear weapon development. Its newly elected president pledged that he will continue to support Hezbollah's struggle against "the enemies of Islam." He has even vowed to reinforce Hezbollah; and he announced just today, Mr. Speaker, that his country is prepared to provide nuclear technology to other Islamic nations.

Mr. Speaker, the spiritual adviser to and supporter of the president, Ayatollah Misbah Yazdi, issued a call for the public to join the swelling ranks of Iran's homegrown suicide bombers, stating that "Suicide operations are the peak of the nation and the height of its bravery." And President Ahmadinejad himself has equated martyrdom with art and made known his ambition to spread his government's Islamic ideology to the world.

Mr. Speaker, the possibility of the regime in Iran having indigenous nuclear capability is a recipe for destruction that is simply unthinkable, and we absolutely must not make the cataclysmic error of believing that those now ruling in Iran have only peaceful purposes in developing nuclear capabilities.

Iran attempts to allay international concerns, pledging that its nuclear program will be subject to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Yet this assurance is completely unassuring when we put it in the context of 18 years of unrelenting deception in the IAEA's ineffectiveness. Iran has violated its obligations and forfeited its credibility.

On Sunday, Iran's Foreign Minister Mottaki warned that referral to the UN Security Council would be a political no-win situation with "certain consequences affecting Iran's decisions." It is totally disingenuous for Iran to appeal to the West's conscience in this regard. Iran has set on a course that it has never wavered from, and it is seeking only to buy time. Mr. Speaker, the International Atomic Energy Agency should refer Iran to the Security Council.

It goes unnoticed, Mr. Speaker, that it is the Iranian people who are suffering the most as a result of this radical clerical regime. The people of Iran should know that they have at least this Nation's unequivocal support to take the stand that they have yearned for for so many years. This support should be stated openly, clearly, and repeatedly.

Regardless of what the International Atomic Energy Agency decides, United Nations policy should be clear. It should be articulated, and it should be open support for the freedom-loving people of Iran to establish a restored Iran, an Iran that contributes to its people and to the world, as it classically has done. What is required, Mr. Speaker, as Assad Homayoun has articulated, is "legitimization through recognition" and the people of Iran will rightfully have the resolve and recourse to establish a government by the people and for the people. This is a day we all should look forward to with gratitude to the good people of Iran.

Mr. Speaker, as the International Atomic Energy Agency meets to determine in the next days whether to refer Iran to the Security Council, the United States must clearly—and firmly—state its position on Iran.

Iran's clandestine nuclear weapons program has been in the works for the past two decades. As a member of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, all of Iran's nuclear activities are treaty-bound to be constantly safeguarded by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Since 1987, Iran has pursued a hidden nuclear program in flagrant violation of its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Iran's actions over the past 18 years are clearly directed toward building a nuclear weapons capability. The Iranians have already built a pilot uranium enrichment facility and are currently completing a huge facility capable of producing enough highly enriched uranium to produce forty nuclear weapons per year.

Iran has secretly imported 18 tons of uranium yellowcake from China and constructed a conversion facility to produce uranium hexafluoride gas for enrichment.

Iran has also experimented with separating plutonium, and are presently building a heavy water reactor.

Further, it has now been reported that Iran has experimented with polonium. Polonium is a radioactive isotope with only one principal use: to trigger a nuclear explosion.

Further, Mr. Speaker, analysis by the U.S. Department of State released as of August 2005 states that "the United States believes

that Iran has manufactured and stockpiled blister, blood, and choking chemical agents, and weaponized some of these agents into artillery shells, mortars, rockets and aerial bombs in contravention to the Chemical Weapons Convention.

In July, Iran announced that it succeeded in developing solid fuel technology for ballistic missiles, which can be launched with almost no warning, far more quickly and reliably and with greater accuracy than those with liquid fuel.

In August, Iran resumed converting uranium to gaseous state. This is a step that precedes enrichment which then can produce nuclear material usable both as fuel in nuclear reactors and as material for an atomic bomb.

Mr. Speaker, Iran calls upon the Western countries to trust Iranian intentions, but how could we possibly do that?

Iran's claim is that its nuclear program is intended for peaceful purposes only—to produce electricity. That claim is simply not credible. Iran has the world's second largest proven reserves of natural gas, along with huge crude oil reserves. It is neither cost effective nor expedient to develop nuclear capabilities for Iran's energy needs.

The world must not be so naive in this grave situation—we must look at Iran's past and present actions. They are the most reliable indications of its true intent.

For years—since the early 1990's, Iran has persistently maintained the need for nuclear weapon development. Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, who some hail as a “moderate”, has repeatedly stated that nuclear development was a “necessity.” Rafsanjani has also stated that “If a day comes when the world of Islam is duly equipped with the arms Israel has in possession, the strategy of colonialism would face a stalemate because application of an atomic bomb would not leave any thing in Israel but the same thing would just produce damages in the Muslim world.” What frightening words.

Iran is in violation of numerous treaties—and continues its patterns of deceit. Iran is trying to create a Euro dominated exchange of oil, and has a strategic economic relationship with China.

Iran suppresses its people with the harshest and most brutal kind of treatment. Just last Tuesday, September 6th, prosecutors' offices in provincial centers announced that “Women who violate Iran's strict Islamic dress code will be flogged immediately”—they will appear before an Islamic judge immediately after arrest to receive a sentence, which is usually 100 lashes in public.

Its newly elected President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad pledged that he will continue to support Hezbollah's struggle against the “enemies of Islam.” He has even more recently vowed to reinforce Hezbollah.

And, Mr. Speaker, the spiritual advisor to and supporter of President Ahmadinejad, Ayatollah Misbah Yazdi, has issued a call in an Iranian newspaper for the public to join the swelling ranks of Iran's homegrown suicide bombers, stating that “Suicide operations are the peak of the nation, and the height of its bravery.” And President Ahmadinejad himself has stated that “Is there art that is more beautiful, more divine, and more eternal than the art of martyrdom?” The Iranian President has said that his ambition was to spread his government's Islamist ideology to the world.

Mr. Speaker, the possibility of the regime in Iran having indigenous nuclear capability is a recipe for destruction that is unthinkable. And we absolutely must not make the cataclysmic error of believing that those now ruling in Iran have only peaceful purposes in developing nuclear capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, Iran is attempting to allay international concerns, pledging that its nuclear program will be subject to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Yet this assurance is completely unassuring when put in the context of 18 years of unremitting deception, and the IAEA's ineffectiveness. Iran has violated its obligations and forfeited its credibility. We must not allow this defiant threat to the world to pass by unnoticed. The IAEA should refer Iran to the Security Council. The world cannot allow the current ruling regime of Iran to obtain and develop indigenous nuclear capability.

It goes unnoticed, Mr. Speaker, that it is the Iranian people who are suffering the most as a result of this radical clerical regime. It seems all too possible that Iran wishes to develop nuclear capability to stifle international support for an Iranian popular revolt as much, and possibly more so, than to counter an Israeli nuclear “threat”. The people of Iran should know that they have this nation's support—unequivocal support to take the stand that they have yearned for, for so many years. This support should be stated openly, clearly, and repeatedly.

Regardless of what the IAEA determines—Security Council or not, United States' policy should be clear, articulated support for the freedom-loving people of Iran to establish a restored Iran, an Iran that contributes to its people and the world, as it classically has done.

What is required, Mr. Speaker, as Dr. Assad Homayoun the President of the Azadegan Foundation has articulated, is “legitimization through recognition” and the people of Iran will rightfully have the resolve and recourse to establish a government—by the people and for the people. That is a day we should all look forward to, with gratitude to the good people of Iran.

#### HATE CRIMES

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, this body passed the gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. CONYERS) hate crime bill with very little notice. Some here were heard to say, oh, well, they will just take it out in conference. However, there is a decent chance that will not happen.

It is true that people who act out of hate can and do cause devastation and severe hurt. There is no question about that. Those who cause such harm deserve and should be punished severely. As a former judge, I have sentenced and severely punished people acting out of hate, including signing legal orders that the perpetrators should be put to death.

Ironically, the cases often cited as a basis for creating hate crime laws usually include the horrible dragging

death of the African American in Texas or the poor young man in Texas who was killed for being a homosexual. The main perpetrators in those cases got the death penalty that I believe they deserved. Those were cases in which no hate crime law would have made any difference whatsoever; yet they are constantly cited as a reason for it.

In the dragging death case, I personally might support punishment by allowing the victim's despondent family to choose the rope or chain and the terrain over which to drag the heartless defendant to inflict the death penalty. But the hate crime laws do not offer a more painful form of capital punishment. The one yesterday certainly does not, so it would have had absolutely no effect on the very cases its proponents often herald as poster examples.

What was done yesterday created a vague, ambiguous Federal offense which sends a message that random, senseless acts of violence are far more preferable in our society than such acts with a motive. Never mind that sociopaths or antisocial personalities who commit random, senseless acts of violence are unlikely to be rehabilitated. They will not get punished under this new law passed out of this House yesterday.

This new hate crimes bill that passed yesterday, this body said to the world that “sexual orientation” and not just “gender,” which should be respected, but “gender identity,” whatever that is, are in the same category as those unfortunate individuals who have suffered because of the color of their skin or their religious preference.

Have the Members ever stopped to think about the words “sexual orientation”? Regardless of what definition they may give those words, when we pass laws, the words used create an exceptional chance that at some point down the road someone is going to say the words mean exactly what they say. In the case of “sexual orientation,” someday someone can look at those words and say they have the very meaning they state: That includes those who are sexually oriented towards animals, those who are sexually oriented towards corpses, those who are sexually oriented towards children. That is abominable. But someday those words could be cited by some appellate court as having their very plain meaning, not just the meaning that is socially or culturally accepted at the time they were passed.

There is another aspect that is not discussed or debated but is coming some day through this new law. It is true that the law addresses crimes of violence or attempted crimes of violence. However, under Article 18 U.S. Code 2(a) of the Federal Criminal Code, “whoever aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces, or procures” a crime's commission is punishable just as if he is the principal.

Do the Members understand what that means? Let me ask my colleagues if a Christian, Jewish, or Muslim religious leader teaches and preaches that