to eat horse meat. That is not what we are about as a country. There are so many other alternatives.

We can use animal contraception methods. We could reopen over 100 herd management areas that the Bureau of Land Management has closed. We could start centers such as the one I saw this weekend, 61 horses brought from the wild West for adoption. They came from Nevada and Wyoming and California, beautiful creatures. People in the east coast are adopting them.

There are so many things we could be doing rather than selling these beautiful creatures for horse meat. We are not just about dollars and cents. We are about the things that made our country great. The wild horse is one of those things. It inspires poetry; and if my colleagues do not understand that, I guess we can't very well communicate why this is so important to us. But I trust the majority of this Congress knows what we are talking about.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I recognize my final speaker to close, Mr. Chairman, let me just point out if it is about the bottom line, it is about making sure USDA inspectors inspect the American food chain and not foreign food chains.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me time, and I appreciate his leadership, as well as the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

I want to remind my colleagues that this particular amendment, which is a funding limitation, however, is still very similar to an amendment that the House voted on shortly before we broke before the Memorial Day district work period. That particular amendment passed in an overwhelming fashion and in a bipartisan fashion. So this is truly bipartisan when it comes to recognizing how valuable the horse is to this country and what a symbol it is of our freedom and how important it is to recognize this truly American icon.

When Americans think of the horse, I do not believe they think of it in terms of foreign cuisine on the tables of countries around the European area.

This amendment has invoked a lot of emotion and misinformation. The opposition has said that this will increase the abuse of horses and horses running wild out West. Such statements are not true.

Here are the facts. Each year some 65,000 horses are slaughtered in this country for human consumption in Europe and Asia where they are sold in restaurants as a delicacy. Another 30,000 are trucked to Canada and Mexico for slaughter. This amendment will end that slaughter of American horses for human consumption overseas.

Slaughter is not the same as humane euthanasia administered by a veterinarian in a very controlled environment. Euthanasia of horses is administered by legal injection, whereas slaughtered is administered by unskilled, untrained workers using the captive bolt. Many times this is administered improperly, causing unnecessary pain and suffering before death.

Passage of this amendment will not cause an overpopulation of horses. Each year 690,000 horses die in the U.S. many of which are euthanized by a licensed veterinarian. Slaughtered horses represent only 1 percent of horses that die each year. This would not result in an overpopulation of horses as some suggest.

There are alternatives available. Americans do not profit from slaughtering horses. This is an export-driven market. Foreigners eat our horses and foreign companies make money, and we should stop looking at it in that perspective and start looking at it in the American perspective.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) will be postponed.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa) having assumed the chair, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2744) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2744, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2744 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 303, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

Amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 3 and 6;

Amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 5, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. HEFLEY, regarding an across-the-board cut;

an amendment by Mr. TIAHRT, regarding regulations;

an amendment by Mr. BROWN of Ohio, regarding school food program;

an amendment by Mr. KUCINICH, regarding genetically engineered fish;

an amendment by Mr. KUCINICH, regarding BSE testing;

an amendment by Mr. WEINER, regarding minimum guarantees for agriculture funding for States;

an amendment by Mr. STUPAK, regarding FDA clinical trials;

an amendment by Mr. STUPAK, regarding FDA whistleblowers;

an amendment by Ms. KAPTUR, regarding Emerald Ash borer;

an amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, regarding 213A of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed in the RECORD or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. An amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in this request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2744.

□ 1600

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2744) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and

Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) had been postponed.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

Amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 3 and 6;

An amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 5, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

an amendment by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) regarding an across-the-board cut;

an amendment by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) regarding regulations;

an amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) regarding school food programs;

an amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) regarding genetically engineered fish;

an amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) regarding BSE testing;

an amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) regarding minimum guarantees for agriculture funding for States;

an amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) regarding FDA whistleblowers;

an amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) regarding FDA clinical trials;

an amendment by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) regarding Emerald Ash borer; and

an amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) regarding 213A of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in the request or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed in the RECORD or a designee, shall be considered read, shall not be subject to amendment except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 7____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who make loans available under section 156 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272) to processors of domestically grown sugarcane at a rate in excess of 17 cents per pound for raw cane sugar or to processors of domestically grown sugar beets at a rate in excess of 21.6 cents per pound for refined beet sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The United States sugar program is an archaic remnant of a Depression-era policy to artificially raise prices of sugar. Today, it harms American companies and consumers, while preventing developing nations from competing in the global market place. Everybody pays. U.S. consumers alone paid an additional 1 to $2 billion directly, and much more indirectly.

This is not a program that benefits our average family farmer. Under the 2002 farm bill, the sugar program has 42 percent of the sugar benefits going to the most profitable 1 percent of large corporate sugar farmers. This policy weakens our credibility for trade liberalization as it continues protection of sugar policies that restrict trade. These continuing subsidies are harming progress in the current Doha Round, a key component of which is to reduce unnecessary agricultural subsidies worldwide.

We saw an example in the discussion of the Australian Free Trade Agreement where, to keep our outrageous sugar subsidies in place, the United States acceded to Australia's position on maintaining monopolies for the export of wheat, barley and rice, therefore closing off export opportunities to United States farmers producing these crops.

It is, I think, outrageous in current American free trade CAFTA, where we are watching the door barely open over the next 15 years. If it were to pass, these countries would be able to export only 1.7 percent of the U.S. consumption.

This policy of supporting high-cost producers and limiting imports through quotas deprives more low, cost-efficient producers in developing nations. These protectionist policies in developed countries have deprived poor, desperately poor countries like Ethiopia, Mozambique and Malawi of $238 million in sales since 2001.

The current U.S. sugar program emphasis on overproduction has caused environmental degradation in environmentally sensitive areas, particularly the Florida Everglades and the Mississippi Delta wetlands. The down payment on cleaning up the Everglades that are significantly damaged by sugar production is nearly $8 billion.

Mr. Chairman, the impact on jobs in the United States is also unfortunate. The number of employees in sugar-using industries, an estimated 724,000 jobs, is 12 times the 61,000 sugar production jobs in the United States. It produces a loss of jobs as sugar-intensive industries like confectionery move to Canada and other low-cost areas. This is an opportunity today to correct that.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) for the great job the gentleman has done on the appropriations bill, along with the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO). It is kind of surprising that we have this many controversial amendments on the floor today after we worked things out in subcommittee pretty well.

I think it is an amazing thing that we are one of the few countries in the whole world that is still able to feed itself, and we arrived at this point because we had a government that supported programs that guaranteed and made sure that we always had an adequate supply and processing capacity of food and fiber so we never had to worry about whether or not we were going to have enough.

These programs do not enrich farmers. They may keep them in business in hard times, but they do not enrich them, but they do provide for adequate production of food and fiber.

Now we bring an amendment to attack the sugar industry. The last time we did away with the sugar program, the price of sugar went wild, absolutely wild.

We hear those that are opposed to the sugar program come to the floor and talk about how cheap sugar is in the world market. The fact is, all of the sugar production in the world is supported by the countries where it is produced. What is in the world market is what is excess to their own needs. It is a matter of fact that it is essential to our own well-being to have the ability to produce enough sugar in this country to take care of our own needs. Any country that cannot supply adequate food and fiber production and processing capacity is at risk in a far greater way than we have ever faced in the United States of America. Over and

over again these very modest programs that keep this production at a safe level are attacked over and over by those that just simply do not understand what it is all about.

Now I hear them talk about how farm programs enrich people. I happen to have been involved with farm programs my entire life. If anybody thinks it is a way to get rich, let me encourage them to go buy one. They are for sale every day because people go broke trying to make a living on them. Go buy one and get just rich with them. I do not know anybody who would tell Members that is the best way to make a dollar in this country. These people do it because they love it and because they are good at it, and they do not ask the government to take care of them.

It is for the well-being of the American people that we provide these programs that guarantee an adequate production of not only sugar but a lot of other food and fiber products that are necessary for our own national security. It is not a give-away program or an enrichment program for a few, as it has been described. Let me encourage this body to follow the recommendations of the subcommittee and to vote against this amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), but the fact is that the people who are involved with sugar are not going broke. The point I made is that the top 1 percent get 42 percent of the benefits.

We do not have a problem of sugar production in this country. First of all, we produce so much sugar and if it falls below the target level they just turn the sugar over to the government and walk away from the loans. In 2002, we were paying more than a million dollars a month just to store the surplus sugar, just to store the surplus sugar.

We have 41 other countries around the world that are ready, willing and able to go into the United States market, but are not able to do so. Some of us say we believe in free trade, but we will not allow free trade when it comes to sugar because it is so intensely protected.

I have here and include for the RECORD an open letter to the United States Congress and the President signed by 50 prominent academicians, consumer experts, trade advocates, taxpayer advocates, and people who care about the environment that talk about what an outrage it is to continue this pattern.

Mr. Chairman, we just heard ''people are not asking the government to take care of this.'' Wait a minute, the government absolutely is taking care of the sugar industry in this country.

I am not talking about the problems that genuinely affect family farms. If we were doing the right thing instead of lavishing subsidy on people who do not need it and funding the promise of the agriculture bill for things like environmental cleanup, we could help those family farmers. I think it is about time to get this in perspective and not confuse lavish sugar benefits with helping ordinary family farmers.

MARCH 15, 2005.

OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE U.S. CONGRESS

SOUR SUBSIDIES—U.S. SUGAR POLICY IS UNFAIR TO AMERICAN CONSUMERS AND TO POOR COUNTRIES; HARMS THE ENVIRONMENT

Summary: The current sugar policy in the United States—a system of price supports and import restrictions—cannot be justified on economic or humanitarian grounds. It imposes high costs on U.S. consumers and taxpayers and causes job losses in the U.S. In addition, the sugar program causes enironmental damage and blights economic opportunities for many small farmers in poor countries, primarily for the benefit of a small group of well-off producers.

The U.S. sugar policy started 70 years ago during the Great Depression as a temporary support program for U.S. growers. The system of price supports and import restrictions allows growers in the U.S. to charge consumers and other users artificially high prices for sugar and other sweeteners, currently more than two to three times the world market price. During those 70 years, 18 presidential elections have taken place, and still consumers and taxpayers are paying to support sugar beet and sugar cane growers.

The sugar program is a transfer of wealth from those who often can least afford it to a smalll group of sugar producers. The American public transfers about $1.3 billion each year to support the sugar beet and cane growers in the U.S. The primary beneficiaries of the program are a few large corporations rather than small family farm operations, as was originally intended.

The disadvantaged lose the most when food prices are manipulated to support sugar producers. American consumers are forced to pay two to three times the world market price for sugar. Because sugar is a key ingredient in many foods, including whole grain breads, high-fiber cereals, and fruit preserves, the higher prices have a disproportionate impact on those families, who pay a larger percentage of their income on food. As a result, families with children and people on low and fixed incomes are hit the hardest by the U.S. sugar program. Sugar reform would give American families a real break for their food budget.

The miguided support policy destroys precious natural habitats. The current sugar policy's incentives for overproduction have caused environmental degradation in ecologically sensitive areas, including the Florida Everglades and the Mississippi Delta wetlands. The impact is particularly acute in the Everglades, as the U.S. grows much of its cane sugar in Florida, resulting in the diversion of sorely-needed water from the country's most famous and endangered wetland. Sugar producers are seriously polluting these valuable wetlands to produce sugar that could be produced with less cost and pollution in a number of other countries. In addition, the U.S. is growing sugar beets with high costs and poor sugar yields per acre on land that could readily be shifted to crops with higher comparative advantage, such as feedstuffs.

Domestic sugar policy has contributed to the loss of jobs in the sugar-using industry. The number of employees in the sugar-using industry—an estimated 724,000—vastly outnumbers the 61,000 sugar production jobs in the United States. The artificially inflated domestic sugar price increases the costs of production for sugar-using industries, which has led to some companies moving their facilities to other countries and has added to U.S. job losses in these industries.

Sugar producers in developing countries bear the brunt of rich countries' support programs. Domestic subsidies and protectionism distort the price of sugar on the world market. Poor farmers in developing countries—no matter how efficient—cannot compete with sugar unloaded on the world market by rich countries' subsidized producers, and a valuable opportunity for achieving higher living standards is lost.

The United States undermines its global leadership role in promoting open trade by insisting on indefensible sugar protectionism. While the U.S. promotes open trade in many venues, it is one of the worst offenders in distorting world sugar markets. The United States' exemption of sugar from recent trade negotiations has undermined the country's ability to negotiate and achieve more open trade with other nations. This special protection of sugar has cost other U.S. producers broader export opportunities and U.S. consumers the chance to benefit from more open trade with these countries.

The U.S. sugar policy affects other economic and policy objectives besides trade. Reforming one of the most protectionist agricultural programs could contribute to economic growth and stability in other parts of the world and demonstrate U.S. willingness to embrace broader international cooperation.

As a group of non-profit organizations representing consumers, citizens, and taxpayers, we support a fundamental reform of the United States' sugar policy.

Removing protectionist barriers to sugar around the world could lower the price for U.S. consumers by 25 percent from current, artificially high levels.

Reducing support in the U.S. could save consumers and taxpayers up to $1.3 billion per year.

The net loss to the U.S. economy due to the sugar support program in 1998, the most recent year for which analysis is available, is about $900 million, according to the U.S. General Accounting Office.

Reducing sugar cane production in Florida could improve environmental quality as water-retention capacity in the Florida Everglades watershed could be increased.

Lowering sugar overproduction can help reduce the impact of pesticide and fertilizer usage on the environment.

Reducing costs for sugar-using industries could help retain workers.

The benefits for developing countries would also be substantial:

If rich countries' sugar subsidies and trade barriers were eliminated, it is estimated that the world market price of sugar could rise by almost 40 percent, providing valuable economic opportunities. At the same time, consumers in heavily protected markets such as the U.S. would still enjoy an overall benefit of a reduction in prices of about 25 percent.

If the U.S. is serious about helping poorer countries, it has to open up its markets for those countries' products, which would help U.S. consumers and create employment not only in poor countries but also in the large sugar-using sectors in the U.S.

The undersigned urge our public and political representatives to debate the need for reforming this destructive policy that hurts consumers and taxpayers in the United States, harms the environment, and holds back further ecommic development in many poor countries around the world.

Frances B. Smith—Consumer Alert; Barbara Rippel—Consumer Alert; Rhoda

Karpatkin—Consumers Union; Mark Silbergeld—Consumer Federation of America; Pam Slater—Consumers for World Trade; John Frydenlund—Citizens Against Government Waste; Dennis Avery—Hudson Institute—Center for Global Food Issues; Alex Avery—Hudson Institute—Center for Global Food Issues; Greg Conko—Competitive Enterprise Institute; Fred Smith—Competitive Enterprise Institute; Fred Oladeinde—The Foundation for Democracy in Aftica; Tad DeHaven—National Taxpayers Union; Chad Dobson—Oxfam America; Philip D. Harvey—DKT Liberty Project; Phil Kerpen—Free Enterprise Fund;

Clayton Yeutter—Former U.S. Trade Representative and former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture; Nathaniel P. Reed—Chairman Emeritus, 1000 Friends of Florida and former Assistant Secretary of the Interior; Professor William L. Anderson—Dept. of Economics, Frostburg State University; Professor James T. Bennett—Dept. of Economics, George Mason University; Sam Bostaph, Ph.D.—Associate Professor and Chairman, Dept. of Economics, University of Dallas; Donald J. Boudreaux—Chairman, Dept. of Economics, George Mason University; John Brätland, Ph.D.—Economist, U.S. Department of the Interior;

Peter T. Calcagno, Ph.D.—Assistant Professor of Economics, Department of Economics and Finance, College of Charleston; Professor Lloyd Cohen—School of Law, George Mason University; Professor John P. Cochran—Metropolitan State College of Denver; James Rolph Edwards, Ph.D.—Professor of Economics, Montana State University-Northern; Professor Kenneth G. Elzinga—Robert C. Taylor Professor of Economics, Dept. of Economics, University of Virginia; Professor William P. Field—Dept. of Economics (emeritus), Nicholls State University; Professor Gary Galles—Professor of Economics, Pepperdine University; S. D. Garthoff—Adjunct Faculty, Dept. of Economics, Summit College—The University of Akron;

Professor Robin Hanson—George Mason University; David R. Henderson—Research Fellow, Hoover Institution; Robert Higgs, Ph.D.—The Independent Institute; Professor Steven Horwitz—Professor of Economics, Associate Dean of the First Year, St. Lawrence University, Canton, NY; Professor Daniel Klein—Dept. of Economics, Santa Clara University; Professor Laurence Iannaccone—Dept. of Economics, George Mason University; Dr. Arnold Kling—www.econlog.org; Professor Dwight R. Lee—Ramsey Professor of Economics, University of Georgia; Professor Leonard P. Liggio—Atlas Economic Research Foundation; Professor Roger Meiners—University of Texas at Arlington;

Professor Andrew Morriss—School of Law and Dept. of Economics, Case Western Reserve University; Professor Svetozar Pejovich—Dept. of Economics (emeritus), Texas A&M University; Dr. William H. Peterson—Independent economist, Washington, DC; Professor Adam Pritchard—University of Michigan; Professor Gary Quinlivan—Dean of the Alex G. McKenna School, St. Vincent College; Professor Charles K. Rowley—General Director, The Locke Institute; Karen Vaughn, Ph.D—Professor of Economics (ret.), George Mason University; Professor John T. Wenders—Dept. of Economics, University of Idaho; Bart Wilson—Associate Professor, Dept. of Economics, George Mason University; Professor William Woolsey—Dept. of Economics, The Citadel.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the authorizing committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Blumenauer-Flake amendment which calls for reductions of the loan rates established in the 2002 farm bill for both sugar beets and sugarcane.

Farmers have crafted their business plans based on the assurances of the 2002 farm bill. Much of the crop of sugar that will be placed under loan in fiscal year 2006 is already in the ground. Farmers have invested time and money in that crop, often with capital borrowed from the bank. It is unfair now to reduce the returns that farmers counted on when planning, financing and planting that crop.

This debate concerning the sugar program is an important one. However, it is a debate we should conduct at the appropriate time: during authorization of a new farm bill.

□ 1615

As chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, I have announced my intention to hold hearings, and the committee will begin work on a new farm bill this fall. During that process and not when we are on the House floor debating an appropriations bill is the correct time for discussing and possibly making important changes to U.S. sugar policy.

Mr. Chairman, in my capacity as chairman, it is my responsibility to look at all of agriculture and consider what is best for the United States and our farmers and ranchers. However, I must note that the U.S. sugar industry does not take the same view when it comes to CAFTA. That free trade agreement is good for U.S. agriculture, but U.S. sugar is the only major agriculture group opposing it. I am disappointed that we do not have total agricultural support for that FTA. I hope that sugar interests will look to help us with that legislation and find a way to close the gap and see that it is passed.

But regardless, the policy that was put in place by the 2002 farm bill must remain intact. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the coauthor of this amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment forward.

Mr. Chairman, this represents a bipartisan step in the right direction. There are much needed reforms in this area. These agriculture subsidy programs are out of control, not just in the area of sugar but sugar is right on top. It is amazing that you could have something as sweet as sugar that leaves such a bitter, sour taste in consumers' mouths when you realize that we pay more than $1 billion a year extra just from the inflated cost of sugar to support this program.

Supporters of the sugar program like to say this does not cost taxpayers any money, but they ignore the fact that it costs to store the sugar. It costs to implement the program. And when you levy a tax on consumers by inflating the cost, it is just like a tax. It is just like a tax. So we are paying. Every time you bite into a candy bar, that is a couple of cents that you are paying extra. It is the principle of diffuse costs/concentrated benefits. No one is going to come to Washington to lobby to get 4 cents off their candy bar price, but the top 1 percent of those who are getting this subsidy are sure going to come here to lobby and they do and they are. That is why it is so difficult to get rid of these subsidies.

Let me just remind my colleagues some of the organizations that are for this amendment. The National Taxpayers Union, a statement from them says, Sugar interests like to make the claim that the sugar program is at no cost to taxpayers. As I said, they conveniently ignore that this monstrous program costs staffing and operating the bureaucracy necessary to support it.

Another statement from Citizens Against Government Waste: It is bad enough that the archaic sugar program forces American consumers to pay two or three times the world price for sugar and sugar-containing products. Even worse is the fact that more than any other farm program, this is an obstacle to advancing freer international trade for all agricultural products. We saw in our free trade agreement with Australia, for example, this was a stumbling block. It is a stumbling block right now to CAFTA. So it comes up again and again and again.

We have got to stand for free trade. I do not know how in the world you can support this program and truly stand for the principles of free trade. The Free Enterprise Fund said, In 2004 government price controls through quotas and loan guarantees priced U.S. sugar at more than 20 cents a pound, more than double the world price of 8.6 cents. So it is inflating the cost all over.

Also, for those conservatives out here, the Club For Growth has come out against this subsidy program and for the Blumenauer/Flake amendment. The Club For Growth will be scoring this amendment. For those who feel that fiscal responsibility is important, vote for the Blumenauer/Flake amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), a distinguished member of our subcommittee.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am troubled by the attack on sugar cane and sugar beet growers that this amendment represents, and I strongly would like to urge all my colleagues to reject this proposal. Mr. Chairman, all U.S. commodities covered by the 2002 farm bill are eligible for loans from the Federal Government. So sugar cane and sugar beet farmers are not receiving special treatment. The only difference between the sugar loan program and other commodity loan programs is there is no cost to the taxpayer. Sugar farmers have had the same loan level for 20 years. Inflation continues to increase production prices.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment reopens the farm bill and singles out one commodity. This is an issue that we should discuss when the 5-year farm bill expires and is reenacted in 2007. I would urge my colleagues to reject this proposal and not yank the rug out from our American farmers who are trying to produce food and fiber for our country and others around the world.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. I have great respect for my friend from Florida, but I have three brief observations. First of all, the notion that there is no cost to the taxpayer is just simply not the case. Consumers in this country by all independent estimates are paying between $1 billion and $2 billion a year extra in the price that they pay for sugar and sugar-related products. Second, there is never a good time to consider this. This amendment is not pulling the rug out from underneath sugar producers. It would be a 6 percent reduction in the lavish Federal subsidy. This will be a good signal for people to get serious about making a change.

I heard my friend from Virginia talk about the problem under CAFTA. That is an example of how hard-nosed and extreme the sugar interests are. Getting 1.7 percent of the market over 15 years is such that they consider it being tantamount to World War III. I think that is an example of the mindset of this industry, how intransigent they are and why we need to address it today.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I know a great many sugar producers who have had to buy the sugar beet factory in order to have a viable business. In doing so, they have taken out extensive loans and the whole financial structure is based on the current sugar program. And so to change the program in the middle of the stream when these people are oftentimes selling at marginal rates, sometimes below the forfeiture level, and then to say, well, we are just going to change it 5 or 6 percent, the margin of profit sometimes is no more than 2 or 3 percent.

So to say to these people, it makes no difference and we are going to just willy-nilly change the farm bill makes absolutely no sense. You can do it for wheat, you can do it for corn, you can do it for any crop; and that is why we have a farm bill, to make sure that people have some continuity, have something to hang their hat on.

I certainly rise in opposition and I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

First, let me talk about some of the comments that were just made and tell you that the world cost of production of sugar is about 16 cents, (not the 8.5 cents) is the world price. The world price is a dumped price. That means when a country overproduces sugar and cannot get enough money for it, it just dumps it on the market for whatever it can get. That is the dumped price. What happens, as the gentleman from Oregon said, this does not cost jobs in the United States.

The reality is that if you look at Mexico and Canada, right now the price of sugar in the United States is around 22 cents. The price of sugar in Mexico is 23 cents. The price of sugar in Canada is about 21 cents. These companies are not moving to these foreign countries because of the price of sugar.

The reason they are moving there is the same reason they are moving to Mexico, where Mexico will allow a company to move there, build their facility, employ their people, buy world-dumped-price sugar, and then sell it back into the United States but not allow it to be sold into Mexico to compete with their domestic sugar supply. That is what we are dealing with. We would allow free and fairer trade across the country, free trade and fairer trade in sugar, but this is not it.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. No one has more respect for the gentleman from Idaho than I have, but the dynamic that is going on here is that we provide the most lavish support for sugar production in the world. These other countries cannot compete with us. I have mentioned and I have entered into the RECORD areas where countries like Mozambique and Malawi, where they are losing business, they cannot compete in terms of what the United States does with our dramatically subsidized sugar.

Were we to stop this program, and bear in mind I am not suggesting stopping it, everybody is exercised because we are talking about a 6 percent reduction, but if we were to go to a world market price we would find that the world price would increase but we would find that prices in the United States would decrease, and we would save damage to the environment and to United States production. I think it is a win-win situation.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to protect the industries in Mozambique. I am here to protect the people in Belle Glade, Florida. If the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) were with us today, he would tell you the same thing. It is about jobs in this country. I appreciate all this ruckus being made on the floor about subsidies. There are no subsidies. Sugar is at the lowest price it has been in decades. When was the last time a candy bar reduced its price? When was the last time a Coca-Cola was sold cheaper in the machine? Has it happened? No. It has not happened. We are talking about trying to reintroduce an amendment that has been introduced for now 10 years, since I have been in this process.

They talk about wealthy growers, wealthy farmers. You come out to Belle Glade and see people that are farming sugar in my district, people that need jobs, people of all races and ethnicities, people that are working hard for a living supplying America's sugar needs. They are not on the dole. They are not on the take. They have not forfeited their sugar. They have not turned in their goods. They have not asked the government for special favors or money. They have worked hard and paid their taxes. But all of a sudden on the floor I am told I have got to help the people in Mozambique. Well, God bless America. I will help my people. You help Mozambique.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Oregon for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of this amendment by both my colleague from Oregon and my colleague from Arizona. It is very important to note that if we talk about free trade and we talk about free markets, we ought to follow that talk with action. The reality is you simply cannot defend current policy. I listened to one of my colleagues on the floor just a few moments ago who talked about the dire consequences of this amendment.

Let me tell you how precisely how dire they are. It would reduce the effect of the sugar loan program by 6 percent. Quite frankly, we have to begin at some point. If we believe in free markets, if we believe there ought to be open trade on these issues, then we need to begin somewhere.

I just listened to my other colleague from Florida, a gentleman I admire greatly. He said visit these poor sugar farmers and see that they are barely making their living. I understand that. Except that on that theory, the government owes it to everyone in America to

subsidize their income. That simply is not the kind of America that I believe in. It is not the kind of America that the Founding Fathers envisioned. U.S. sugar policy today, the subsidies we provide, the loan programs we provide cost American consumers as much as $2 billion each year. How do we defend that policy back home? Is it not appropriate now that we begin to send the message that we should wean ourselves from unproductive subsidies and policies that discourage productive capacity and production by people of goods and services we need?

No one wants to put today's sugar farmers out of work, but we do need to make sure that there is free trade in America and that no product is given beneficial treatment. This is a reasonable start. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

□ 1630

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Blumenauer-Flake amendment to H.R. 2744. I have lots of respect for the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), but I must speak up for our sugar producers and for jobs in South Texas.

Nearly every year an anti-sugar-farmer amendment is offered to the agriculture appropriations bill, and almost every year the same misinformation is recklessly spread about sugar farmers. Before voting on the Blumenauer-Flake amendment to H.R. 2744, consider these facts:

I repeat what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) said earlier. All U.S. commodities covered under the 2002 farm bill receive loans from the Federal Government. Sugar is not receiving a special treatment. I represent lots of ag producers, and it is a fact that loan levels for sugar farmers have remained unchanged for 20 years.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Blumenauer-Flake amendment to H.R. 2744.

Sugar prices in the United States are low by world standards. Grocery shoppers in other developed countries pay 30 percent more for sugar than U.S. consumers.

America already has one of the most open sugar markets in the world, importing sugar from 41 countries whether we need the sugar or not. As the world's fourth largest net sugar importer, we're the only major sugar-producing country that is a net importer.

146,000 Americans are employed by the U.S. sugar industry. A vote for the Blumenauer-Flake Amendment to H.R. 2744 is a vote against 146,000 hard-working farmers and workers in 19 States.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Blumenauer-Flake Amendment to H.R. 2744 and save over 100,000 American jobs.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

It seems curious to me that at a time when our trade deficit is the deepest in the history of our country and that we face the prospect that this year the United States may actually import more agriculture goods than it exports, that we would hear in the urging of the passage of this amendment that bringing in foreign product is the thing we need to do.

I represent sugar beet growers in the Red River Valley. This is an industry that they have built from scratch with sweat and toil at an enormous financial risk. Presently, it makes a $2 billion contribution to our economy and employs directly 2,500; indirectly, 30,000. This is a vital industry to the region I represent and needs to be protected.

It is simply not responsible to take on a component of the economy as important as, for example, this industry is in the region I represent by amendments offered in the course of appropriations debate.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the distinguished ranking member of the authorizing committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Blumenauer-Flake amendment; and I just want to correct some misinformation that is put out here, some of it by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

We are not the highest-priced support system in the world. In fact, CAFTA was brought up. I was in Guatemala, and the internal price in Guatemala is actually higher than the internal support price in the United States. We are importing 1½ million tons of sugar that we do not need that the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and I could grow in the Red River Valley with our farmers, and here we are in CAFTA letting sugar come in from a country that has an internal price support that is higher than the United States. The Europeans are 50 percent higher than we are in this country, and this program does not cost any money directly for the government.

But the irony of this amendment, if we pass it, we probably will have forfeitures for the first time in 20 years, and we will cost the government money.

So oppose the Blumenauer amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON).

Mr. MELANCON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

I stand here today, and if sugar is such a great and wonderful and high-priced subsidized commodity, someone needs to call Hugh Andre or Nooni Duplantis or call the management at the two sugar mills that shut down in Louisiana. They did not shut down because they were making money. These boys are not having problems getting their production loans because they are making money. They are having problems because they are having a tough time making the bottom line, and it is just not working.

When we start talking about free trade, we are getting things confused here. Sugar in the GATT gave up 15 percent of the imports allowed in this country under the agreement with the United States Government that that would be it, no further depletions in the future agreements. Yet every time there is an agreement, sugar is in it. Do the Members know that there is not another agreement in a third world developing country that grows sugar, that sugar has been included? Canada got out of the agreement. They produce sugar.

I ask that the Members vote against this amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), who will wrap up this debate for our side, again strongly opposing this amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment.

I want to come clean and say that I have an extremely large sugar refinery in my district, so I have followed the sugar industry throughout the course of my career in the House of Representatives.

It is very easy to hoist up a straw man and say that they are the root of all evil. But remember the old series ''Dragnet'' where they said, ''Just the facts, ma'am, just the facts''?

The facts are that this is an agriculture bill, not a farm bill. Congress made promises to farmers in the 2002 farm bill, and sugar farmers made decisions based on these promises. Sugar is not receiving special treatment. All U.S. commodities covered under this farm bill receive loans from the Federal Government, and loan levels for farmers have remained unchanged for 20 years. Sugar policy, unlike other farm policies, operates at no cost to the taxpayers, that is, no cost to the taxpayers. In fact, sugar prices in the United States are low by world standards.

So America's sugar farmers cost taxpayers nothing, provide U.S. consumers with prices that are lower than the rest of the world, and open their market to imports more than other countries.

This northeasterner from New York absolutely opposes this amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is a fascinating debate that we are having. I appreciate the spirited nature, and I hope that it leads to a broader discussion, because I hope each and every Member does his or her own individual research and considers some

of the fantastic claims that have been made here.

I had one of my colleagues say, ''We have the most open market in the world for sugar in the United States.'' Let us take a step back and have people examine that, because no expert that I have heard suggests that that is remotely the case.

''Sugar does not receive any special benefits or treatment''? Not true. Sugar alone has this system of keeping out production from 41 other countries except under tightly controlled circumstances and providing lavish guarantees to many large sugar producers.

The point I made earlier, was not that somebody couldn't cite a poor sugar farmer that he or she may know someplace. The point I made is that if the Members care about poor farmers and other areas of agriculture, take a look at this program. Forty-two percent of the benefit goes to the top 1 percent of the producers. It is outrageous. It is how they are able to become the top agricultural contributors to political campaigns in the United States Congress, even though sugar farmers are only 1 percent of our farm production.

I heard the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) say he did not care about people in Mozambique. It was about jobs in Belle Glade, FL. That is an interesting quotation to come from him as a champion of open trade and a member of our Committee on Ways and Means. I will look forward to hearing his saying something like that when it comes to CAFTA or the next trade legislation. That is completely contrary to what I have understood his position to be in the past.

The fact of the matter is that when it comes to lavish support for the sugar industry, we turn a blind eye, either for politics or for sentimentality, but the fact is that we are consistently, consistently, paying raw sugar prices two to three times the world price. Do not take my word for it. Go to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service that we rely upon or, as I mentioned, the experts that I am putting in the RECORD.

We consistently, consistently in this country pay more. That is why we are taking $1 to $2 billion out of the pockets of the consumer and into the hands of the sugar industry, and that is the tip of the iceberg in terms of the costs.

I mentioned Florida. We would not be putting 450,000 acres in sugarcane production in Florida draining into the Everglades if it were not for this lavish program. But we are as a Congress because of the legacy of the explosive growth.

I will wrap up by saying there is a lot to say. I urge colleagues to examine it and to approve the Blumenauer-Flake amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) will be postponed.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, energy prices, specifically natural gas prices, in the United States have reached drastically high levels and are devastating our agricultural sector. Maintaining abundant supplies of natural gas and other various forms of energy are essential to keeping American agriculture competitive within the world marketplace.

According to the Fertilizer Institute on May 26 of this year, ''Natural gas is the feedstock for producing nitrogen fertilizer and accounts for up to 90 percent of the cost of its production. As a result of the ongoing natural gas crisis in the United States, 21 nitrogen fertilizer production facilities have closed since 1998. Sixteen of those plants have closed permanently, while five plants remain idle.''

If present policy of denial of access to decades of natural gas reserves continues in this country, the future offers no hope for relief. The U.S. Department of Energy projects that by 2010 the Nation's demand for natural gas will increase by another 30 percent. We cannot continue to have the highest natural gas prices in world. We are at $7, Canada is at $6, Europe is at $5, China is at $4, and the rest of the world is below $2, and two countries are below $1.

Mr. Chairman, as we move toward a conference with the Senate, may I have the gentleman from Texas's (Chairman BONILLA) commitment to work with me in securing report language calling for the Economic Research Service to examine the impact of rising natural gas prices on our domestic agricultural economy and the effects that has on American agriculture in the world marketplace?

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would be happy to work with the gentleman and anyone associated with this issue to ensure that the Economic Research Service examine the high energy costs of natural gas prices and their impact on the rural agricultural economy.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I thank him for his answer.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. CHABOT:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 203 of the Agriculture Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who carry out a market program under such section.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

□ 1645

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the rationale behind this amendment is simple: hard-working taxpayers should not have to subsidize the advertising costs of food industry associations or cooperatives, or State and regional trade groups. Yet this is exactly what the Market Access Program does.

Since 1997, MAP has cost the American taxpayers nearly $1 billion. Let me put that another way. Despite a massive budget deficit and unsustainable spending on entitlement programs like Social Security and Medicaid, the Federal Government continues to spend more than $100 million annually to underwrite the overseas advertising costs of groups like the Popcorn Institute and the Catfish Institute and the Ginseng Board, just to name a few.

Let me be clear. I strongly support American businesses of all kinds marketing their products around the world. I just do not think that the American taxpayer should have to pay for their advertising costs. It seems reasonable to believe that if trade associations felt that advertising their products in other countries would be beneficial, they would do it, and they would pay for it.

Mr. Chairman, the General Accounting Office, the GAO, has reviewed the MAP program and has concluded that MAP has no discernible effect on U.S. agricultural exports. Let me repeat that: no discernible effect. But at an estimated cost of $140 million last year, MAP does have a discernible impact on the American people in the form of lighter wallets and in the red ink of our budget deficit.

Let us be honest. Most American businesses do not benefit and do not try to take advantage of government handouts like MAP. Most businesses want to keep more of what they earn. They want fewer burdensome regulations that limit growth and stifle productivity, and they would like the opportunity to compete on a level playing field in markets around the world. That would be a true Market Access Program.

However, the U.S. Department of Agriculture plans to spend $125 million on MAP in the 2006 fiscal year. If recent

history is any indication, those groups that market pistachios and prunes and papaya and pears and pet food and popcorn will do pretty well, getting nearly $6 million in 2004. The National Watermelon Promotion Board benefited from MAP in the past too.

We should ask ourselves, if these groups truly thought it would benefit their bottom line to advertise in foreign markets, would they not do it on their own dime? Would they not do it themselves? If it was their own money, would they not be more likely to work harder to make sure the money was well spent? Would that not make for more effective market access?

MAP is the poster child for corporate welfare. It is wasteful spending in the name of job creation and market access that fails to provide either.

I urge my fellow Members of Congress to join me and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and join the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, Taxpayers For Common Sense, and U.S. PIRG in casting a vote for the overburdened American taxpayer. Please vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to hear the term ''corporate welfare'' that was brought before the public to a large degree in the previous administration to try to attack a lot of private sector investment opportunities that helped create jobs. This does not fall into that category.

This is a situation where individual companies that receive assistance from the MAP program have to match 50 percent of any funds received. In addition, participants are required to certify that Federal funds used under the program are to supplement and not replace private sector funds.

Farmers, ranchers, and rural business owners from all regions of the country benefit from the program's employment and economic effects from expanded agricultural export markets. More than 1 million Americans have jobs that depend on exports. This program helps to ensure that American agricultural products have export markets.

MAP is an effective program and deserves everyone's support. I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman GOODLATTE), also in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to the amendment. This is not the time for unilateral disarmament when you are talking about the trade competition that we face in the world.

The gentleman mentions it is a $140 million program. The European Union alone spends $2 billion each year on export subsidies. So the opportunity for us to promote exports by giving companies an incentive to buy American agricultural products when they then provide sales and services overseas is well worth it, if indeed you are facing that kind of competition.

The European Union has a trade surplus in agriculture with the United States. One of the reasons they do is because they provide far more of this type of support than we do. So to take away what little we have while we are in the midst of intense negotiations with the World Trade Organization is, to me, unilateral disarmament.

What this program does is promote the export of American agricultural products. It is estimated that for every $1 billion of U.S. agricultural exports, we create 15,000 jobs in this country. Last year we exported over $60 billion worth of agricultural products, creating nearly 1 million jobs. Taking away this program is going to take away some of those jobs. It is not a good idea. I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Ohio for his commonsense amendment. If this Congress were not a captive of special interests, the Chabot/Brown amendment would pass unanimously.

We in this body, we preach balanced budgets; yet we spent, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) said, $1 billion on this program, on this welfare program. We preach in this body prudent spending, yet we are suggesting spending $125 million for fiscal year 2006 on this program. We preach free enterprise in this body day after day after day, yet we are using government dollars to advertise on behalf of private interests.

The Market Access Program, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) said, gives away $100 million annually to groups like the Catfish Institute, the Popcorn Institute, the Ginseng Board to market their products overseas. We encourage these organizations, these private for-profit or not-for-profit, it does not matter, we encourage them to advertise overseas if that helps their bottom line. But they should do it on their dime, not on the taxpayer's dime. It simply does not make sense.

I know what budget cuts mean to my district in Cleveland when we have seen the cuts that happened to NASA and the kinds of job loss in my community. We have seen what Medicaid cuts cost in terms of quality health care. Yet we are going to spend $125 million on a program that clearly shows no real benefit to those organizations. If they did show benefit, they would be spending their own money.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Chabot amendment, to join National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, Taxpayers For Common Sense, U.S. PIRG, and a whole host of other groups in passing this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) will be postponed.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONILLA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding on this important subject matter. It is an issue that I know the gentleman has done due diligence on and paid attention to.

I rise today to address the issue of an amendment that I had prepared to offer that I will not be offering that would require the Secretary of Agriculture to report to Congress on the National Animal Identification System, including the effectiveness of the pilot programs funded in the FY 2005 budget year. Analysis of the economic impact of the proposed system on the livestock industry and the expected costs of the implementation of the system need to be part of a report.

USDA has been working diligently to establish a National Animal Identification System since December of 2003. That is when they discovered bovine spongiform encephalopathy, BSE, in a Canadian cow in Washington State. On May 5, 2005, USDA announced their Draft Strategic Plan and Draft Program Standards. The Department plans on making this a mandatory system by 2009, which would identify animals for disease surveillance.

It is not a new concept, Mr. Chairman. In fact, in the 90s we had implemented a plan to address and identify cattle vaccinated for brucellosis, which is a bacterial disease that affects cattle, hogs, and other livestock. This program has been successful and is scheduled to be phased out. This is not a new thing for the USDA.

I have been saying since before the discovery of BSE that we need an animal identification system that is up and running. It would be an insurance policy for livestock owners in the case of a disease outbreak. It would also be a system that is beneficial for foreign trade. It would be creative, and it would be invaluable for our marketing opportunities and for our breeding information.

Overall, the need for this system is immediate. The Canadians and the

Australians, whose system I have visited and observed, and others already have electronic systems in place that they continue to refine.

For the sake of disease surveillance in trade, for the future of the livestock industry, I would like to see a system up and running as soon as possible. In fact, I am in the process of finishing my own bill on animal identification that I plan to introduce in the coming weeks.

One of the most important and immediate needs is to know what the USDA has been doing. They have invested approximately $18 million in a pilot program working in cooperative agreements between the States and the tribes, and the accountability of the USDA yet has not been apparent to us. We need to know how these projects are progressing and how they justify their worth to the taxpayer.

Also the USDA has spent another $15 million on development, infrastructure, promotion and staff overhead of the animal identification system that they are seeking to implement. It may only be the tip of the iceberg, but when the USDA issued its Draft Strategic Plan and Draft Program Standards in May, many hoped to see a cost estimate for the system.

Farmers are concerned about the costs that they might have to invest into them out of their profit margins. So I have those similar concerns. I am asking the USDA to produce that report. In fact, last year in the report language of the same appropriations bill, there was a request for a report on BSE itself, and that was to be before this Congress on July 15 of 2004. We have not seen that report yet, and I hope we are able to get one. The CBO score for this proposal, by the way, I did have it scored, scored it at zero; so there is not a cost to our budget.

Again, I hope we would be able to get some report language that could address this important topic of animal identification.

I thank the chairman for his diligence on this issue and for yielding to me.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for bringing this issue to the forefront. It is something that I have been working on and many other Members as well, and we are committed to working through conference to address the gentleman's needs.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to express my pleasure with the gentleman raising the issue of animal identification. I would simply like to say that I, for one, believe that we are not moving ahead on this matter nearly fast enough. We need a national program. We need to get to 48-hour track-back as soon as possible, and we should be doing everything possible to move USDA forward.

We have a pilot project on this issue going on in Wisconsin which appears to be very successful, but I am afraid that there is much more foot-dragging than we can afford on this issue. I would simply say that I would hope that both the USDA and the Congress would become much more aggressive than it has been so far in establishing a truly effective national animal ID program, so that we can assure the consuming public that every bit of meat that is produced is in fact safe to eat. The sooner we do, the sooner we set up this kind of a system, the sooner every farmer, every rancher, and every consumer will be better off.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment offered by Mr. WEINER of New York; amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. REHBERG of Montana; amendment offered by Mr. HINCHEY of New York; amendment offered by Mr. SWEENEY of New York; amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon; and amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. CHABOT of Ohio.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

□ 1700

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 201, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]

AYES—226

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hayworth
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Rogers (MI)
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—201

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Hobson
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris

Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Akin
Cox
Hastings (FL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Menendez
Rush

□ 1726

Messrs. PEARCE, ORTIZ, ALEXANDER, GALLEGLY, GARY G. MILLER of California, LINDER, BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mrs. BONO changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CUELLAR, MARSHALL, TANNER, BRADLEY of New Hampshire, EDWARDS, HOEKSTRA, GORDON, SCHWARZ of Michigan, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. REHBERG

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 240, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

AYES—187

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonner
Bono
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Conyers
Costa
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKinney
McMorris
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Simmons
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden (OR)
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—240

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Otter
Oxley
Pastor
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Cox
Ford
Hastings (FL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Menendez
Rush

□ 1735

Mr. FORBES changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no''.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HINCHEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 210, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

AYES—218

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
Costello
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo

Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Harman
Hefley
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kirk
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Platts
Pomeroy
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—210

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Cox
Hastings (FL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Menendez
Rush
Slaughter

□ 1745

Messrs. SHAYS, THOMPSON of Mississippi, BOREN, WYNN and MORAN of Kansas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWEENEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 269, noes 158, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

AYES—269

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bono
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hayworth
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Reichert
Renzi
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Simmons
Smith (NJ)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—158

Akin
Alexander
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Berry
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Cardoza
Carson
Carter
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
DeLay
Dingell
Doolittle
Drake
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
Feeney
Flake
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Honda
Hulshof
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lucas
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris

Melancon
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pastor
Pearce
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Scott (GA)
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiberi
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—6

Cox
Hastings (FL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Menendez
Rush
Slaughter

□ 1755

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. WATERS and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 232, 233, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 280, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

AYES—146

Akin
Allen
Andrews
Baldwin
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Conyers
Cooper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
Dent
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Ehlers
Emanuel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Fattah
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gordon
Green (WI)
Hart
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Holt
Hostettler
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy (RI)
Kind
Kingston
Kirk
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
McDermott
McHenry
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Myrick
Ney
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Simmons
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Stark
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tiberi
Tierney
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wamp
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

NOES—280

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Becerra
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Filner
Foley
Ford
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Israel
Issa
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—7

Cox
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Larson (CT)
Menendez
Rush

□ 1803

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 234, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, I inadvertently voted ''no'' on an amendment to the fiscal year 2006 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, H.R. 2744. I intended to vote "aye" on the Blumenauer-Flake Amendment regarding payments to the Sugar Loan Program, rollcall vote number 234.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 66, noes 356, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

AYES—66

Akin
Andrews
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Berkley
Bradley (NH)
Brown (OH)
Burgess
Capuano
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Davis, Jo Ann
DeGette
Dent
Doggett
Duncan
Ehlers
English (PA)
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Hayworth
Hensarling
Hostettler
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Istook
Kucinich
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
McDermott
McHenry
McKinney
Miller, Gary
Moore (WI)

Myrick
Paul
Pence
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Rohrabacher
Royce
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Smith (NJ)
Tancredo
Tiberi
Tierney
Van Hollen
Waxman
Wilson (SC)

NOES—356

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Camp
Cox
Crenshaw
Hastings (FL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Menendez
Moore (KS)
Rush
Slaughter
Spratt
Sullivan

□ 1811

Mr. RYAN of Ohio changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUPAK:

Page 83, after line 19, insert the following sections:

SEC. 7____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to keep in effect an exemption under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for a clinical trial that concerns a serious or life-threatening disease or condition and is not included in the registry of such trials under section 402(j) of the Public Health Service Act.

SEC. 7____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve an application under section 505(b)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act that—

(1) is for a drug for a serious or life-threatening disease or condition; and

(2) is under subparagraph (A) of such section supported by a clinical trial that—

(A) has received an exemption under section 505(i) of such Act; and

(B) is not included in the registry of clinical trials under section 402(j) of the Public Health Service Act.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to give patients and doctors the information they deserve about the safety and effectiveness of prescription drugs.

My amendment is simple. It requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make sure clinical trials that are required to be listed in a public database by law are in fact listed, and it requires those clinical trials to be listed before a drug is approved to be marketed.

My amendment requires nothing of HHS but to enforce the current law. As part of the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997, Congress mandated that a central drug trial database be created to house all clinical trials for all serious and life-threatening diseases and conditions. Three years later, in 2000, clinicaltrials.gov became the online site of the clinical trials data bank. FDA issued guidance on registering their trials in the clinical trials data bank in March of 2002. Two years after the guidance for the industry has been issued, compliance with the law has been dismal at best.

While 80 percent of drug trials are privately conducted, only 13 percent of them are listed on clinicaltrials.gov. FDA analysis from 2002 showed that less than half of all cancer trials are on the FDA Web site. An FDA official last year told The Washington Post that they have seen no ''big increase in the monthly submission of privately sponsored protocols'' since 2002. Drug company compliance has been so lax that last year even the editor in chief of the Journal of the American Medical Association, JAMA, assumed the registry was only for federally funded clinical trials.

□ 1815

The reality is that this law is not a lack of understanding, but the law has been ignored by the drug companies. This amendment is simple. Before the FDA can approve a new drug application, the clinical trials must be registered at clinicaltrials.gov first. FDA cannot allow these drug companies to continue to ignore the law. We said in 1997 that the drug companies must share their drug trial information with patients and doctors, especially those with serious injuries and illnesses or life-threatening disease.

This issue is not controversial. Last June, the American Medical Association adopted a resolution calling for a Federal database of clinical trials. The AMA and others are concerned that drug companies emphasize the results of positive tests while playing down

the negative or inconclusive results as they did with Vioxx, Accutane, and the adolescent antidepressant drugs. The New England Journal of Medicine and others require studies to be listed on the Web site before the journals will publish articles about the studies.

This amendment does not create any new duties. This amendment does not expand the database to other drugs. No drugs are going to be denied approval, as long as the trials get listed. It just requires the enforcement of this widely supported, lifesaving law. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' The amendment imposes additional duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, this does not require any new duties, none whatsoever. If the chairman would point that out to me, maybe we could have a discussion about it; but there are no new duties being required here. It does not require the drug companies to do anything different than they were required to do in 1997. They do not have to report the results of the studies. They just have to report it. In addition, it does not mandate posting trials for anything else, because we have limited it more to the serious and life-threatening, exactly what the law said in 1997. We did not expand the scope of it. The FDA simply has to enforce what they are supposed to enforce by law. The FDA has already published several guidelines to drug companies about which drug trials have to be listed, when they have to be listed, and what has to be listed. If they can get them listed, it can be approved. The amendment simply instructs the Secretary of HHS, not FDA but HHS, to ensure compliance. It makes sure one hand of the HHS talks to the other.

When we drafted this amendment, it should be made germane because it concerns the use of funds for carrying out the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and funds for that purpose provided in the bill. As to whether there are those duties, I referred to the Secretary here. I did not refer to anyone else, the same as the 1997 law. We have said ''Secretary'' because it is used in both the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and also the Public Health Service Act, that is, HHS administers both of these acts. Therefore, there is nothing new.

The argument is not that there is a new duty for HHS to check whether clinical trials are registered because the Public Health Service Act section, 402(j), states that the database, and I am using the exact language now, 402(j) of the Public Health Act says, shall include a registry of clinical trials, end of quote, for which investigative and new drugs have been provided.

There is nothing here new. All we are saying is the concepts used in my amendment are used in current law. We use the word ''exemption.'' That is in current law. We use ''registry of clinical trials.'' Current law. We refer to only serious or life-threatening disease or condition. That is current law. There are no new duties here.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan proposes to change existing law in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

As recorded in Deschler's Precedents, volume 8, chapter 26, section 52, even though a limitation or exception therefrom might refrain from explicitly assigning new duties to officers of the government, if it implicitly requires them to make investigations, compile evidence, or make judgments and determinations not otherwise required of them by law, then it assumes the character of legislation and is subject to a point of order under clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The proponent of a limitation assumes the burden of establishing that any duties imposed by the provision either are merely ministerial or are already required by law.

In the statutory context chosen by the amendment, a Federal official at the Food and Drug Administration would be required to examine a registry of clinical trials maintained by a different entity, the National Institutes of Health, before exempting a drug for a clinical trial or approving an application for a drug under existing law. Under the terms of section 402(j) of the Public Health Service Act, the registry of clinical trials is fluid, with each clinical trial sponsor being allowed 21 days after the approval of a drug to submit required information. In the opinion of the Chair, an examination of the contents of that fluid registry of data maintained by the NIH would constitute a new duty on the Federal officials at the FDA. The Chair finds that the gentleman from Michigan has not met his burden to show that the new duty imposed is ministerial.

Accordingly, the point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, does the Federal Food and Drug Administration and NIH not fall underneath the Health and Human Services, HHS, Department?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. As the Chair has ruled, although the two entities are within the same Department, the amendment would require that one entity examine the other entity's registry.

The Chair has ruled on the point of order.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, in all due respect, I do not require any of that. I require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to do it; not the FDA, not the NIH, the Secretary of Health and Human Services. These agencies, Food and Drug Administration, NIH, are underneath their jurisdiction. That is why we drafted it this way, to get around the germaneness issue. We are not requiring FDA or NIH. It is only the Secretary of HHS.

As to the second part of your ruling, Mr. Chairman, you said we are creating new law. We were very careful, as I pointed out, that every word used in the proposed amendment is the same words used in the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. That is exemption, that is in both acts; registry of clinical trials, exact same words; and limits to, quote, serious or life-threatening disease or condition, again words all found in the 1997 act which we require the Secretary to do, so we do not get into this thing about putting a new requirement on FDA or NIH.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled. The gentleman's comments are post-facto argument and not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEFLEY:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 7____. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of $168,320,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will not take a lot of time with this. I rise again today to offer an amendment to cut the level of funding in this appropriations bill by 1 percent. This amount equals $168.32 million, which represents only one penny off every dollar.

As most Members are aware, I have offered a series of amendments on appropriations bills like this. It is no criticism of the committee or the job that they have done. It is just the idea that we need somewhere to begin to draw the line, and the budget we have next year is simply too large, and we can do something about the deficit right now.

By voting for this amendment, you are stating that American taxpayers should not have to pay higher taxes in the future because we could not control our spending today. This fiscal year 2006 agriculture appropriations bill provides nearly $17 billion in total discretionary resources and represents an increase of $93 million over the President's request.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of this amendment.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again in a bipartisan way, this subcommittee works very hard to put a bill together each year with the majority-passed budget constraints that we have to live under. The gentleman from Colorado is a good Member who comes to the table year in and year out, and sometimes week in and week out, with an effort to cut the bill even further. However, again, with all due respect to his efforts, the bills that we put together on appropriations are done as a part of a team effort. We feel like we are at the rock bottom number that we could possibly be at at this point and strongly oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Page 83, after line 19, insert the following section:

SEC. 7____. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Food and Drug Administration may be used for the approval or process of approval, under section 512 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, of an application for an animal drug for creating transgenic salmon or any other transgenic fish.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment today to begin a discussion in this House which is aimed at ensuring the livelihood of commercial fishermen and protecting our oceans, lakes, and streams. This amendment is a reasonable and moderate safeguard. It will delay FDA approval of genetically engineered fish for a year. This amendment is necessary because commercial fishermen and environmentalists have raised concerns that GE fish may pose ecological risks. Scientists from Purdue University and the University of Minnesota have raised a number of serious questions about the ecological impacts of GE fish. These risks include GE fish escape from ocean pens into the environment, which could impact wild populations of fish.

In this first chart, Mr. Chairman, GE fish are being engineered to grow faster and bigger. However, several fish ecologists from the University of Minnesota and Purdue University have expressed concerns with these salmon, as their accidental release may create environmentally disastrous extinctions of natural wild salmon species.

In the second chart, the bottom fish is the same age as the two smaller fish on top.

□ 1830

But, of course, what we have here is a genetically engineered fish on the bottom.

The third chart, scientists have determined that a larger fish has an advantage in mating. Thus, larger GE fish, which are more aggressive and consume more food, attract more mates than wild fish. In essence, one could call this one the "handsomely big GE fish" is more successful than the "lonely natural fish."

Scientists have also determined that these GE fish may survive for only a limited number of generations in the wild. Their offspring will be less fit and less likely to survive. So we are talking about the survival of species here.

On the fourth chart, mutant fish are created as GE fish escape into the wild and mate with natural fish. The mutant's fish larger size gives an advantage in mating, forcing new genetic traits to be integrated into the wild. But these mutant fish may only survive for a limited number of generations in the wild. The implications are serious. After several generations, natural fish may go extinct because larger GE fish are more successful than natural fish in mating. Mutant fish also go extinct because their mutant genes decrease the survivability of the species.

As a result of GE fish producing unfit offspring that are more successful in mating, the Purdue scientists predict that if 60 genetically engineered fish were introduced into a population of 60,000 wild fish, the species would become extinct within only 40 fish generations.

Scientists call this outcome the Trojan Gene Effect. The end result is a possible extinction of important commercial fish species like salmon. The National Academy of Sciences has examined this issue in their report "Animal Biotechnology: Science Based Concerns, 2002," and found "considerable risk" and a need for more research.

"Transgenic Atlantic salmon pose a near-term regulatory issue. A brief review of the hazards they pose provides a useful illustration of the environmental hazards posed by GE aquatic species more generally.

"The committee's review," continuing on of the quote, "of ecologic principles and empirical data suggests a considerable risk of ecologic hazards being realized should transgenic fish or shellfish enter the natural ecosystems. In particular, greater empirical knowledge is needed to predict the outcome should transgenes become introgressed into natural populations of aquatic organisms."

The American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, the science society of experts on fish, amphibians, and reptiles, has joined the call for a 1-year moratorium. This amendment is strongly supported by commercial fishermen because their struggling industry cannot afford a negative ecological impact on the wild fish species that they depend on for their livelihood.

Several States have passed legislation regulating GE fish, including prohibitions, labeling requirements, and permit requirements. The States include Alaska, California, Maryland, Oregon, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I brought this discussion to this House for the purposes of alerting the Members of Congress that we need to have a deep debate about this, that we need to do more research, we need to get into this; and for that reason I would have the debate continue.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 83, after line 19, insert the following (and make such technical and conforming changes as may be appropriate):

SEC. 768. None of the funds made available under the heading "FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE—Food Stamp Program" in title IV may be expended in contravention of section 213a of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1183a).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today I rise to support an amendment that hopefully will be seen as a common sense amendment. It deals with H.R. 2744, more specifically with the Food Stamp Program aspect of it, and simply says that we should be complying with the Immigration and Nationality Act when we pass this legislation. The amendment is common sense because it simply says that we should always abide by current Federal law.

As it stands right now with regard to current Federal law, 8 USC 1183(a), it states that an affidavit must be filed by a sponsor of an alien who is in this country legally today. This affidavit of support is a legally binding guarantee on the part of a sponsor that the immigrant that is in this country that they are sponsoring will not become a public charge of this country. That is, that they will not become dependent on welfare. And it is limited for a period of 10 years or until that person becomes a citizen, whichever comes first. This ''public charge'' requirement is nothing new. It goes all the way back to our immigration policy way back in 1880.

Secondly, with regard to current law, current Federal law states that this affidavit is enforceable against the sponsor of the immigrant by any Federal Government or State, or political subdivision thereof, or any other entity that provides any means-tested public benefit. This means that the sponsor and not the U.S. taxpayer is to be the individual that is responsible for the alien. It also requires providers of these benefits to seek reimbursement from the sponsors and even allows the government to sue for noncompliance.

Just a side note here of interest, there is another law currently on the books in this country, 8 USC 1227, and it makes it clear that aliens who are in country who do become public charges within 5 years of their entry into this country that they are actually subject to deportation in some cases.

The amendment that is before us simply says this: It simply states that no funds appropriated in this Act under the Food Stamp Program will be spent in noncompliance of current Federal law. This amendment is simply about enforcing current law. If one does not like the current law that goes all the way back to 1880, they certainly have a right to try to change that, but that should be done in another piece of legislation and not through this vehicle. So by not supporting my amendment, they are publicly admitting on the floor in the United States that our laws elsewhere on the books are not to be complied with.

I will just end with this: Yesterday, a group of constituents was in my office from a group called Bread for the World, and they came to emphasize the fact that people in this country are going hungry and that there is not quite enough money in the Food Stamp Program today, in their opinion, that it is not adequate to provide all that is needed. So, under such circumstances, we should not be adding to the incentive for other people to become part of this program and become public charges to the taxpayer.

I, therefore, conclude by saying I urge of all my colleagues to support this common sense amendment.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is somewhat unusual, and I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey's (Mr. GARRETT) concern in this area. However, this is almost like going into a neighborhood and seeing a family that is playing by the rules and respecting the law and we are going to pass a law that says you have to do that all over again. So, in our view, it is unnecessary and duplicative and there is no indication that USDA is doing anything to contradict statutory provisions right now related to collection from sponsors of food stamp benefits paid to sponsored aliens.

So, because of the redundancy and the statement of the obvious, frankly, I would oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the comments, and if we can be provided with some evidence that the Department is, in fact, complying with the law, that would be greatly appreciated. It is our understanding that currently aliens who are in this country under this program who have a sponsor are, in fact, receiving food stamps under the current law and that there has been no effort whatsoever, ever, in any cases to go after and reclaim those funds from the sponsor in the case. So I would be appreciative of that information at a later date or now if the gentleman has it.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I would just note that the responsibility for enforcing the laws that the gentleman is referring to actually fall under the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, USCIS, and the State welfare departments. States are responsible for making demand for and collecting from sponsors any benefits paid to sponsored aliens. So there is no indication that the USDA is violating any of these regulations and rules, again emphasizing that the responsibility for compliance here lies with other agencies and some at the State level.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUPAK:

Page 83, after line 19, insert the following section:

SEC. 7___. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Food and Drug Administration to conduct any investigation of, or take any employment action against, an officer or employee of the Food and Drug Administration pursuant to the officer or employee providing to the Congress or the public information or opinions that concern such Administration and are not prohibited from disclosure under section 301(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer an amendment that will ensure that the FDA continues to carry out its mission to promote drug safety and effectiveness and assist the public in obtaining accurate science-based information.

The FDA's mission is not to conduct secret investigation of its own employees. Unfortunately, some of the FDA's recent actions seem like they are more about protecting themselves than protecting the American public.

My amendment is very simple. It forbids the use of funds by the FDA to conduct any investigation of or take any action against an FDA employee who provides information or an opinion to the public or Congress that concerns the FDA and is not prohibited from being released under the law.

Congress has expressed serious concerns regarding recent reports that FDA has asked Dr. David Graham to leave his current position within the Office of Drug Safety after more than 20 years of service. Dr. Graham has been a dedicated public servant, working to ensure the safety of America's drug supply. Dr. Graham was asked to

testify before Congress at the request of a committee Chair and was under an obligation to answer a question posed by the committee based on his expertise. And Dr. Graham, to his credit, answered, in his opinion, there are five more drugs that we should look at, including the drug called Accutane, which has over 250 suicides associated with it. The public's interest and society's safety is certainly not served when the FDA goes around and asks their safety officers to leave their job because they have done their job and honestly answered a question put forth by committee members in a congressional setting.

In the words of Dr. Janet Woodcock, the former director of the Center of Drug Evaluation and Research, ''. . . FDA thrives on differences of scientific opinion. That reality is our culture. Our scientists have the right to speak up and disagree and have a vigorous scientific debate. That's how we arrive at the best decisions.''

However, the FDA actions are contrary to this statement. The treatment of Dr. Graham and other employees undoubtedly has had a chilling effect on the willingness of FDA's employees to speak up and disagree when they believe the public's health is at risk.

Other reports have said that the Director of the Center of Drug Safety himself, Dr. Steve Galson, contacted the editor of the Lancet to suggest that Dr. Graham manipulated a study to be published in the Lancet. At the same time, according to the Government Accountability Project, FDA managers posed as whistleblowers, attacking Dr. Graham's credibility in an effort to discourage the Government Accountability Project from taking from Dr. Graham as a client.

The FDA also launched an investigation into Dr. Andrew Mosholder when a newspaper reported he was not able to testify before an advisory committee about his concerns about antidepressant use in children. This shameful behavior by management of the FDA cannot continue, and we demand that we put a stop to it.

I ask for support of my amendment.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. STUPAK) amendment to provide whistleblower protection to FDA employees.

We have talked a lot today about scientific and management problems at the FDA, about whether their scientific advisory committees have been corrupted by pharmaceutical company influence, about how we can be sure that FDA has the tools that it needs to do its job to protect the health of the American people.

□ 1845

Yet I might just quote to you the White House Chief of Staff, Andrew Card, who said, ''The agency is doing a spectacular job,'' and should ''continue to do the job they do.''

Unfortunately, we know that the FDA has not always lived up to its responsibilities; and rather than encouraging employees to speak out and engage in scientific debate, the FDA has worked hard to silence employees who believe that a drug on the market is harmful to the health of the American people.

Dr. David Graham, as my colleague pointed out, is just one example of how things have gone wrong at the FDA. After 20 years of service, when Dr. Graham testified before the Senate Finance Committee at the request of the committee chairman in November of 2004, in response to a question, he listed, as has been stated, five drugs he believed to pose serious health risks.

His concerns turned out to be warranted. One of the drugs he mentioned, Vioxx, has since been removed from the market, following reports that it causes heart attack and stroke, and others on the list have been shown to have equally serious and sometimes deadly side effects.

FDA employees did all they could to stop Dr. Graham from testifying. A statement by the head of the agency, Dr. Crawford, was e-mailed to the reporters quoting something that Graham said in an internal e-mail. After the hearing, Dr. Graham himself said, ''Senior management at the FDA did everything in their power to intimidate me prior to my testimony.''

FDA employees went out of their way to slander Dr. Graham. The director of the Center of Drug Safety, Dr. Steven Galson, contacted the editor of the Lancet to suggest that Dr. Graham manipulated a study which was about to be published.

The Government Accountability Project has reported that FDA managers posed as whistleblowers to attack his credibility. Fortunately, they were foolish enough to call from government phones so that the source of the calls was easy to trace and the trail ended at the FDA.

FDA has since said that they are working to improve the handling of differences of opinion and that it acknowledged the right of employees to raise concerns to oversight groups. In that case, they should welcome the passage of this amendment to give its employees whistleblower attention.

Mr. Chairman, the Food and Drug Administration is charged with such an important responsibility. It ensures that medications that Americans take every day are safe. It should be simple; it should be done without influence, by industry or anyone else.

Unfortunately, that is not always the case; and when things go wrong, we depend on scientists at the agency to alert the American public that they may be putting their health in serious jeopardy with a certain medication. This amendment simply says that we will ensure that they can do that without fear of reprisal.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' The amendment imposes additional duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I ask for the learned chairman to tell me where we are imposing a new duty on the FDA. What we are asking here is simply that the FDA follow the law; that they not use funds, as my colleague put it, for reprisals against employees who are encouraged to speak their mind, and when they speak their mind, they are investigated and harassed and intimidated and asked to leave their jobs.

My amendment specifically says we do not disclose, and make sure we do not disclose, anything that is confidential, proprietary, proprietary interests of the drug companies. As long as those are not disclosed and not confidential in that manner and no one does it, then there is no reason to be harassing, intimidating, and investigating people who testify before advisory committees.

There is no new change in the law. All we are saying is FDA, you are also subject to law. You have to follow the law. And those things that are confidential and proprietary in interest, we do not expect you will disclose them; therefore we do not do it.

So if someone can tell me what is the new duty, I will be happy to draft my amendment before we are done tonight, and we will make it in order then. I really do not see any new duty being imposed here, with all honesty. I am not trying to be flippant; I am just trying to get an answer to my question. Just like the last one, there is no new duty.

So if someone can tell me that, I will be happy to change the amendment to make it germane.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan proposes to change existing law, in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

As recorded in Deschler's Precedents, volume 8, chapter 26, section 52, even though a limitation or exception therefrom might refrain from explicitly assigning new duties to officers of the government, if it implicitly requires

them to make investigations, compile evidence or make judgments and determinations not otherwise required of them by law, then it assumes the character of legislation and is subject to a point of order under clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The proponent of a limitation assumes the burden of establishing that any duties imposed by the provision either are merely ministerial or are already required by law.

The Chair finds that the limitation proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan does more than merely decline to fund employment investigations. Instead, it requires the officials concerned to make determinations regarding a specific type of employee behavior prior to initiating an employment investigation. This is a matter which they are not charged with under existing law.

On these premises, the Chair concludes that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan proposes to change existing law.

Accordingly, the point of order is sustained.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, we drafted these amendments carefully with legislative counsel and others to make sure they were germane. If you want to rule that they are not germane, I guess you have the right to do that; and I will not appeal the ruling of the Chair because I can count the votes.

But the thing I would ask, when a Member has a parliamentary inquiry, if someone would at least tell us where the amendment is wrong so it can be corrected. With all due respect to the chairman, you read what was put forth, but you never say what is wrong with our amendment.

What is wrong with these last two amendments that made them not germane, so we can correct it to be within the parliamentary setting of this body? We have part of the House institution telling us our amendments are in order. We get to the floor, and we find them not in order.

I guess it is just a little frustrating when we talk about the health and safety of the American people, and we have examples where the FDA has not done their job, so we try to correct it in the only body we can, through legislative amendments, and we come here and we get this ''speak-legalese,'' and I do not have anything against legals since I am an attorney myself. But just a simple question like where are we legislating in this appropriations bill, when we have such tightly crafted amendments that are even taken from existing law so we do not legislate on an appropriations bill and we are still ruled out of order or not germane.

If you can answer that parliamentary inquiry, I would appreciate it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. With regard to the inquiry, the Chair states again that the amendment, by limiting funds for some, but not all, employment investigations, requires the officials concerned to make determinations regarding a specific type of employee behavior prior to initiating an employment investigation in order to discern whether it is an employment investigation of the type for which funds have been limited. Those are determinations which they are not charged with under existing law.

Mr. STUPAK. But, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, the FDA does make investigations under current law under their own administration. So how can you say they are not charged with the duty of doing investigations of their employees? They make that determination every day, whether a member can speak at an advisory committee, whether a member can answer a question, an FDA doctor, at a congressional hearing, as we saw with Dr. Graham.

I am bemused, to say the least.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIAHRT

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TIAHRT:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to promulgate regulations without consideration of the effect of such regulations on the competitiveness of American businesses.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment, but I do understand that the gentleman is going to withdraw his amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have the number one economy in the world. It is the envy of the world. But we are looking at some signs that I think indicate a long-term problem. Where will this economy and this country be 10 years, 15 years, 20 years from now? We have a lot going on around the world as far as other countries trying to develop a stronger economy, looking forward, eliminating the barriers that were created by their own governments, so that they can keep and create jobs in their own country and outside the United States.

Last year our trade deficit was $670 billion. This year it looks like our Federal deficit is going to be down from the projected $375 billion to down around $300 billion. But still that is a lot of money. Even though we have seen some good things happen because of the tax relief that President Bush pushed and was passed by the House and Senate, we still need to look forward and see how we are going to create a strong economy, not only in the agricultural area, but in all facets of the United States.

Right now we know that in the agricultural community regulatory costs are creating problems down on the farm. We already know that less government regulation not only means granting freedom to allow Americans to pursue their dreams; it also means providing the space for businesses to thrive in agricultural areas and creating more jobs in those same areas communities. Instead, our Federal Government has become a creeping ivy of regulations that strangle enterprise and that makes it more difficult to keep and create jobs in rural America.

Unrealistic and unnecessary prohibitions, along with burdensome mandates, are creating difficulties for our farmers, ranchers, and those involved in the agricultural industry. How can we expect our agriculture economy to develop and grow when bureaucracy prevents farm businesses from starting or expanding? With the decreasing numbers of farms and the growing average age of farmers, we need to be doing everything we can to eliminate the barricades farmers and ranchers face so that, as they provide the food to feed our Nation and the world, they can do so in an easier fashion.

One area where the United States Department of Agriculture has an opportunity to reduce burdens for the private industry is in the area of national animal identification. I know there is concern among private industry that implementing a national system to track cattle and other animals will end up creating huge costs that will get passed on back to the producer. There is even greater concern among the private industry that there will be no value added to the end product, despite the increased costs associated with implementing an animal identification program.

As the Department of Agriculture looks at implementing national animal ID, I think they should work closely with industry to find a private solution to help pay for the costs associated with creating such a vast and complex system.

While working with State governments and universities is an important process, I hope that USDA will be forward-thinking in forging public-private partnerships to pursue market solutions that will help producers recover costs associated with implementing technology needed for animal identification.

I believe that anytime that we can provide support through private initiatives that will deliver objectives sought by the Federal Government, I

think we should jump at the opportunity to forge these partnerships and create a win-win-win situation, for the government, for the taxpayer and for industry.

Each and every Federal agency should take into consideration the effect proposed policies will have on competitiveness of U.S. businesses, including farms and ranches.

I plan to withdraw this amendment today because I am very encouraged by the forward thinking of our subcommittee chairman on agriculture in appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA). I believe we can work together and strengthen farmers and ranchers and agriculture businesses financially through less regulation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF OHIO

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act to the Secretary of Agriculture may be used, after December 31, 2005, to purchase chickens, including chicken products, under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, unless the Secretary shall take into account whether such purchases are in compliance with standards relating to the wholesomeness of food for human consumption, pursuant to section 14(d) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1762a(d)).

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman is going to speak on his amendment, but I just want to let the gentlemen know that we are happy to accept the amendment and move forward with the vote as soon as he would like.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

□ 1900

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. My remarks will be brief. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA) for his support.

We all know the importance of antibiotics to our public health, beginning some 60 years ago with penicillin and other antibiotics. We also know the increasing problem of antibiotic resistance in people who have not been cured because of their resistance to antibiotics that have been administered to them.

This amendment says the USDA can only buy chicken products for school nutrition programs if it complies with the requirement of existing law that foods purchased for these programs be ''wholesome,'' meaning protected from antibiotic resistance. This amendment tells the USDA that we are serious, this Congress is serious about protecting the American people from the dangers of antibiotic resistance. I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

On March 14, 1942, the world changed.

A woman named Anne Miller had been hospitalized in New Haven, Connecticut, for more than a month with a strep infection. Every conventional treatment had failed, and doctors feared she would not last the day.

But then, Anne Miller got an experimental injection of a new medicine called Penicillin. And in just over 12 hours, her temperature had returned to normal.

A half-century ago, America's hospitals were jammed with patients suffering from strep, pneumonia, meningitis, typhoid fever, rheumatic fever, and other killers.

Penicillin and other antibiotics allowed us to bring these lethal infections under control and save millions of lives. These new miracle drugs changed the world.

But a new danger—antibiotic resistance—is threatening to turn back the clock, by making the antibiotics we rely on ineffective.

When an antibiotic is used on a person or animal, it may kill some of the bacteria, but it will not kill all of them. The survivors reproduce, propagating these hardier ''antibiotic resistant'' bacteria.

Antibiotic resistance is a serious and growing public health problem: 38 Americans die every day from antibiotic resistant infections, according to the World Health Organization—some estimates suggest the number is more than twice that large; Antibiotic resistance costs America's health care system an estimated $4 billion every year; The Centers for Disease Control has called antibiotic resistance one of its ''top concerns''

Human medicine is partly to blame. Doctors are often pressured to overprescribe antibiotics, leading to the spread of resistance. And both the medical profession and the CDC have taken this seriously, with outreach campaigns to educate both doctors and patients about the dangers of antibiotic overuse.

But animal agriculture is also to blame. About 70 percent of antibiotic use in America is not for people but for the cows, pigs, chickens, and other animals people eat. And about 70 percent of those antibiotics are not even used to treat sick animals, but to prevent illness or just to make healthy animals grow faster.

And the overuse of antibiotics in animal agriculture has serious consequences. Fluoroquinolones—the class of antibiotics that includes Cipro—are an important example.

Cipro, as we know all too well, is used to threat Anthrax. But Cipro is also used to treat infections by a foodborne bacterium called Campylobacter.

The FDA approved fluoroquinolones for use in human medicine in 1986. And FDA approved fluoroquinolones for use in chickens in 1995.

During the 9 years between 1986 and 1995, no more than 3 percent of Campylobacter cases in the U.S. involved resistant bacteria. But just 2 years after FDA approved fluoroquinolones for use in chickens, resistance in humans had jumped to 13 percent. By 2001, 19 percent of the Campylobacter infections in humans were antibiotic-resistant.

The FDA has begun a response to this problem—by proposing to ban fluorquinolone use in poultry. But the company that makes them has sued, and litigation could take several years to resolve.

Private industry also has recognized the problem. Leading fast food chains like McDonald's and Wendy's have told their suppliers they will not buy products made from chickens raised with fluoroquinolones. And leading chicken producers like Tyson, Gold Kist, and Purdue have also committed to stop using fluoruoquinolones.

But the National School Lunch Program lags behind, and the USDA still buys our children chicken raised with fluoroquinolones.

Congress acted in 2004—adding report language of the FY2004 Agriculture Appropriations bill that asked USDA to initiate ''a policy to not purchase chickens for these programs from companies that do not have a stated policy that they do not use fluoroquinolones in their chickens.''

That language was approved by a bipartisan majority in this House. It was approved by a bipartisan majority in the Senate. And the bill accompanying it was signed by President Bush.

Unfortunately—but not surprisingly—USDA did nothing to implement that provision.

It is time for Congress to order USDA to step up to the plate. And that is exactly what my amendment does.

Existing law requires that USDA take steps to ensure the wholesomeness of food delivered through school nutrition programs. If USDA actually applies that requirement when purchasing chicken products, I believe the agency will be unable to conclude that a substance FDA wants to take off the market because of public health concerns is wholesome.

Last year, we asked the USDA to do the right thing. The USDA ignored our request.

This year: tell the USDA that we are serious about protecting the American people from the dangers of antibiotic resistance; Let us pass this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Add at the end (before the short title), the following new section:

SEC. 7____. The Department of Agriculture, at the request of a producer or processor, shall test ruminants, ruminant products, and ruminant by-products for the presence of bovine spongiform encephalopathy, subject to reimbursement by the producer or processor of the costs incurred by the Department to conduct the test, and none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the

salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department to enforce any regulatory prohibition on such testing by the Department of Agriculture of ruminants, ruminant products, or ruminant by-products for the presence of bovine spongiform encephalopathy.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment would permit anyone to test for Mad Cow if they so desired. It would require the USDA to perform the test and require the requestor to pay for it.

This amendment may strike my colleagues as unnecessary. After all, any food manufacturer should be able to test their own product for safety. Let me explain.

Mad Cow disease has been detected in 187,000 cows all over the world. Its early symptoms include weight loss, loss of balance, and acting skittish. The cow later descends into drooling, arching its back, waving its head, and exhibiting unusually aggressive behavior. It is inevitably fatal.

Variant CJD, as it is called, which is the disease humans can get from eating infected cattle, has resulted in over 150 deaths in Europe. Most of those occurred in the U.K., the epicenter of the human and bovine outbreaks. The U.S. was spared until 2003 when the first case of Mad Cow was detected in Washington State.

Immediately, countries that had invested heavily in their own testing and processing infrastructure in order to assure a safe beef supply closed their borders to American beef exports. Countries like Japan, which now tests every cattle slaughtered, demanded similar testing rates and practices of their own of any importer, including the United States. In the case of Japan, the U.S. refused to meet their demands. As a result, an industry trade group claimed losses of $4.7 billion for cattle producers.

Small businesses like Gateway Beef Cooperative, which processes 200 cattle per week, were losing $50,000 per week. Creekstone Farms Premium Beef was losing about $40,000 per day. Some businesses responded with a logical plan. They wanted to test all of their cattle, just like Japan. Not only would it restore access to a crucial overseas market, but it would give them a competitive advantage in parts of the world where consumers demanded the highest safety standards. It was a solution that let the free market work its purported magic by allowing consumers to choose how safe they wanted their beef.

But, Mr. Chairman, the USDA stopped them. They invoked a 1913 law, originally intended to ''protect the farmer and stock raiser from improperly made and prepared serums, toxins, and viruses.'' The law gives them control over ''veterinary biologics'' like diagnostic tests. In this case, the USDA took control over who could test their cattle and when by using this law to license use of the diagnostic test only to themselves. An American company was forbidden from testing their own product for safety.

Their reasoning? Allowing companies to test all of their cattle, FDA says, ''would have implied a consumer safety aspect that is not scientifically warranted.'' In other words, the FDA worried that consumers will see a label indicating that their meat has been tested for Mad Cow disease and assume it is safer than meat that has not been tested.

Why would they worry about that? Is this not the way it is supposed to be? If your food has been tested, you can be assured it is safer. It is not a reason to prevent testing. In fact, it is a strong argument in favor of allowing testing.

The real reason the USDA will not let a business owner test their own product is that the beef industry is afraid that a new standard of safety will be set and the marginal cost of adequate testing will cut into their shareholder profits. They also stand to lose if a sufficient number of tests are conducted and another Mad Cow case surfaces. In the meantime, Japan and South Korea are under enormous pressure to lower their beef testing standards and reopen their borders to American beef. They look at all their options.

Option number one is to require the U.S. to bring their testing rates up to speed with other industrialized nations. France and Germany test over half their cattle. The U.K. tests all cattle over 24 months old. Japan tests every single one. Meanwhile, the United States boasts about their ramped-up testing rate. In 2004, the year after we found our first case of Mad Cow, the USDA tested 176,468 out of roughly 35 million cattle. That is about a rate of one-half of 1 percent. In other words, about one out of every 200 cattle was tested.

On top of that, the administration proposed to reduce funding for surveillance by two-thirds this year, from $69 million to $29 million.

The second option for Japan and South Korea is to give in to U.S. demands, drastically lower their safety standards, and allow beef that is held to a safety benchmark that is orders of magnitude lower than their own. In so doing, they would risk undermining fragile public confidence in meat safety. It is not right that the administration would play politics with global food supply.

Now, my amendment would allow voluntary testing to occur by requiring the USDA to perform the test on demand. That way the integrity of the testing procedures is maintained under close supervision, and there is accountability and transparency.

In the future, there must be a provision to ensure that Congress does not reduce the amount of USDA funding with funds paid by industry for the testing program.

In trying to rescue their business by giving consumers what they want, some American beef producers could help fill the leadership vacuum left by the USDA. They should be allowed to.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of Rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment imposes additional duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman is right. There is a point of order, because we need to legislate to fix this problem. I hope that when the authorizing and appropriating committees meet next year that they will consider this approach, giving it the consideration it deserves. It is for both American cattlemen and consumers.

The gentleman is correct. I will concede the point of order, and I thank the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEINER:

Add at the end (before the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 7___. Using funds that would otherwise be paid during fiscal year 2006 with regard to cotton, tobacco, and rice production, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make grants to the several States in an amount, for each State, equal to at least 0.75 percent of such funds, to be distributed to active agricultural producers in the State in a manner approved by the Secretary.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I think this represents the final amendment on the bill and gives me another chance to offer my thanks to the chairman and ranking member for doing well with a bill that provides far too little funding for the important agriculture programs of this country.

What does this amendment do? My amendment would require that every State in the Union, all of the States, get at least .75 percent of the funding provided for cotton, tobacco, and rice in this bill. Every single State should get .75 percent. Even though 24 States in the Union have no cotton, have no rice, have no tobacco, this amendment would require that .75 percent of the funding be reserved for those States.

Before the chairman has a chance to say it, I will say it for him: It is a preposterous concept. It is a mind-boggling concept, in fact. Why would we allocate funds in an agriculture bill for places like I represent in New York City that have no agriculture programs?

But I say to my colleagues, that is exactly what we recently did in the homeland security bill. We said that we are going to allocate a fixed amount of money in the homeland security bill, notwithstanding the fact that there might be little or no homeland security needs. Did this create a wise funding formula? Well, only if one thinks that Wyoming should have the highest per capita funding in the country for homeland security grants, and California and New York will be one and two for the least per capita.

Now, of course, one would not want to leave Wyoming unprotected, but I believe that having a minimum guarantee in that bill was simply foolish. After all, New York City had been the target of actual terrorism six times between 1993 and 2001. Twice the World Trade Center was attacked. Efforts were foiled to destroy the Holland and Lincoln Tunnels and the GW Bridge. We were a target in the Anthrax attacks, a subway bomb plot and, of course, a mission that was disrupted to blow up the Brooklyn Bridge by al Qaeda in 2003.

I am not saying that we should not find a way to make every city and locality safe. But are we really better off because of this formula that has .75 percent going to every State? Have we not perhaps reached a point that now cities and States are trying to figure out, how the heck do we spend this money? Well, the answer is, yes, we have reached that point.

Madisonville, Texas, population 4,200, I understand one of the nicer places in Texas, used a $30,000 homeland security grant to buy a custom trailer, and I am not making this up, a custom trailer that will be used during the annual October Mushroom Festival for people who are overheated or injured; and it will double, forgive me, no disrespect to the people of Madisonville, Texas intended, it will double as a command center during supposed emergencies should al Qaeda attack Madisonville, Texas.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it would be absurd for my amendment to become law. It would be a mockery of this House to say that every State should get the same amount of tobacco funding even if there are no tobacco farms, the same amount of cotton funding even if there are no cotton farms, and the same amount of funding even if there are no rice farms. It would be absurd. Why, then, do we have other elements of the bill, other elements of our law, other appropriation bills that are allocated that way? It does not make any sense. Is it really the way it should be?

I have to tell my colleagues something. I am going to be magnanimous. I am a representative from Brooklyn and Queens and the beautiful City of New York. We do not have tobacco farms. I will tell my colleagues what I am going to do: Keep your cotton and tobacco subsidy. Keep your agriculture subsidy. We are not farmers, and we are very grateful to the men and women of this country who are. They make it possible for all of us to eat at prices that are extraordinary. We are the envy of the world when it comes to agriculture.

But can we not also agree that when it comes to things that are not so enviable, like the challenge that cities like New York face when dealing with homeland security, maybe, just maybe, my colleagues can be equally magnanimous? Maybe, just maybe, they can say, you know what? Where we have need, where we have threat, we are going to ask for money. Where there is no threat, where there is no need, we are not.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote no on the Weiner amendment, but I would urge my colleagues to keep it in mind the next time we consider homeland security grants.

Mr. Chairman, I, to the relief of everyone, I am sure, yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of Rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does anyone wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, to paraphrase a line from a movie, I am out of order; this whole House is out of order in the way it allocates homeland security funds. I do not dispute the point of order, and I will yield to the ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2, Rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

□ 1915

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 80, noes 335, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

AYES—80

Akin	Fossella	Norwood
Baker	Foxx	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Pence
Bartlett (MD)	Garrett (NJ)	Petri
Bass	Gibbons	Pitts
Bean	Graves	Price (GA)
Beauprez	Gutknecht	Radanovich
Bishop (UT)	Hayworth	Ramstad
Blackburn	Hefley	Rogers (MI)
Bradley (NH)	Hensarling	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Herger	Royce
Burgess	Hostettler	Ryan (WI)
Buyer	Inglis (SC)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Issa	Sessions
Chocola	Jenkins	Shadegg
Coble	Jones (NC)	Shays
Cox	Keller	Shimkus
Cubin	Linder	Shuster
Davis, Jo Ann	Lungren, Daniel E.	Stearns
Davis, Tom	Mack	Sullivan
Deal (GA)	Manzullo	Tancredo
Dent	Matheson	Tanner
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCotter	Taylor (MS)
Duncan	Miller (FL)	Terry
Everett	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Feeney	Myrick	Westmoreland
Flake		Wilson (SC)

NOES—335

Abercrombie	Bachus	Berman
Ackerman	Baird	Berry
Aderholt	Baldwin	Biggert
Alexander	Barrow	Bilirakis
Allen	Barton (TX)	Bishop (GA)
Andrews	Becerra	Bishop (NY)
Baca	Berkley	Blumenauer

Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Cannon
Culberson
Gohmert
Gordon
Hastings (FL)
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
Marshall
McHenry
Menendez
Payne
Pickering
Reynolds
Rush
Wasserman Schultz
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1938

Messrs. BAIRD, LYNCH, INSLEE, RANGEL, KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. HART changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. FOSSELLA changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 236 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 236 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 258, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

AYES—169

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Beauprez
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cox
Cramer
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLay
Dent
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Otter
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reichert
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Simmons
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

NOES—258

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Buyer
Cannon
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens

Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Gordon
Hastings (FL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Menendez
Pickering
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1948

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma and Mr. BARROW changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Miss McMORRIS changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 237 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). The Clerk will read the last three lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006''.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS) having assumed the chair, Mr. TERRY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2744) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 18, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

YEAS—408

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—18

Bass
Bean
Bradley (NH)
Flake
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Hefley
Kucinich
McDermott
Miller, Gary
Paul
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Stark
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)

NOT VOTING—7

Gordon
Hastings (FL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Menendez
Owens
Smith (TX)
Young (AK)

□ 2006

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of January 4,