

for murder in Texas was found working in a lumberyard near Elkins, West Virginia.

Last week, another illegal immigrant struck and killed 4-year-old Tyler Evans in a car accident in Boone County, West Virginia. The police report alleges that speed and alcohol were factors in the fatal crash. Both illegal immigrants had falsified immigration papers.

I held a roundtable with law enforcement officers and elected leaders and talked with many constituents throughout August to discuss the House border security bill and the Reid-Kennedy amnesty bill. The response was unanimous: No amnesty and increased enforcement along our borders.

We shouldn't stop there. It is critical that we provide employers the ability to check immigration status of employees and hold them accountable for their workers. Clearly, most people who enter illegally are not security threats, but it is critical to our homeland security that we are able to account for the people who enter this country. We need to pass tough immigration reform now. It is too late for Tyler Evans, but we need to act before it is too late for other Americans.

#### PEOPLE PROTECTION

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, nothing could illustrate more that this Republican Congress is a do-nothing Congress than the fact that, on the first full day back, the only thing we are dealing with is the Horse Protection Act. The previous speaker on the Republican side talked about immigration reform. When I was back in my district, people wanted to know when this Congress was going to address immigration reform, when we were going to address port security and the rising number of people that have no health insurance. But we not dealing with those issues today, we are dealing with the Horse Protection Act. What about people protection?

Osama bin Laden is still at large. The 9/11 Commission recommendations have not been implemented by this Congress. What about a people or American protection act?

The previous speaker talked about immigration reform. This Republican Congress is not even addressing immigration reform. They have decided they are not going to deal with the issue between now and the end of this congressional session. It is a disgrace. This Republican Congress is doing nothing. It is the biggest do-nothing Congress that we have ever seen. We come here to talk about horse protection. We have been out for 6 weeks. The American people want more.

□ 1015

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 503, AMERICAN HORSE SLAUGHTER PREVENTION ACT

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 981 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 981

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 503) to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour and twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides 1 hour and 20 minutes of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader. The rule also provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Horse meat is generally not consumed by people in the United States,

but more than approximately 90,000 were slaughtered for human consumption in 2005. Virtually all of those horses were slaughtered for export and sent to the largest markets for that product, to countries such as France and Belgium, where it is commonly served to humans. Another 30,000 were transported from the United States to Canada and Mexico for slaughter. A number of States currently have laws that prohibit slaughter or facilitating the slaughter of horses for human consumption, but there is not a nationwide ban.

Last year during consideration of the fiscal 2006 agriculture appropriations bill, my good friends, distinguished Members Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. WHITFIELD, offered an amendment to that bill that would have prohibited the expenditure of taxpayer dollars for slaughter plant and horse meat inspections, effectively ending the practice. The amendment passed the House with bipartisan support by a strong 269-158 vote. A similar amendment also passed the Senate. However, horse slaughter plants petitioned the USDA to allow fee-for-service inspections whereby the plants pay for the inspections. The USDA granted the request. To get around the limitation amendment, horse slaughter plants made that petition to the USDA to allow for inspections.

The American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act would prohibit an individual from slaughtering a horse for human consumption in the United States and would also prevent the transportation of horses from the United States to Canada or Mexico for the purpose of slaughter for human food.

This legislation, H.R. 503, was introduced by Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. WHITFIELD. I commend both of them for their hard work on this issue, an issue that obviously is very important to them and their constituents.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before the House would make in order H.R. 503, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. This bill has the support of 203 bipartisan co-sponsors, myself included. Passing this bill will end the cruel and barbaric practice of horse slaughter. It will ensure that horses are treated humanely up until their deaths, which is a goal that both supporters and opponents of the legislation can support. It will also improve conditions for living horses.

In my home State of California, for example, we have experienced no increase in cases of horse abuse or neglect since we banned their slaughter in 1998. Horse theft cases in California have declined by 35 percent since then as well.

Simply put, horses are an integral part of our country's culture and history. They do not deserve to be slaughtered in the brutal conditions which they must currently endure before death. American horses deserve better treatment.

But the American people deserve better treatment as well. Unfortunately, the Republican majority in Congress appears focused exclusively on issues which do little to improve the lives of Americans.

A few days ago, we celebrated Labor Day. Yet it is clear that people who work for a living have very little to celebrate. The minimum wage remains unchanged. Our constituents face ever-rising energy prices. Seniors continue to be burdened with high costs for prescription drugs. College graduates are saddled with debt. Other young people cannot afford to attend college at all. And nearly 5 years to the day after September 11, our Nation is still not secure.

These are some of the pressing and critical problems the American people deal with on a daily basis. Congress could easily devote an entire week to each issue, and yet we find ourselves procrastinating. Instead of addressing these challenges that confront our constituents, real issues that impact real people, the majority has chosen to authorize commemorative coins. This Congress cannot bring itself to allow a clean vote to help hardworking Americans by raising the minimum wage, though not for lack of Democratic proposals to do so. My colleague, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, has introduced a bill that will raise the minimum wage for the first time in nearly a decade, and Congressman HOYER's amendment to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill will do the same.

Unfortunately, these sensible proposals to give working families a boost have either been stalled by the Republican leadership or loaded with poison pills to ensure that Americans go yet another year without a minimum wage increase. We owe it to the hardworking voters who send us to Washington to increase the minimum wage before we adjourn. Instead, the leadership has turned our attention to horses.

The majority also refuses to take action to combat skyrocketing energy costs. Democrats have advocated for an innovative and strategic national energy policy, one which rolls back tax breaks for oil companies and invests the savings in alternative fuel sources. Not only will such action lower energy costs over the long term, but it will also help our Nation break our dependence on foreign oil.

The American people deserve an energy policy that is responsible, innovative, and independent. Dozens of promising proposals for such a policy have been introduced, proposals which could be brought to the floor today. However, the leadership has decided instead to use one of our few remaining legislative days to debate horses.

Even before this energy crisis, the steady rise in health costs threatened to drive many middle-class families out of our health care system altogether. Most of the 3 million people who have lost health coverage since 2002 make over \$50,000 per year, and some make over \$75,000 per year. This figure is frightening, for it indicates that high insurance costs are affecting more and more Americans. Additionally, seniors have already begun to hit the "doughnut hole" in the Medicare prescription drug program, which has forced them to bear thousands of dollars in unexpected costs.

The Democratic plan for the future gives the Federal Government the freedom to negotiate for lower prescription drug prices. It also provides millions of American families with urgently needed health insurance. We owe it to our constituents to reform the health care system to make it more affordable before we adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that this Congress has done little to help American seniors. Sadly, younger Americans have not fared much better. The Republican leadership has left our Nation's students saddled with ever-growing amounts of student loan debt.

Democrats have offered a new direction for higher education, centered on expanding Pell grants and restoring the \$12 billion in cuts to student aid which Republicans passed earlier this year. This will ease the debt burden for recent graduates and put the dream of a college education within reach for more young Americans. We owe it to our students and to the families who support them to increase tuition assistance before we adjourn. However, the leadership has ignored this opportunity to make higher education accessible and affordable. Instead, the majority has decided to take another long weekend, with no votes scheduled on Monday or Friday.

As we can see, the list of misplaced priorities in the 109th Congress is long. However, perhaps none is as disappointing or as dangerous as Congress's refusal to secure our homeland. The majority has refused to fully implement all the recommendations of the September 11 commission. In doing so, it has left unnecessary holes in national security and has failed to fulfill its primary responsibility to ensure America's safety.

Before we adjourn for the year, Congress must secure our borders, and we must do more to protect our ports and airports. Democrats have offered legis-

lation to do so, legislation which will also provide our first responders with the resources they need to respond to a terrorist attack or other national emergency.

These proposals to protect American lives and families are on the table, and Democrats stand ready to pass them with the help of our Republican colleagues. And yet as we return from a month-long break, we have been presented with a paper-thin legislative agenda. This week's schedule illustrates how out of touch this Chamber's leadership is from American families and the problems they face every day.

As a result, on the floor of the House of Representatives this week, we will focus on improving the welfare of America's horses. What we should be doing is improving the welfare of America's people.

My Democratic colleagues and I have offered a new direction, a plan to raise the minimum wage, ease our reliance on foreign energy sources, lower prescription drug prices, make college more affordable, and strengthen our Nation's security to combat terrorists.

□ 1030

We will continue to fight to pass this package of urgent national legislation, and we await the cooperation of Republican colleagues to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), a prime author of this legislation.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and its underlying bill. But I do want to respond to my friends on the other side and their comments about the appropriateness of this particular piece of legislation, which I believe they support being on the floor here.

Since 1979, there have been efforts and attempts and a struggle to bring this piece of legislation to the floor for open public debate so that we can flush out the fact from the fiction.

And while I know and I believe over the next month we will be debating a number of important issues, like border security, like protecting this Nation, and our war on terror, this is a piece of legislation that is long overdue and needs to be discussed and needs to be disposed of in an appropriate fashion.

As author of the legislation, I have worked tirelessly to bring it to the floor. What the bill does is it prohibits the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling or donation of horses or other equines for the slaughter for human consumption.

It makes it impossible to do so in the United States but also prohibits the transport to Canada and Mexico. And

some might ask, why is that important? Well, it is important for a number of reasons. The first and foremost is that it is one of the most inhumane, brutal, shady practices going on today in this Nation.

It is important because more than 70 percent of the American people, at least every survey I have ever seen, support the notion that we ought to ban the slaughter of horses for human consumption. It is important because a substantial number of States have outlawed this practice, yet because of a Federal court case, an injunction has been obtained in which the court has essentially said, unless Congress acts, this practice can go on despite the will of the people and the States involved.

For years I had hoped for a fair and honest debate on this issue. We have been thwarted in that effort until now. Each year, 90,000 horses in the country are slaughtered and shipped overseas to Europe and Asia where they are served in restaurants as a delicacy, not as a necessity. I want this process stopped, and some of my colleagues in this chamber do not.

This rule gives us the opportunity for that fair and open debate. I want to thank the Rules Committee and its chairman, Mr. DREIER, for that opportunity. However, I must stress that I have real concerns over the seven amendments that are possibly going to be introduced in the course of today's debate.

I have concerns about it, because they are being introduced by people who have for a long time tried to stop this debate from happening in the first instance, and, therefore, then I would suggest that every one of these amendments are poison pills. Every one of these amendments are intended for one thing, that is to continue this practice, a practice that I do not want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, is subsidized by this Federal Government.

Now, last year, my good friend from Florida pointed out, last year we passed with 269 votes an amendment in the ag appropriation bill that said taxpayer dollars should not be used for something the American people do not support in the first instance; should not be used to subsidize and continue this process.

Despite passing that piece of legislation, the USDA and others thwarted our efforts to have the right thing happen.

I would suggest to my colleagues that today we send a strong message: We end this practice. And, yes, let's get on with the other business of this House. But after many, many years, three decades of attempts, it is about time we passed this legislation and ended this practice.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, with energy costs at an all-

time high in the United States, climate change threatening the future prosperity of our country and our planet, the Taliban regaining control in Afghanistan, Iraq in meltdown, the U.S. saddled with the largest debt in the history of the world, the real wages of average Americans in decline, 42 million Americans without health care insurance, and most of the 9/11 Commission recommendations to make America safe still not implemented by this Congress, it is unbelievable to me that we are spending this day on the horse meat bill.

Now I commute 3,000 miles from California to Washington to serve the people, as we all do, to serve the people. And I am for the horsies, too. I will vote for it. We could have done it by consent. We could have done it on voice vote.

I cannot believe that we are here today using the very limited time left to this Congress to deal with horse meat. Now, I hope that we can come to our senses, that the Republican leadership in this House will get a grip about what the American public needs us to do to serve their interests, to make sure that they are secure, both from an economic point of view, from international terrorism and to deal with the terrible disaster that has become Iraq and the disaster that is growing in Afghanistan.

As I say, I am happy to vote for the horsie bill, but I am ashamed that that is all we are doing here today.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 503 has not received the support of any House committee and was, in fact, ordered to be reported unfavorably to the floor with the recommendation that it not pass by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 37-3 of the Agriculture Committee. So, naturally, the Members of that committee are very sympathetic with those who do not want to hear this legislation today.

The committee rejected this legislation because it has real concerns that eliminating the option of humane euthanasia at horse-processing facilities will do undeniable harm to the welfare of the 90,000 unwanted horses per year that normally go this route. This rule makes in order several amendments that seek to correct some of the problems created by this bill.

Since H.R. 503 leaves so many questions unanswered, the amendments are the only means to provide solutions to the problems. What happens to those 90,000 horses? H.R. 503 provides no answer to that question. Will they be guaranteed a safe, healthy future by the passage of H.R. 503? Sadly, the answer is, no.

H.R. 503 provides no provisions for the welfare of these unwanted horses.

Proponents suggest that these 90,000 horses will not all necessarily be absorbed by the rescue facilities but will instead be sold to new owners or kept longer by their current owners. Many of the horses received by these processing plants are traditionally unserviceable, vivacious or behaviorally unacceptable in today's equine community.

Holding on to a dangerous horse presents a potentially dangerous situation for the owner and his or her family. And selling the dangerous horse to an unwitting buyer is irresponsible. Obviously, the idea of sending a horse to a processing facility is not something any of us would like to think about. But for certain horses, these facilities, which are federally regulated with on-site U.S. Department of Agriculture veterinarians and humane euthanasia and processing conditions that are acceptable to the both the American Veterinary Medical Association and the American Association of Equine Practitioners provide a humane alternative to additional suffering or possibly dangerous situations.

In order to ensure the welfare of these animals while they are alive, it is imperative that all humane disposal options be available. A responsible horse owner has the right to choose, and although we may not agree, we need to respect that right.

H.R. 503 is a deceptive piece of legislation. Much of the misinformation that surrounds this bill has led many to believe it will accomplish things that it is not capable of achieving. Make no mistake about it: H.R. 503 will not prevent horses from dying. Proponents note that an alternative to sending the horses to processing facilities is to put the horse down on the farm. Apparently, the alternative to death is, well, death.

The euthanasia practices employed at the three U.S. processing facilities meet the humane euthanasia guidelines of the American Veterinary Medical Association, and the regulations established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for humane euthanasia.

The proponents of H.R. 503 are not arguing to keep horses alive or maintain a standard of care to ensure the horse's welfare; they are arguing about what happens to the meat once the animal has been euthanized. Furthermore, the humane treatment of these horses is regulated from the moment the decision is made to send the horse to the processing facility.

The Commercial Transportation of Equine for Slaughter Act regulates the transportation of the horses to the facility, preventing the transport or euthanasia of injured horses. This bill raises many questions about the welfare of horses but provides no solutions. If you care about animal welfare, vote against H.R. 503. If you care about horses, vote against this bill.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, the rule governing the debate on H.R. 503 makes in order seven amendments, all but one of which were filed late, beyond the deadline for amendment submission with the Rules Committee.

What does this suggest? Normally, as we know, the Rules Committee is not enthused with late-filed amendments. As I recall, the majority on the Rules Committee has even used this as an excuse to not make certain amendments in order.

So I think those of us on both sides of the aisle are being sent a signal here. And that message is that there is a concerted effort among some in power in this body to torpedo the pending legislation, H.R. 503, by gaining the adoption of nefarious and ill-conceived amendments that would simply gut the legislation. This is the hand that we are being dealt. And it is apparently the one that we must play.

With that said, I rise in support of the rule. I urge my colleagues, especially on my side of the aisle, to vote for it, so at the very least, we can have an open debate on the issue of horse slaughter in the United States, so that we can strive to keep hope alive.

Americans do not eat horse flesh. The concept is repugnant to most Americans. Yet the merchants of slaughter will have us believe that it is fine and dandy to slaughter our horses for the sole purpose, the sole purpose, of sending their flesh overseas to support some warped demand among foreign diners for horse meat on their menus.

Hear me and hear me now: America, the land of the brave and true, we are sending over 90,000 horses a year to slaughter. Stunned in the head if lucky, throats slit. Explain this to your children. Try to defend this to your constituents.

I hope my colleague will vote for the rule, demonstrate that we will stand up to the likes of those who slaughter our horses for profit and slaughter our horses for power.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), who has done so much to bring this legislation to the floor.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank the Rules Committee for bringing this rule to the floor on this important issue. I might say that the first legislation introduced in the U.S. Congress to try to curtail the slaughter of American horses for human consumption was back in the mid-1970s. And year after year after year after year, the Ag Committee refused to take any action. They never had a hearing. They did everything that they could do to defeat this bill and to make sure that it never saw the light of day.

Well, today we have the opportunity to vote on this bill to have a free and open discussion about the importance of this bill and to make the American people recognize and realize that there are only three slaughter plants in the U.S. operating where the horses are being slaughtered for human consumption. Every one of them is owned by foreign interests, by the Belgians, by the Dutch and by the French.

All of the meat is exported to Europe. Now, the Fort Worth newspaper today had an editorial opposed to this bill and what they said reflects the inaccuracy about this bill. They talked about how pet food is made from horse meat. The truth of the matter is, the pet food association has not used horse meat for 12 years.

□ 1045

That is just one of the inaccuracies. Horse slaughter is about a process. There are groups of killer buyers around America who will obtain horses by any means possible, by theft, by misrepresentation.

Skye Dutcher, a young girl from New York, came to Washington just yesterday to tell us the story about on her 12th birthday her horse was stolen from her family's farm. A fellow took it to a killer buyer, and he received \$150. The killer buyer took it to the auction, and the horse was taken to slaughter.

Judy Taylor, in my State of Kentucky, had two Appaloosas, and she had cancer. She gave them to a friend who said, I will take care of them. That friend sold them to a killer buyer. The killer buyer took them to Beltex in Fort Worth, Texas, where they were slaughtered.

So the nasty part of this business is that so many horses are being obtained illegally, and I know of very few industries in America today where the products that they are using are obtained illegally.

We hear a lot about these unwanted horses and what are we going to do with 90,000 horses that have not been slaughtered. I would say to you that 12 years ago 300,000 horses were slaughtered each year. Today, that number is down to 87,000 because the demand is going down. With that kind of a drastic reduction, you would think there are a lot of unwanted horses running around the country. Yet there is not one study anywhere that indicates that there is an abundance of horses. In fact, as I said, most of the horses that are being slaughtered are wanted. The owners would love to have them back, but because of this process, this is what is happening.

The State of Texas had a law on its books that made it illegal to use horse meat for human consumption, to buy it or sell it or transport it. They tried to shut down the slaughterhouses in Texas. The prosecutors were getting

ready to go to court, and the foreign owners filed a lawsuit in Federal court. They won that lawsuit because the Federal judge said this is about interstate commerce and the State of Texas will be impeding interstate commerce by trying to shut these slaughterhouses down.

So the only thing that we can do is if it is going to be changed, Congress has to do it. That is what this bill is about today. H.R. 503 is on the floor because Congress wants to take action.

Every poll that has been taken on this issue, the American people support the prohibition of slaughtering horses. Horses have never been a part of the food chain. They are not like cattle. They are not like pigs. They are not like goats. Those animals are raised for slaughter; and when you take it to auction, you know where it is going to end up. That is not the case with horses.

I think that this is going to be quite an interesting debate, a worthwhile debate; and I want to thank the Rules Committee for giving us this opportunity today.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all Members to support the rule and the underlying bill. Congress should do the right thing for America's horses by ending the cruel practice of horse slaughter.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are a larger set of priorities which must be addressed. The American worker deserves an increase in the minimum wage, and our Nation's seniors deserve lower prescription drug prices. Almost 5 years after September 11, failing to secure America's ports and airports is unconscionable.

Democrats are committed to staying here until these priorities are accomplished. I would urge all my colleagues to join us in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I also yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 40, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

YEAS—351

Ackerman	Baker	Berman
Aderholt	Barrett (SC)	Biggert
Akin	Bartlett (MD)	Bilbray
Alexander	Barton (TX)	Bishop (GA)
Allen	Bass	Bishop (NY)
Baca	Bean	Bishop (UT)
Bachus	Berkley	Blackburn

Blunt Gilchrist  
Boehler Gillmor  
Boehner Gingrey  
Bonilla Gohmert  
Bonner Gonzalez  
Bono Goode  
Boozman Goodlatte  
Boren Gordon  
Boucher Granger  
Boustany Graves  
Boyd Green, Al  
Bradley (NH) Green, Gene  
Brady (PA) Grijalva  
Brady (TX) Gutierrez  
Brown (OH) Gutknecht  
Brown (SC) Hall  
Brown, Corrine Harman  
Brown-Waite, Hart  
Ginny Hastings (WA)  
Burgess Hayes  
Burton (IN) Hayworth  
Butterfield Hefley  
Buyer Hensarling  
Calvert Herry  
Camp (MI) Higgins  
Campbell (CA) Hinojosa  
Cannon Hoekstra  
Cantor Holden  
Capito Holt  
Capps Honda  
Cardoza Hooley  
Carnahan Hostettler  
Carson Hoyer  
Carter Hulshof  
Case Hunter  
Chabot Inglis (SC)  
Chocola Inslee  
Clay Israel  
Cleaver Issa  
Clyburn Jackson (IL)  
Coble Jackson-Lee  
Cole (OK) (TX)  
Conaway Jefferson  
Cooper Jenkins  
Costa Jindal  
Cramer Johnson (CT)  
Crenshaw Johnson, E. B.  
Crowley Jones (NC)  
Cuellar Jones (OH)  
Culberson Kaptur  
Davis (AL) Keller  
Davis (CA) Kelly  
Davis (FL) Kennedy (MN)  
Davis (IL) Kildee  
Davis (KY) Kilpatrick (MI)  
Davis (TN) Kind  
Davis, Jo Ann King (IA)  
Davis, Tom King (NY)  
Deal (GA) Kingston  
DeGette Kline  
Delahunt Knollenberg  
DeLauro Kolbe  
Dent Kucinich  
Diaz-Balart, L. Kuhl (NY)  
Diaz-Balart, M. LaHood  
Dicks Langevin  
Dingell Lantos  
Doggett Larsen (WA)  
Doolittle Larson (CT)  
Dreier Latham  
Duncan LaTourette  
Edwards Leach  
Ehlers Lee  
Emerson Levin  
Engel Lewis (KY)  
English (PA) Linder  
Eshoo Lipinski  
Etheridge LoBiondo  
Everett Lofgren, Zoe  
Farr Lowey  
Feeney Lucas  
Ferguson Lungren, Daniel  
Filner E.  
Fitzpatrick (PA) Lynch  
Flake Mack  
Foley Maloney  
Forbes Manzullo  
Fortenberry Marchant  
Fossella Markey  
Foxy Marshall  
Frank (MA) Matheson  
Franks (AZ) Matsui  
Frelinghuysen McCarthy  
Garrett (NJ) McCaul (TX)  
Gerlach McCollum (MN)  
Gibbons McCotter

McCrery  
McDermott  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Northup  
Norwood  
Ortiz  
Otter  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pombo  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryan (KS)  
Sabo  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz (PA)  
Schwarz (MI)  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons

Simpson  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Sodrel  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tauscher  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas

Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Visclosky  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters

NAYS—40  
Abercrombie  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Berry  
Blumenauer  
Boswell  
Capuano  
Castle  
Chandler  
Conyers  
Costello  
DeFazio  
Ford  
Andrews  
Beauprez  
Becerra  
Bilirakis  
Cardin  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Doyle  
Drake  
Emanuel  
Evans  
Fattah  
Gallegly  
Green (WI)

Harris  
Hastings (FL)  
Hobson  
Hyde  
Istook  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Kirk  
Lewis (CA)  
McKinney  
Miller, Gary  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Nadler

Anderson  
Ney  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Osborne  
Owens  
Royce  
Rush  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sessions  
Strickland  
Towns  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

PERMISSION TO REDUCE TIME FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING DURING FURTHER PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE AND IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further proceedings today in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, the Chair be authorized to reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any question that otherwise could be subjected to 5-minute voting under clause 8 or 9 of rule XX or under clause 6 of rule XVIII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 5122, G.V. "SONNY" MONTGOMERY NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5122), to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Edwards moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 5122 be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in section 721 of the Senate amendment (relating to treatment of TRICARE retail pharmacy network under Federal procurement of pharmaceuticals).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 2007 defense authorization bill passed the House on May 11 and the Senate on June 22. It is deeply disappointing that during a time of war it has taken the House and Senate Republican leadership over 2½ months to appoint conferees to write the final defense bill, which includes programs vital to our

## NOT VOTING—41

□ 1114

Messrs. PETERSON of Minnesota, POMEROY, and KENNEDY of Rhode Island changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MEEHAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, due to circumstances beyond my control on Thursday, September 7, 2006, I regrettably missed the vote on H. Res. 981, a bill providing for consideration of H.R. 503, the Horse Protection Act.

H. Res. 981 presents a reasonable rule that made several amendments in order, and allowed adequate time to have a full and fair debate on the underlying bill.

In turn, I would have voted "yea" on H. Res. 981, so that we could begin to consider the underlying provisions of H.R. 503.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably detained and missed one rollcall vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 430.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 430, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."