

lives and billions of U.S. dollars have been spent in the war in Iraq. This war has dangerously overstretched our military and preoccupied our country for almost 3 years now, and it still has no end in sight.

And after all this, what a tragedy and disaster it will be if the real winner in this war is not the Iraqi people nor a more secure and democratic Middle East but rather Iran, a country that supports terrorism and opposes most of what we stand for. Yet today this possible scenario is exactly what we face.

Iran has used our preoccupation in Iraq to its advantage. While we have searched for nonexistent weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, Iran has pursued its own nuclear ambitions. Now, with its decision to resume uranium enrichment, Iran is dangerously closer to having the capability to produce nuclear weapons. And press reports today link Iran's supposedly peaceful nuclear program to its military work on high explosives and missiles.

At the same time, Iran has deeply insinuated itself in Iraq. It has taken advantage of Iraq's porous borders and is supporting anti-American efforts there. Its goal is to promote a Shiite-dominated anti-American state that can strengthen Iran's military, economic and political power in the region.

But even before its latest nuclear pursuits and involvement in Iraq, Iran's actions have been seriously troubling. It has pursued dangerous chemical, biological, and ballistic missile capabilities; supported terrorists; and undermined the Middle East peace process.

□ 1815

Amidst all of this, Iran's leaders have escalated their anti-Semitic rhetoric, threatening to wipe Israel off the map.

Yet, rather than handle Iran's nuclear situation and involvement in Iraq early and decisively with a sophisticated policy that also addresses the broader problems posed by the country, this administration largely relied on the Europeans to sort this thing out. As a result, the nuclear situation is now an international crisis, and we risk having a radical anti-American regime armed with nuclear weapons entrenched as the dominant power in the Middle East.

We simply cannot let this happen. Iran must not acquire a nuclear weapon. It must respect Iraq's sovereignty, and it must become a constructive member of the international community. While cooperation with our allies and strategic partners is critical, the U.S. must take the lead here. The agreement brokered by Secretary Rice this week to report Iran to the U.N. Security Council is encouraging, but action by the council is uncertain and may not resolve the nuclear crisis or much else. The administration must put forth the necessary plan, and Congress must do its part. Today, the House Armed Services Committee held a hearing on this matter and will do more.

There are no simple answers or easy solutions, but one thing is clear: the administration, with Congress, must be more engaged and must get this right. Other countries will be closely watching this situation, and there are serious implications for the security of our Nation, stability in the Middle East and the nonproliferation regime.

We must address the immediate nuclear crisis, but we must also account for the complexity of the situation and broader, long-term issues involved; and we must consider all tools at our disposal. Yet there are limits to what we can accomplish militarily, and sweeping sanctions could cause more harm than good. Still, there are many tools available that this administration has, unfortunately, failed to utilize effectively or at all.

Here are some of them: we should actively support the IAEA's efforts. We should pursue more focused and vigorous diplomacy and encourage China, Russia, and India to play key roles. We should develop necessary human intelligence capabilities.

We should cultivate U.S. support among the Iranian population and substantially increase democracy promotion efforts that encourage the population to demand more moderate leadership. Specifically, we should increase communication through TV, radio, and the Internet. We should convey a coordinated U.S. policy. We should widely disseminate information about the regime's repression and corruption. We should provide effective assistance to Iranian dissidents and pro-democracy NGOs here in the United States.

We should increase cultural, academic, and professional opportunities for Iran's youth and women. Additionally, we should consider "smart sanctions," as well as incentives that would target Iran's leadership, avoid harming the Iranian population and have strong international support. For example, we should sanction overseas assets of corrupt leaders.

Also, we should encourage Lebanon to disarm Hezbollah, which Iran uses to reject power. We should limit Iran's ability to disrupt oil and gas supplies and increase energy prices. This includes reducing the vulnerability of Middle Eastern energy resources to Iranian-backed terrorist attacks and decreasing U.S. reliance on such resources.

We simply cannot allow Iran to emerge as the real winner in the war in Iraq. This must be a top bipartisan priority.

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

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

ECONOMIC RESULTS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of Mr. MACK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I first want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) for bringing this exciting news about adult stem cell success to us. Last week, Congresswoman NANCY JOHNSON and I had the opportunity to visit again Wake Forest Medical Center's regenerative medicine program, where they are doing some absolutely wonderful things from adult stem cells, and I hope sometime in the future soon to bring some information about that program.

But, Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to talk about some other good news. While we were working in our districts for the past month, good economic news continued to pour in, thanks to the Republicans' fiscal restraint and pro-growth economic agenda. In fact, our unemployment rate is lower than the average of the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s; and earlier this month, the Dow Jones Industrial Average closed above 11,000 for the first time since the 2001 terrorist attacks. In addition, new-home sales reached an all-time high in 2005. Finally, it was just reported that consumer confidence has risen this month to the highest level since June of 2002.

The great economic news flies in the face of the Democrats' message of doom and gloom. Before the district work period, Republicans passed a Deficit Reduction Act, which was a plan to reform the government and yield savings for American taxpayers. Fortunately, today we passed this bill again, modified slightly by the Senate; but it was with no support from the Democrats. Once again, we show that Republicans are indeed the party of fiscal restraint.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans will continue to push for pro-growth economic policies aimed at ensuring that all Americans can realize the American Dream.

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

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

COMMENTS ON THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last night, Cindy Sheehan was evicted from this Chamber and arrested. Her crime? Wearing a T-shirt that highlighted the number of dead soldiers in Iraq and asking, "How many more?"

Since when is free speech conditional on whether or not you agree with the President of the United States? In fact, isn't the whole point of the first amendment to our Constitution to protect dissenters? And how ironic is it, Mr. Speaker, that this outrageous suppression of peaceful protest should take place on the very same day that America lost one of the pioneers of civil disobedience, Coretta Scott King.

I will say about this episode what I said about the torture of prisoners, the PATRIOT Act, and the administration's illegal domestic surveillance program: How can we claim to be fighting on behalf of freedom around the world, making the world safe for freedom, when we are smothering freedom here at home?

Let us not forget also that Cindy Sheehan has given her child for this country and this war. She deserves the sympathy and gratitude of every American. No one who sat in this Chamber last night has the moral authority she does to express an opinion on the Bush Iraq policy.

But I might argue that it is actually a little misleading to classify Ms. Sheehan's views as "dissent" or "protest," because a majority of Americans agree with her that the invasion of Iraq was a tragic mistake and a majority agrees with her that the President misled us about weapons of mass destruction intelligence in order to justify this war.

The President, meanwhile, represents a minority view, and he tried once again to sell that minority view to skeptical Americans last night. And once again he did so by employing a spin, misleading rhetoric, and outright deception.

Of course, he conveniently conflated the 9/11 attacks on America with the conflict in Iraq, exploiting a national tragedy for the umpteenth time. He talked about the importance of Iraqi reconstruction, but did not mention that the official in charge of reconstruction says there is not enough funding to complete key projects. He said that military commanders on the ground would make decisions for troop levels, but in 2003 he dismissed the general who correctly warned that keeping the peace in post-war Iraq would require hundreds of thousands of troops.

The President set up this misleading either/or proposition choice last night: you either support his militarism, or you believe in "retreating within our

borders and the false comfort of isolation."

This is a false charge. We should absolutely be engaging the nations of the world, especially ones that are poor, underdeveloped, and vulnerable to terrorism; but we should be engaging the world with humanitarian support, not with bombs and missiles.

Yes, by all means, let us meet the challenges of the world, where too many suffer under economic and political repression. But instead of sending troops, let us send small business loans, let us send agricultural experts, let us send doctors, teachers, scientists and constitutional scholars. Let us engage, not invade.

This has been the core philosophy of my SMART Security Plan that I have discussed here many, many times: less brawn, more brains; less belligerence, more benevolence.

It is interesting that a President who has disparaged allies, rejected multilateralism, and ignored global commitments now talks about the dangers of isolation. The only way to promote peace and security to combat terrorism, to stop the spread of deadly weapons is to embrace a vision of global partnership, cooperation and diplomacy; and that is exactly what the President has failed to do.

He could start by abandoning his vision of conquest and bring our troops home. Only then can we begin the hard work of defeating tyranny and ensuring freedom and ensuring peace around the world.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to avoid improper references toward the President or the Vice President.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2006 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2006 THROUGH FY 2010

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 2006 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 401 of the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95). This status report is current through January 27, 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 forth by H. Con. Res. 95. 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 2006 because those years are not considered for enforcement of spending aggregates.

The second table compares, by authorizing committee, the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2006 and fiscal years 2006 through 2010. "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 allocation from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of the discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2006 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) suballocations as well as the 302(a) allocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2007 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 401 of H. Con. Res. 95. This list is needed to enforce section 401 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills or amendments thereto that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2006 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 95

(Reflecting action completed as of January 27, 2006—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal years—	
	2006	2006–2010
Appropriate Level:		
Budget authority	2,144,384	(1)
Outlays	2,161,420	(1)
Revenues	1,589,892	9,080,006
Current Level:		
Budget authority	2,135,436	(1)
Outlays	2,161,041	(1)
Revenues	1,607,178	9,176,057
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget authority	–8,948	(1)
Outlays	–379	(1)
Revenues	17,286	96,051

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2007 through 2010 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2006 in excess of \$8,948,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2006 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2006 in excess of \$379,000,000 (if