

be a Jewish chaplain, and he said to his Jewish chaplain friend, "Chaplain, do I offend you when I pray in the name of Jesus Christ?"

The Jewish chaplain said, "No, you do not. This is your faith and your tradition and you should pray in the name of your savior." This came from a Jewish chaplain.

Mr. Speaker, to me this is a very tragic situation. We are asking the President, as Commander-in-Chief, to use his constitutional authority to call up the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, and say, Mr. Secretary, I am Commander-in-Chief and I am asking that you protect the first amendment right of all of our chaplains, whether they be Muslim, Jewish or Christian.

As I begin to close, let me just read a letter that I received from an Army major who is a chaplain. This was last year.

"Dear Congressman Jones:

Thank you for your interest in ending the religious persecution that exists in our military today. I am a chaplain in the United States Army, and I can tell you in all honesty that religious persecution is taking place in the Army on a daily basis. The persecution centers on Christian chaplains praying in the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ."

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear tonight that if we do not protect the right of our chaplains in the military; and I have spoken to many, almost 200 as I said just a few minutes ago, that are telling me that they are being encouraged not to pray outside of the church in the name of their religion and their faith; there is something wrong with that.

We are going to do a news conference tomorrow and ask the President to please protect the first amendment right of our Muslim, Jewish and our Christian chaplains, and I will tell you that the American Center for Law and Justice, ACLJ, they have over 158,000 signatures from people around this country asking the President to use his constitutional authority to protect the first amendment rights of all of our chaplains.

With that, I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan, congratulations, you are a great man and a great patriot. And I close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and God please bless and hold in his arms those who have given their life dying for this country, and I ask God to please bless America, and continue, God, to show us the light that we might save this great Nation and do what is right in your eyes.

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.)

OPENING BORDERS TO U.S. BEEF

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to congratulate Mr. DINGELL. Mr. DINGELL lockers next to me in the House gym, and I see him occasionally, and I appreciate the fact that he gets down there on occasion, and we get a chance to talk.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Japanese border was opened to U.S. beef trade. This was good news. This border had been closed since December 2003. In 2003, we exported \$1.4 billion in beef to Japan. Since that time, the border has been closed, and we have lost over \$3 billion in trade. Regaining the market is not going to be easy. Australia has filled much of the void that was created by this ban on U.S. beef. We also must restore confidence in U.S. beef in Japan. I think roughly two-thirds of the Japanese public are saying that they are not sure that they want to eat beef from the United States. And of course, we have a very safe supply.

We also must ship beef from cows 20 months of age or younger, and to verify that age is going to be difficult because we do not have an animal ID program which is critical for this country. So we hope that this trade can be restored rather quickly.

Over the last year or two, much of the focus on trade issues, particularly in regard to agriculture, has been in regard to the Canadian border and also Japan. But as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, the major issue regarding agricultural trade is not Japan. It is not Canada. It is being played out to some degree this week in WTO talks in China. The major players in these talks in regard to agriculture are the United States and the European Union.

This brings me to a discussion of comparison of these two trading powers. On the chart here, we see the comparison. The economy of the United States is \$11.7 trillion a year. The European Union is \$9.4 trillion. So they are very comparable economies. Well, the largest two in the world. The import tariffs on European Union goods coming into the United States are roughly 12 percent. In contrast, our goods going into the European Union are being tariffed at 30 percent, more than double. This is hard to understand when you look at the comparison of the economies. The agriculture trade deficit of the United States right now is a minus \$6.3 billion to the European Union although we have a slight trade surplus with the overall trade worldwide. This has been a major problem for us. Of course, those tariff differences have been a major issue.

Export subsidies: These are subsidies that are given to promote exports. You see that the European Union is providing roughly \$3 billion in export subsidies; the United States, \$31 million in subsidies. So it is about a 100 to 1 ratio with the European Union providing

\$100 for every \$1 that we are providing in export subsidies.

Farm subsidy per acre: This is an interesting statistic. The United States subsidizes our farmers \$38 an acre, and the European Union subsidizes their agriculture \$295 an acre, almost six times as much as we do.

One other interesting statistic of comparison is that we have had two cases of BSE or mad cow disease in the United States, just two. In the European Union, they have had 189,000 cases of BSE in the last 15 years. Last year alone, in 2004, they had 756 cases of BSE where we have had two in the last 3 years in North America. So you would think that we would have a tremendous opportunity to trade beef with the European Union, and yet that has not happened. What has happened is the European Union has not allowed U.S. exports of beef into the European Union at all for the last several years because we use some hormones with our beef. They have used this as a tactic to keep our beef out even though the WTO has declared our beef perfectly safe. So we have had practically no trade with them in this regard.

We also have had genetically modified crops such as corn and soybeans which have been excluded, again for final sanitary reasons which, again, defy logic. They have also shut out our pork and our poultry.

Mr. Speaker, we do not think these issues will be resolved in this current round of trade talks that are occurring now in Hong Kong, but eventually, they must be addressed if there is going to be some equity in world trade. And if the WTO is going to move forward, we absolutely have to have some equanimity in the relations we have with the European Union, and we think that these trade issues need to be resolved.

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

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

ALITO CORRECT ON CONSTITUTION

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, before I begin my remarks, I would also like to congratulate Mr. DINGELL for his 50 years of service to this institution and to his country.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to the attention of the American people that the President's nominee for United States Supreme Court, Judge Samuel Alito, wrote in a job application at the Justice Department some 20 years ago statements to the effect that the Constitution does not protect a right to an abortion. Judge Alito's statements regarding Roe v. Wade reflect a widely

held belief by many judges and lawyers and scholars across the political spectrum. These legal experts recognize that *Roe v. Wade* was indeed bad law created out of whole cloth by an unelected Supreme Court seeking to legislate its social agenda from the bench.

Ironically, if *Roe v. Wade* was overturned today, it would not end abortion on demand. It would simply leave the matter to the States and to the people through their elected representatives.

Mr. Speaker, this was not the vision of our Founding Fathers. They wrote the U.S. Constitution to specifically protect those that were most innocent and to protect the most basic civil right of all, that being life itself.

The preamble to the Constitution sums up the entirety of their reasons for establishing a constitution in the first place, that we, the people, to “secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”

The Constitution expressly states in plain language that one of the primary purposes for its existence is to secure the blessings of liberty to our future children. The phrase in the 14th amendment sums up the entire document. It says, “No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law.”

Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of the innocent and their constitutional rights is why this government exists. How does it secure the blessings of liberty to our posterity to sacrifice their very lives upon the altar of convenience?

Judge Alito was correct; the Constitution does not guarantee the right to hire someone to kill an innocent unborn child and dispose of the body. Our Founding Fathers put pen to paper and proclaimed: We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

When our Founding Fathers proclaimed those words, the course of human history was forever changed.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to have this debate on abortion out in the open.

□ 2015

Those who promote abortion on demand ignore the Constitution and the original intent of our Founding Fathers who took great care to structure a foundation for self-governance that safeguards innocent life and human dignity. America will not remain free if we claim for ourselves the right to destroy innocent human lives simply because they are unwanted or they are at our mercy, or because they lack even the voice to cry out. We cannot embrace the notion that by our own choice we determine the dignity or worth of other human beings. That is the principle of might makes right, and

this Nation was founded to dispel that depraved injustice.

Mr. Speaker, the future of this country in freedom depends that the fundamental principle which guarantees the right to the divine gift of life and liberty to each of us must remain intact. This is America’s creed. This is our foundation. It is so very simple. We are not born equal; we do not become equal when we reach a certain level of development or age or status. All human beings are created equal. That principle of human equality must not be discarded by the United States of America, because if Americans in the 21st century cannot or will not sustain the will and the courage to protect the innocent, in the final analysis we will never sustain the will or the courage to protect any kind of liberty for anyone.

Mr. Speaker, as the nomination of Judge Samuel Alito moves forward, let us all just remind ourselves that we are Americans, that we walk on the freest soil, and that we breathe the freest air of any people in human history. There is nothing more American than defending innocent human life. So now it is up to this generation, Mr. Speaker, to protect the God-given life to live so that future generations will say of us that we justify our brief moment here. God bless America.

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

(Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania 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 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 5-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 December 5, 2005.

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 reso-

lution’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 allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of 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) suballocation 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) 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.

STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2006 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 95 REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF DECEMBER 5, 2005

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2006	Fiscal years 2006–2010
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	2,144,384	n.a.
Outlays	2,161,420	n.a.
Revenues	1,589,892	9,080,006
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	2,130,625	n.a.
Outlays	2,155,935	n.a.
Revenues	1,607,200	9,176,091
Current Level over (+) / under (-)		
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	-13,759	n.a.
Outlays	-5,485	n.a.
Revenues	17,308	96,085

n.a. = 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 \$13,759,000,000 (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 \$5,485,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2006 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

Revenues: Enactment of measures that would reduce revenue for FY 2006 in excess of \$17,308,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues