

FISCAL YEAR 2008 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JUNE 8, 2007

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
[In millions of dollars]			
Enacted in previous session:			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,050,796
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,450,532	1,390,018	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	419,862	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-575,635	-575,635	n.a.
<b>Total, enacted in previous session</b>	<b>874,897</b>	<b>1,234,245</b>	<b>2,050,796</b>
Enacted this session:			
Appropriation Acts: U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 110-28) <sup>1</sup>	1	42	-335
<b>Total, enacted this session</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>-335</b>
Entitlements and mandates: Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	547,255	532,903	0
Total Current Level <sup>1,2</sup>	1,422,153	1,767,190	2,050,461
Total Budget Resolution	2,496,028	2,469,636	2,015,858
Adjustment to budget resolution for emergency requirements <sup>3</sup>	-606	-49,990	n.a.
Adjustment to the budget resolution pursuant to section 207(f) <sup>4</sup>	1	1	-17
Adjustment to the budget resolution pursuant to section 207(d)(1)(E) <sup>5</sup>	-145,162	-65,754	n.a.
Adjusted Budget Resolution	2,350,261	2,353,893	2,015,841
Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	34,620
Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution	928,108	586,703	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2008-2012:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	11,313,270
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	11,137,725
Adjustment to the budget resolution pursuant to section 207(f) <sup>4</sup>	n.a.	n.a.	-54
Adjusted Budget Resolution		n.a.	11,137,671
Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	175,599
Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.  
<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to section 204(b) of S. Con. Res. 21 the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, as approved by the Senate and the House of Representatives, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. The amounts so designated for fiscal year 2008, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:  
 U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (p.L. 110-28) ..... 605 48,639 n.a.  
<sup>2</sup> Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.  
<sup>3</sup> S. Con. Res. 21 assumed \$606 million in budget authority and \$49,990 million in outlays from emergency supplemental appropriations. Such emergency amounts are exempt from the enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current level totals exclude the emergency requirements enacted in P.L. 110-28 (see footnote 1 above), at the direction of the House Committee on the Budget, budget authority and outlay totals specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced (by the amounts assumed for emergency supplemental appropriations) for purposes of comparison.  
<sup>4</sup> Pursuant to section 207(f) of S. Con. Res. 21, the House Committee on the Budget adjusts budget authority and outlays to reflect the difference between the amount assumed in the budget resolution for nonemergency supplemental appropriations in fiscal year 2007 and the amount actually appropriated for nonemergency purposes.  
<sup>5</sup> Section 207(d)(1)(E) of S. Con. Res. 21 assumed \$145,162 million in budget authority and \$65,754 million in outlays for overseas deployment and related activities. Pending action by the House Committee on Appropriations, the House Committee on the Budget has directed that these amounts be excluded from the budget resolution aggregates in the current level report.  
 Source: Congressional Budget Office.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, the great giveaway of American land has not occurred. The Amnesty International plan to grant legal permanent residents to 12 to 20 million illegal people from all over the world did not succeed in the Senate, and rightfully so.

The bill that the Senate tried to push off on the American public was too massive, too complicated, too long. It was almost longer than the Bible and had less to say.

Madam Speaker, the American people get it. They understand that the first problem that has to be solved is the border. Border security is the number one issue. The Federal Government, our government, the most powerful superpower that has ever existed, cannot protect the borders. Or is it that they don't protect the borders or refuse to protect the borders?

The American public want our borders secure before we start talking about immigration, whether it's legal or illegal. And that's what our Federal Government should do, simply follow the law that's already existing.

We have enough laws now to protect the border, but for some reason, the law does not get enforced by the executive department. We hear all kinds of reasons why it doesn't occur, but the bottom line is our borders are porous, on the northern border and on the

southern border, and the first duty of government is to protect the people, and that means protect our borders and protect it first. When we solve that problem, then we can move on to the other issues.

And the second issue is not what to do with the people that are here illegally. We first close the gap, close the border, keep people from coming here illegally, but the next thing we have to deal with is the immigration service. It's in chaos, it's in turmoil, and this last week's example is a perfect example.

The passport service. Now, the law requires that all Americans traveling anywhere, including Mexico, Canada and the Caribbean islands, have passports. Congress passed that law 3 years ago. The Federal Government, the executive branch, had 3 years to get ready to make sure that Americans had those passports, and sure enough, 2007 came, Americans were following the law. They started applying for passports, and all of the sudden, there are lines all over the United States for people waiting for their passports. First it was 4 weeks; then it was 6 weeks. Now, it's 3 months to 5 months. The Federal Government cannot even process a simple passport for an American citizen, and it is a relatively simple process to deal with a passport.

And now, what has happened? The Federal Government says, well, since we can't follow the law, we'll suspend the law until we're able to get it together. Now, it's not the fault of those

workers in the passport office. They're working as long as they can, as hard as they can, but those people that run the passport office, the Federal bureaucrats, never were organized enough to make sure that Americans, in a streamlined process, could get passports.

So now the law's not going to be followed until the passport service gets it together, and that's very unfortunate because the problem is we're going to use this same department, the immigration service, to so-called legally legalize the 12 to 20 million people in the amnesty bill, the so-called Z visas which are very complicated to understand, something that will take a lot longer to process than a passport. So the Z visas for 12 to 20 million illegals will take forever to process if we ever go to that service.

What I'm saying, Madam Speaker, is we deal with the border first. Second, we fix and streamline the immigration service so it doesn't discriminate against people who are coming to the United States legally, that we make it efficient for Americans to travel abroad. And once we fix that problem, then down the road we deal with the third issue, the issue of what to do with people that are here illegally.

Until we take it in that order, until Congress addresses those three respective acts with three bills, we will never solve the problem. And a massive, so-called immigration reform bill, the American public is suspect and skeptical of that plan because, frankly, I

don't think the American public trusts the Federal Government to do the job of securing the border and reforming the immigration service.

But we know that the Federal Government does have the capability to grant amnesty to people that are here illegally. So, hopefully, Congress will do its job, get organized, pass three separate bills so that we have border security; that we have an efficient, workable immigration services; and then down the road, we deal with what to do with the people that are here illegally in the U.S.

The American public expect it. They have expected it for a long time, and it's time for us to get about the people's business and resolve these three problems as efficiently and quickly as we can.

And that's just the way it is.

**PRESIDENT SHOULD OVERRULE PROPOSED NEW STRATEGY OF GIVING WEAPONS TO SUNNI ARAB GROUPS**

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, tonight I rise to demand that President Bush take immediate action as Commander in Chief to overrule a proposed new strategy in Iraq, a proposal that may put our troops in even greater danger in the days ahead.

The New York Times reported this morning that our commanders in Iraq are now planning to give weapons to Sunni Arab groups, weapons that may turn around and be used against our very own troops.

In the past, these Sunni groups have been allied with al Qaeda and have actually been suspected of being involved in attacks upon our troops. So why are we doing this? According to the Times, our commanders have reason to believe that the Sunnis have split with al Qaeda and are now ready to fight on our side. Well, it could be true, but this strategy is fraught with terrible peril for our brave men and women in combat.

The Times reports, "Critics of the strategy, including some American officers, say it could amount to the Americans arming both sides in a future civil war. The United States has spent more than \$15 billion in building up Iraq's Army and police force, whose manpower of 350,000 is heavily Shiite. With little sign of a political accommodation between Shiites and Sunni politicians in Baghdad, there is a risk that any weapons given to Sunni groups will eventually be used against Shiites." And I must mention, our troops will be stuck in the middle, dying for what? Because there is the possibility, says the Times, the weapons could be used against the Americans themselves.

Let me repeat that last sentence, "There is also the possibility the weapons could be used against the Ameri-

cans themselves." That's what the Times had to say.

But first, Madam Speaker, we sent our troops into battle without the proper body armor or vehicle armor. Then we put them in the middle of a bloody civil war they were never trained to fight. Then, when many of them got wounded, we gave them terrible medical treatment at home. Now this is the latest outrage.

Madam Speaker, I do not condemn our commanders in the field for making this decision. They are taking this risk because they are desperate to implement President Bush's hopeless, foolish surge policy, but the surge has not worked, is not working and will not work.

As the Times reports, "An initial decline in sectarian killings in Baghdad in the first two months of the troop buildup has reversed, with growing numbers of bodies showing up each day in the capital. Suicide bombings have dipped in Baghdad, but increased elsewhere, as al Qaeda groups, confronted with great American troop numbers, have shifted their operations elsewhere."

There's only one way, Madam Speaker, out of this. We must bring our troops home, and then we must work with the Iraqi people and we must work with them in a peaceful way to reconstruct their devastated Nation.

Last month, a bill that called for starting the withdrawal of our troops within 90 days received 171 votes in this House. Some pundits were surprised that it received that much support. I wasn't. Opposition to this President's failed foreign policy is growing all over America, and those voices are eventually being heard in this body more and more every day.

Madam Speaker, if American troops are harmed by this new war strategy, then the American people will hold the President accountable. But if we in this House condone it as well, or remain silent, then we will be responsible, too.

Our job is to force this administration to fully fund the plan to bring our troops and our contractors home, home where they are not positioned in the middle of a civil war.

**SUPPORTING THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE FOR ACCUSED CAMP PENDLETON TROOPS**

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, only those who have been to war can truly understand the hell of war. I have not been to war, but I have spoken to those who have served our country in both Iraq and Afghanistan. I know enough to understand that those who serve in harm's way face grave dangers, and they are under extreme pressure.

Most of us cannot imagine the stress that those in uniform undergo when

they have to make a split-second decision whether to fire or be fired upon, to kill or be killed.

In June 2006, seven Marines and one Navy corpsman from Camp Pendleton were charged with murder in an April 2006 incident involving the death of an Iraqi man. The troops were staking out an intersection while looking for insurgents placing explosives along the road.

The squad of eight is accused of kidnapping the Iraqi man from a nearby home, killing him, and then staging the scene to frame him as an insurgent planting a bomb.

Four of the troops struck plea deals and received sentences of 21 months or less in exchange for their testimony against their squad mates. One of the troops also pled guilty to lesser charges but received an 8-year sentence. The three remaining Marines all face courts martial this summer and life in prison if convicted of premeditated murder.

One of these three Marines is a constituent of Congressman BILL DELAHUNT, who brought the details of this case to my attention.

Madam Speaker, 3 years ago, I came to this floor night after night to speak about what I felt was an unfair prosecution of Lieutenant Ilario Pantano, a Marine who was charged with shooting an insurgent in Iraq. Not because of my concern, but because the charges against Lieutenant Pantano were not justified, the Marine Corps dropped the charges.

Because of my great respect for the men and women who serve in the United States Marine Corps, it is my hope that these Marines will receive the due process and justice they deserve as American citizens and as heroes.

President Teddy Roosevelt once said, "A man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterwards. More than that no man is entitled, and less than that no man shall have."

The same men and women who risk their lives to preserve the rights of all American citizens deserve the protection of those same rights. Those who fight for justice deserve justice in return.

Madam Speaker, our military servicemembers, the military family, and certainly these Marines, deserve no less.

And Madam Speaker, with that, I close by saying, God, please continue to bless our men and women in uniform and their families, and please, God, continue to bless America.

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

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