A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 249.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SUTTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

WILD FREE-ROAMING HORSES AND BURROS SALE AND SLAUGHTER PROHIBITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 331 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 249.

□ 1028

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 249) to restore the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros, with Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 249 is important legislation with broad, bipartisan support. I am pleased to be joined in this endeavor by my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. ED WHITFIELD, and a number of other Members on both sides of the aisle.

This Congress is tasked with the stewardship of much that is invaluable, our breathtaking natural wonders, our healthy rivers and streams, icons of American history; and it is our responsibility as public stewards of our land to manage these resources for the good of future generations. It is a responsibility as chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee that I take very seriously.

The proper care and preservation of wild horses which roam public lands in the West fall within our stewardship, and we are failing to live up to our responsibility. I say that because in 1971 Congress formally protected these wild horses and mandated that they cannot be sold or processed into commercial products, in effect, slaughtered.

□ 1030

Since that time when the Bureau of Land Management has determined that the wild horse population is excessive to the ability of the range to support them, captured animals have been offered to the public through adoption.

But all that changed as a result of a rider tucked away into a massive omnibus appropriation bill enacted during December 2004.

The so-called Burns rider overturned 33 years of national policy on the care and management of wild horses and burros by repealing the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of these animals that had been in law. In effect, Mr. Chairman, these animals were earmarked for death.

Since that time, some of these animals, which belong to all Americans I might add, and which represent the very spirit of the American West, have been rounded up for slaughter and shipped overseas.

And to what end? So their meat can end up on menus in France, Belgium and Japan, where it is considered a delicacy.

Incredible. It is truly and simply incredible. We do not allow the commercial sale of horseflesh in this country for human consumption, but we are exporting horse meat for that very purpose abroad.

Since I first introduced this legislation during the last Congress, I have received an impressive volume of heartfelt letters and e-mails from across the Nation.

The very notion that wild horses, wild American horses, would be slaughtered as a food source for foreign gourmets has struck a chord with the American people. They see in this issue the pioneering spirit and the ideals of freedom. And the current policy has created disillusionment with many over how their government works and what their elected leaders stand for.

The measure we are now considering will halt that practice. The sale and slaughter of wild horses and burros must stop not only because it is wrong, but also because the program is a failure.

While the Bureau of Land Management, the Federal agency which oversees the program, may sincerely hope that these animals do not end up on menus in France or Japan or Belgium, the Burns rider severely handicaps efforts to protect these herds.

Now, some will say the sale authority is necessary because the agency costs of managing the program have grown too high, but this is an issue of the BLM's own making. Each year they round up more animals than can be adopted. The excess animals are sent to holding facilities where their numbers simply increase per year, year after year, driving up management costs. If the agency wants to save money without selling these animals, it needs only to get its round-ups and adoptions in sync.

There are also those who say we need to allow these animals to be sold off because there are too many of them on the public lands and they are causing massive resource damage.

First of all, it should be noted that there are significantly fewer wild horses and burros on public lands today than there were just 25 years ago.

Second, compared to the 3 to 4 million cattle that graze these same acres, wild horses and burros are hardly the most serious threat to our public rangelands.

All I seek to do in this legislation, with H.R. 249, is to return the law to the way it existed for 33 years prior to the Burns rider. The House has twice gone on record supporting a prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild horses and burros.

So I conclude by asking my colleagues' support once again today. It's time to do right by these living icons of the American West.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is indeed an honor for me to be here with the distinguished chairman of the Resources Committee. Through his illustrious career I have been impressed with the way he has run the committee. I've also been impressed with his commonsense approach to issues, except for this one. And I appreciate the opportunity of being here.

You know, Mr. Chairman, this is the time of year when everyone has a great deal of hope. This is the beginning of the baseball season, where every team, with the possible exception of the Royals, still has a mathematical chance of winning the division.

And as a loyal Cub fan, who is now in my 99th year, consecutive year, of reconstruction and renewal, there is still hope for me.

It is also sad because we are about to commemorate very soon the 43rd anniversary of the worst trade made in the history of baseball, according to many scholars. And that trade was a six-player trade in which my Cubs sent three players, including Lou Brock, to the St. Louis Cardinals in exchange for three other players and Ernie Broglio, who was an 18-game winner at the time.

Now, on paper this trade made great sense for the Cubs. They were getting an outfielder, a veteran relief pitcher, and a starting pitcher, a 20-game winner who had won 18 games the year before.

What happened in reality, of course, is that Lou Brock accepted the role of a lead-off hitter when he went to the Cardinals and spurred them to not only the Pennant but also the World Series victory on his way to a Hall of Fame career.

Broglio, a great pitcher, actually developed arm problems, won only seven games the rest of his career, and 2 years later he is out of baseball.

Now, this is known as one of those great trades that looked perfect on

paper but in reality it simply wasn't there.

With all due respect, this bill is one of those great bills on paper, but the reality of it simply isn't there. This is an Ernie Broglio bill if there ever was one.

Now, I have to admit that I don't have a great deal of personal knowledge about horses. My reference to horses in the last 30 years is probably helping my kid to choose either the striped or the painted one on the merry-go-round. The unfortunate thing is that most of the people who will be voting on this bill have the exact same background that I do have.

I am happy to note, though, that I do have a brother who met his wife while he was the rodeo clown, and his wife was in the barrel racing contest and is one the few people who has actually trapped and trained a wild horse on the open desert in Utah and Nevada. So I am using that background from the history as we talk about this particular bill.

And as I looked at this bill as it came out of committee and studied it closer, there are five areas in which I think this bill has significant flaws.

The first is that this bill does not do what its supporters claim it will do. Not the sponsor. He's been totally honest in this. But many of those who have been writing about this particular bill have exaggerated what it actually does.

Secondly, this bill takes away a tool of management from BLM and does not replace it with anything created to help them in their established goal.

Number three, this bill has a difficult system in making the ecosystem of the West, the desert West, a more difficult area to manage.

Number four, there is indeed an extreme cost that the taxpayers are paying in this program that actually ends up being more abusive of the animals that we are trying to preserve and to help.

And finally, I think there is, indeed, a regional bias that can be seen in this particular bill.

Now, if I could, Mr. Chairman, I would like to just talk about perhaps that first issue, just that first issues. This bill does not do what the proponents claim. I have seen the Dear Colleague letters from Robert Redford and Willie Nelson, and one came from the Humane Society making all sorts of claims that are actually not done by this particular bill. The reality is, as well-intentioned as this bill may be, there is actually no change in what will happen with the BLM and their priorities.

If this bill passes, no horse is actually safer than it would have been. And if this bill fails, no horse is actually going to be eaten in France. The idea is this is a very narrow bill that only deals with BLM and deals with forestlands. It doesn't deal with all public lands, doesn't deal with national parks or wildlife refuges or reservations or military affairs. It has been said there are about 90,000 horses a year that are unwanted. Their owners either cannot or will not maintain them.

On BLM lands we are only talking about 7,000 horses, 6,800 last year that were taken off land because of the inability of the land to sustain them. This is only a small portion that this bill deals with, so the overall idea of trying to help all the animals, to stop foreign sales consumption of those, it's not covered in this particular bill. What it does do, though, is take away a management tool the BLM has.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, in the coming speeches by my colleagues who will be down here, and as we go through for the next hour this particular bill, I hope to explore those other issues.

Therefore, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, only to respond to the latter point that the gentleman has just made, the original 1971 language only dealt with BLM lands, so that is why we are not considering all these other areas to which the gentleman referred.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, it's my honor to recognize and yield time to the distinguished Representative from Idaho. I yield Mr. SALI 2 minutes and 14 seconds, which is what he says he needs.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 249 that would end the Bureau of Land Management's authority to sell wild horses. This is an important resource and wildlife management issue that affects our Nation's rangelands.

Recognizing the need to ensure healthy herds and healthy rangelands, the U.S. Congress gave the administration the authority to manage, protect and control wild horses and burros with the enactment of the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971.

The statute directs the agency to maintain populations at a designated appropriate managed level, based on wild herds and rangeland monitoring, to determine the number of animals, including livestock and wildlife, that the land can support. In spite of the removal of horses, as was mentioned by the gentleman from Utah, currently the population of wild horses on the range is more than 10,000 above the appropriate management level.

The excess horse populations are causing significant resource and environmental damage. Even conservation groups such as the National Association of Conservation Districts, the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, the Izaak Walton League, and a number of others have acknowledged the damage caused by this overpopulation of horses. Balanced management, respecting recreation, watersheds, wildlife and grazing must be restored to the public lands where these horses roam.

I urge a vote against H.R. 249 to help protect the environment and ecosystems of the western States.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR).

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Chairman, just for the record, I want everyone to know that I am wearing one of my favorite ties, which is a horse tie. I have been a lifelong farmer and rancher, and I can assure you that no one in this Chamber loves horses more than I do.

But the good citizens of western Colorado and all Americans love our beautiful country and the public plans administered by the National Park Service, the Forest Service and the BLM. For more than 100 years, the Forest Service, the BLM lands, have been managed for multiple use and sustainable yield of their products. This means historic uses such as grazing remain a bedrock use of the land, and conservation remains a bedrock principle for which these lands are managed.

It is one thing to agree on these core principles. It is another one to do the hard work needed to effectively express the principles and actions and policies. Great needs for land management are going unanswered because Congress lacks the will to provide adequate funding to these core management functions. And at the same time, Mr. Chairman, the courage to adjust these laws reflects the reality of land management today.

So, for example, conservation of wildlife under the Endangered Species Act and other laws is regarded by many, including myself, as among the highest conservation priorities in our country. Nevertheless, Congress consistently fails to provide adequate funding for species conservation on the ground, or funding agencies to adequately implement the law.

We are at a similar place with respect to wild horses and wild burros. Legal recognition of the place of wild horses and burros on public lands was introduced in the passage of the Wild Horse and Burro Act in 1971. This law reflected America's love for horses and the concern that they be managed properly on public lands. These are values that, undoubtedly, we all share. The key provisions of the law required the BLM to manage the horses to an appropriate management level, called the AML. As a practical matter, this means that horse population numbers had to be managed within the multiple-use framework controlling management of BLM land.

For years, BLM has not been able to bring horse populations down within the AML ceiling. This means public lands have been degraded from overgrazing by horses. The habitat and food is taken from the wildlife, and the areas overpopulated by horses cannot

sustain other multiple uses of the land. Congress has consistently declined to provide the funding needed to gather more horses off BLM land and support them to live a healthy life in long-term holding facilities.

□ 1045

Still, the law calls for maintenance of wild horse populations at the AML, but the political will has been lacking to allow the agency to succeed.

So Congress enacted a legislative solution in the fiscal year 2005 appropriations bill to help relieve the overpopulation of wild horses on public lands by authorizing the sale of unadoptable horses. These are horses that no one wanted. Not ranchers, not public officials, not even members of the animal rights groups or horse protection leagues, and, I am most certainly sure, no one voting ''yes'' on H.R. 249.

That first year, in 2005, more than 1,500 horses were sold. BLM credits the law with allowing them to operate their program within budget for the first time in a number of years. A small sales program continues today that is significant to the BLM budget. This year already, in 2007, 346 horses have been sold. BLM estimates that it could run a small sales program of about 600 horses per year. The sale of this number of horses is worth several million dollars to BLM over the life of the horses, for a program that is funded only at approximately $30 million annually.

H.R. 249, sponsored by the great chairman, whom I have the greatest of respect for and I know his intentions are good, would eliminate this sales program. Why do it? BLM efforts to prevent the slaughter of horses have been successful to date. Congress is not making sufficient funding available to take necessary care of the horses in long-term care facilities.

While the public is adopting some horses under the BLM program, horses are not being adopted at a rate sufficient to ease the overpopulation on public lands. Perhaps worst of all, the administration's budget for fiscal year 2008 called for a complete cutting of the funding for the horse and burro program. The slow progress that has been made towards achieving the AML in recent years will be reversed if BLM lacks the funds to gather the horses. Expenses will increase in the near future, as there will be more horses to manage because the population will not be controlled next year.

The existing sale authority is a small but necessary tool in an overall program to manage wild horses and burros on public lands.

If you care about the proper management of public lands, responsible government, horse welfare, and political courage, you will vote ''no'' on H.R. 249.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again it is my pleasure to try to say a couple of other elements. As I said, there were five concerns that we have with this particular bill.

The first one, as I mentioned, is it really does not solve the problem. This bill does nothing that the BLM is not already doing in common practice. That is why I said if this bill were to pass, it simply would have no more impact on horses than it does now. No horse would be safer. If it doesn't pass, no horse is going to the slaughter, and no horse is going to be consumed by someone in France.

This bill is very, very narrow. It only deals with a portion of the public lands and a portion of the number of horses that are there, not the overall situation.

But it does do one thing that is harmful. This is the second element. It takes away the tool, as the gentleman from Colorado clearly enunciated, that is used for the management of wild animals, wild horses, on public lands.

There are only two things that we can do. You can either allow these horses that are excess, that are destroying the habitat, that have to be taken off the land, roughly 7,000 last year. About 28,000 are being held in pens right now as we speak that are excess horses, about half of everything the Federal Government actually controls. You can either adopt them, which is a year-long practice and individuals are limited to four adoptees per individual. Or you can sell them. Sell them either for $100 to $2,000, if it is especially a unique animal, and it is limitless. That is what has been happening in the past. BLM has had the ability and about 2,500 horses have been sold. None for consumption purposes.

Now, you have to realize that if you buy a horse from the BLM today, by law and by contract it cannot be resold for consumption. It cannot be resold for slaughter. If that happens, that is a felony. That is why this bill does nothing that it is not already doing today. But this bill does take away the ability to sell those animals, which means you are down to the adoption, which is a very difficult process to go through. That means it will be harder for BLM and the Forest Service, which actually doesn't run their process, which always works through BLM, to actually find homes and places for the excess animals on public lands.

In taking that tool of management away, this bill does nothing to give BLM a creative solution to the situation. Just saying ''no'' may be a good slogan for a drug policy, but saying ''no'' to the BLM does not help them in their chartered task of trying to manage the herd as well as the ecosystem that is going on there.

These horses are not native species to these lands. They do hurt the environment. They trample it down. That is why since 1971 almost a quarter of a million, roughly 200,000 horses, have been taken off the public lands because the habitat is not there for them.

The bottom line is there are too many horses for the land that is available. The bulk of these animals are in my State, Nevada, a few in Colorado, and some in Wyoming and Arizona. This is desert territory. It is not the natural habitat of these horses. This is not the idea of horses running over the rolling hills. If you did that, you would probably want to send them back east to where the natural habitat is, but there is no BLM land back there.

Actually if you really want to help the situation out, you would take about 150 head and put them in Central Park where they could roam freely without any fear of contamination, disease, or muggings like the New York citizens themselves have back in Central Park. That would really help the situation out.

What we have to do here is either allow nature to take its course, in which case these horses will die a pitiful, miserable death of starvation, disease, or by the hands or by the mouths of a predator; or destroy the ecosystem; or, worse, both situations happening, unless we give BLM the tools to remove the animals and find an alternative source for them.

This is a cost for the government. In reality we are spending $38.6 million every year to run the wild horse program. The overwhelming majority of that, almost either $20 million to $25 million, depending on which source you look at, is simply for holding these excess horses in pens, not letting them run free, not giving them the freedom in the wild that you think of, but actually holding them in pens.

Some of the problems for the horses we look at is sometimes we think of Sea Biscuit as we are talking about these animals, an animal that has been bred and groomed and is well taken care of.

These animals fight for their own existence. They are not necessarily the most lovable of animals. And, therefore, they have a hard time being adopted, which means BLM has to put them in a pen where they don't move, they don't do anything except sit around all day and eat. And since they eat and are fed and there are no predators around, these animals can live for up to 30 years at a cost of about $15,000 per animal to the Federal taxpayer, to have them sit around in a pen with no chance of activity whatsoever, in actually a miserable condition.

We are spending $20 million a year to be more abusive to animals than they would be if we gave them the tools to actually give them to other sources. We actually allow them to sell in some particular way, which is why the Humane Society, from their air conditioned offices downtown, wrote me and told me to support this bill. The Farm Bureau that actually works with these animals and knows what they are talking about wrote me and told me to oppose this bill. And in past years when we had further variations of this particular concept, veterinarian groups,

horse owners, cattlemen, over 200 organizations that specifically know and understand horses have opposed the concepts that we are trying to codify in this particular bill.

So once again I say the problem that we have here in the House is that most people like me have no access and no understanding or knowledge of these animals. They are like me, where the biggest decision they have to make with a horse is whether to put their kid on the horse or the snail on the carousel ride. And we are making decisions that actually go against the attitude and the advice that professionals that work with these animals and that know the situation are asking us to do. And it may seem emotional. It may seem good on paper. But trust me. This is the Ernie Broglio bill. It is not as good in reality as it looks in black and white.

Let me also say that to me there is an element of regional bias within this. This is a map of all the public land that is owned in the United States. Everything in blue is the amount of public land owned in the United States. You will notice that there is kind of a balance towards the West. This is where the public land is. This is where the wild horses are. This is desert country. This is not their natural habitat. All of our good friends who are proposing and supporting this type of legislation, unfortunately, are living over here, where there is no BLM land or very little BLM and no wild horse activity, but this is, indeed, the natural habitat. It is unfair to us to try to impose a solution without creative alternatives by the representatives from here on this piece of territory.

We know what the situation is, and that is why we are simply asking you, as best we possibly can, to vote ''no'' on this particular piece of legislation.

I have avoided using any cliches and any bad puns so far. And, LISA, I need to know what my cliches are. Until now, which means I am asking you to notice that this bill is all hat and no saddle. I am asking you that the horse may be with you, and I urge you to vote ''neigh'' on this piece of legislation.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. All Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I noticed on the map, Mr. Ranking Member, that we show across the western States much public land. Among the public land is also a great amount of ranching and farming land. I know that in some of my farming country and my own farm in Costilla County, every now and then, almost every year, we have a beautiful potato field that is run over by a herd of wild horses just because BLM does not have the proper funding and the authority to be able to manage these horses properly. I firmly believe that this bill will take those tools away that BLM currently has to manage wildlife.

Divisional Wildlife manages elk and deer herds so that they can thrive within the habitat that they currently have. One of the biggest problems that I see is that BLM uses the tools that they have and the funding that they have to be able to manage wildlife and horses on public land; but the biggest problem that I see is that if this bill passes, they will not be able to weed out the bad apples in the wild herds.

For example, they round up these horses. They put back into the wildlife the horses that are good, many of them that are good, but the ones that are lame or the ones that we saw like the one here in this picture, the ones that have broken legs, they can weed out of the population so that they can have better wild horse populations out there.

There is nothing more beautiful than to see a herd of wild horses out on the public lands running forever. I can assure you that if this bill passes, it will hurt BLM's ability to manage the great wild horse populations.

So I would also urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

□ 1100

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in response to several arguments that have been brought up about BLM's management of these lands and the cost of the program, I would respond that if there is a cost problem with the management of wild horses and burros, it is one, as I said in my opening remarks, of the BLM's own making.

Each year the Bureau of Land Management rounds up more animals than can be adopted. The excess animals are then sent to holding facilities, where their numbers increase year after year. That drives up the cost of the program. If the BLM wants to save more money, then as I've said, it needs only to get its round-ups and its adoptions in sync. There are ways other than the sale and slaughter of wild horses to save money. For example, a 2004 USGS study found that in the wild, use of contraceptive measures alone would save $7.7 million. So I don't think we should blame the wild horses and the burros for BLM's mismanagement of the program.

And as far as the map the gentleman from Utah presented about where these lands exist, that's true, they exist out West. But it's also true that the title to these lands is in the holding of every American taxpayer, as they are the lands of the public, and our names are on that deed for these lands.

I would note also, in conclusion, that on a similar amendment to last year's Interior appropriation bill, in which language was written to prohibit any such funds, the amendment did pass the House of Representatives by a vote of 249–159, and on this side of the aisle, the majority today, there were only 19 noes on that particular amendment to the Interior appropriation bill.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote ''aye,'' again, to help us protect an icon of the American West, and to provide for the humane consideration and treatment of these wild horses and burros.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, today's legislation marks a continuation of the important effort to advance animal welfare in the 110th Congress. One of the stark differences with the new congressional majority is the ability to deal meaningfully with important animal welfare provisions. Congress, as one of its first orders of business, passed the long-stalled animal fighting legislation, ending barbaric cruelty that helped foster and advance other illegal and dangerous activities.

Today Congress has the opportunity to take another step reaffirming policies that deal with the protection of horses and wild burros; protection of free roaming horses and burros from commercial sale and slaughter.

Actually, it's embarrassing that it had to get to this point because, since 1971, the Federal Government has had a policy to protect these animals. Unfortunately, in the last Congress, without hearing or public notice, a rider was slipped into legislation that eliminated these protections. I'm pleased that a majority of the Commerce Committee and a strong bipartisan majority has voted to support this important provision. The Senate is also moving to protect animals by ending the sale of horse meat for human consumption. These are important steps reflecting a renewed commitment to animal welfare, an essential part of any vision of a livable community.

It is important and overdue that Congress renew our commitment to developing a policy framework strongly supported by the American public.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I have to return to South Carolina to attend the presidential primary debate and the dedication of the library at Shaw Air Force Base. As a result, I will be unable to cast my vote today for H.R. 249, to restore the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros. If I were able to cast my vote, I would vote in favor of H.R. 249, as I have done in the past 109th Congress, rollcall vote 199.

In the 109th Congress, I joined Representatives RAHALL, Sweeney, and WHITFIELD in offering an amendment to the Department of the Interior Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2006 to ensure that none of the funds made available would be used for the sale or slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros. Our amendment passed the House by a vote of 249–159.

The number of wild horses is dwindling. Just a century ago, 2 million horses roamed the west. Today, the combined number of wild horses and burros is less than 30,000, demonstrating that these animals need more protection.

I hope that others will join me in supporting this and other legislation to end the slaughter of our American horses.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 249, a bill to restore the prohibition on the sale for slaughter of wild horses and burros.

Behind closed doors, language was added to the fiscal year 2005 Omnibus Appropriations bill that overturned the 33-year-old ban on the slaughter of wild horses and burros. Immediately, Congress rejected this ploy by voting to amend the fiscal year 2006 Agriculture Appropriations bill to reinstate the ban. That amendment, introduced by Congressman NICK RAHALL, passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 249–159 in the House and the same amendment was included in the fiscal year 2007 bill. We must restore a permanent ban on the slaughter of wild horses and burros to ensure that they remain protected.

Legislators are working to put an end to horse slaughter in this country because horses are some of the most beautiful and beloved domesticated animals on earth. Americans have long appreciated horses—for transport, on ranches, as police mounts, and as cherished companions. America's wild horses are especially prized. The approximately 28,500 horses and burros that roam public land—our prairies, ranges, and the open plains—are cherished symbols of American freedom.

The American Horse Council reports that 1.9 million Americans currently own horses. Another 7.1 million Americans are involved in the industry as horse owners, service providers, employees and volunteers, while tens of millions participate in horse events as spectators. These millions of Americans know that horses should be treated with dignity and respect in life and death. They are disgusted, as I am, that in 2006 over 100,000 horses were slaughtered at three American-based, foreign-owned plants so that the meat could be shipped to Europe and Asia for consumption as a delicacy. And they are saddened that wild horses were sentenced to the same fate, despite the Bureau of Land Management's access to humane options, including adoption, sterilization, relocation, and placement with qualified organizations and individuals.

Not surprisingly, a recent poll conducted by Public Opinion Strategies found that 65 percent of Americans do not support horse slaughter. And 64 percent of Americans believe that horses are a companion animal, like dogs and cats, and killing a horse to eat is not different than killing a cat or dog to eat.

I think it's time to listen to the American public and finally end the barbaric practice of horse slaughter, for wild horses, and for all horses. This legislation demonstrates that we are willing to heed the call of the American people, and take the necessary steps to protect horses from an inhumane and unjust fate.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 249, which will "Restore the Prohibition on the Commercial Sale and Slaughter of Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros." I am sure my colleagues would agree that horses are as American as apple pie, and a symbol of our great Nation. From the time of great explorers like Lewis and Clark to the present day celebration at Churchill Downs, horses have been an intricate part of our society. To their owners, they are companions, for law enforcement officials they are colleagues, but to the American people they have never served as a source of food.

Last year, I stood on this floor in support of H.R. 503, American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. That act sought to prohibit the horrendous practice of domestic horse slaughter for consumption. At the time I spoke out against the appalling practices of this industry that tend to fly under the radar. Horses are forced to travel across our borders for more than 24 hours without rest, water or food in trailers that provide little protection from the elements. Many horses—sick, lame, pregnant or blind—are in distress even before being loaded.

Once at the slaughterhouse, the suffering gets worse. Horses are left for long periods in tightly packed trailers, subjected to further extremes of heat and cold. In hot weather, thirst is acute. Downed animals are unable to rise. All the horses are moved off forcibly when it's time to unload and hurried through the facility into the kill box. In the face of these deplorable conditions, including overcrowding, deafening noise, and the smell of blood, the horses typically become desperate, exhibiting fear typical of "flight" behavior—pacing in prance-like movements with their ears pinned back against their heads and eyes wide open.

Despite the Federal mandate that horses be rendered unconscious before being put to death, many horses are killed alive by repeated blows to the head with captive bolt pistols. While writhing in pain, the coup de grace is administered by a slit of the throat. The dead animal is then processed for shipment overseas and destined for a foreign dining table.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 249 because it extends protection to wild free-roaming horses and burros. This legislation closes the final loophole that jobbers—the middlemen for slaughterhouses—can use. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 249.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 249, which would restore the prohibition on commercial sale of wild horses and burros that was in place from 1971 to 2004.

I want to thank my colleagues Representative NICK RAHALL from West Virginia and Representative ED WHITFIELD from Kentucky for their hard work in restoring this ban, which should have never been lifted in the first place. In the 2 years since the prohibition was eliminated, hundreds of wild horses have been slaughtered. This is unacceptable.

Wild horses are a fixture in United States history. In the 1800s there were more than 2 million wild horses and burros in this country. Today, there are fewer than 29,000. This bill will protect the small number of wild horses and burros who remain, preserving them as national treasures.

Mr. Chairman, this House has time and again expressed the desire of the American people to end the slaughter of innocent, beautiful horses by voting in support of legislation that would ban the slaughter of horses. I urge my colleagues to vote"yes" on H.R. 249.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, but I think the Natural Resources Committee should consider whether additional legislation would be appropriate in order to improve the management of wild horses and burros on Federal lands.

The bill repeals a provision enacted in 2004 as part of an appropriations bill that itself repealed the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros that had been the law since 1971.

The Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act of 1971 established as national policy that wild free-roaming horses and burros were to be protected from capture, branding, harassment, and death and, among other things, it directed that "no wild free-roaming horse or burros or its remains may be sold or transferred for consideration for processing into commercial products."

Practically since its enactment, the law's implementation has been problematic. In particular, the Bureau of Land Management—BLM—has been criticized by the Government Accountability Office and the Interior Department's Inspector General for the way it has responded to the challenge.

Under the act, the agencies inventory horse and burro populations on Federal land to determine "appropriate management levels." They are authorized to remove animals determined to be exceeding the range's carrying capacity so as to restore a natural ecological balance and protect the range from deterioration.

Toward that end, the law authorizes removed animals to be offered for private adoption. New owners can receive title after a 1-year wait, with certification of proper care during that time. An individual may receive title to no more than four animals per year.

The law says that if adoption demand is insufficient, the remaining healthy animals are to be destroyed—but that authority has not been used for more than 20 years, and BLM was prohibited from doing so by funding limitations included in the appropriations act from 1988 through 2004.

The latest numbers I have seen indicated that there currently are an estimated 28,500 wild horses and burros on BLM's 199 herd management areas. I understand this is the lowest level since the early 1970s and is the closest to what BLM considers to be the appropriate management level since that time—but evidently BLM expects the population to increase to about 34,000 in this fiscal year while a reduced emphasis on removal, as proposed in the President's budget request for fiscal 2008, could result in a considerable increase in the number of wild horses and burros on BLM-managed lands. My understanding is that as of the end of fiscal year 2006 there were another 3,180 wild horses and burros on 37 "territories" managed by the Forest Service.

Removals have long been controversial. Some think they are not appropriate, while others are of the opinion that reduction of herds protects range resources and balances wild horse and burro levels with wildlife and domestic livestock. BLM says it bases decisions about appropriate management levels on population censuses and range monitoring, taking into account natural resources, such as wildlife and vegetation, and land uses, including grazing.

My understanding is that between fiscal 1972 and fiscal 2006, 268,709 horses and burros were removed, of which 216,942 were adopted, while others died of natural causes, were sent to holding facilities, or were sold. Because more animals have been removed than have been adopted, large numbers of animals are being held in facilities.

This was the context in which Congress enacted the requirement for sale of unadopted

animals that this bill would repeal. However, in April 2005, BLM temporarily suspended sale and delivery of wild horses and burros due to concerns about the slaughter of some animals. The agency did not sell animals directly for slaughter, and was requiring purchasers to give written affirmation of an intent to provide humane care. Nevertheless, 41 sold animals were resold or traded and then sent to slaughterhouses. Another 52 animals were sold to slaughterhouses, but Ford Motor Co. committed to purchasing them. In May 2005, BLM resumed sales after revising its bill of sale and pre-sale negotiation procedures.

I support this bill because the provision it would repeal was inserted without the benefit of any hearings or public notice and without an opportunity for the Natural Resources Committee, which has jurisdiction, to consider possible alternative approaches.

For the same reason, when the House considered the fiscal 2006 Interior appropriations bill, I supported the Rahall amendment that prohibited the use of funds for the sale or slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros—an amendment that the House again included in the fiscal 2007 Interior Appropriations bill by voice vote.

After passage of this bill, the appropriate next step will be for our committee to review the status of the wild horse and burro program to see whether there is a need for more carefully considered changes in the law.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired. Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 249

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SALE OF WILD FREE-ROAMING HORSES AND BURROS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(d)(5) of Public Law 92–195 (16 U.S.C. 1333(d)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking the period and inserting the following: ''*Provided*, That no wild free-roaming horse or burro or its remains may be sold or transferred for consideration for processing into commercial products.''; and

(2) by striking subsection (e).

(b) CRIMINAL PROVISIONS.—Section (8)(a)(4) of Public Law 92–195 (16 U.S.C. 1338(a)(4)) is amended by striking ''except as provided in section 3(e),''.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Amendments printed in the RECORD may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered read.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT OF OFFSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No authorization of appropriations made by this Act or other provision of this Act that results in costs to the Federal Government shall be effective except to the extent that this Act provides for offsetting decreases in spending of the Federal Government, such that the net effect of this Act does not either increase the Federal deficit or reduce the Federal surplus.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''deficit'' and ''surplus'' have the meanings given such terms in the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 249, the bill that we are discussing here, prohibits the commercial sale of wild horses and burros by the Bureau of Land Management.

As part of the Bureau of Land Management's program to protect and manage and control wild, free-roaming horses and burros, they are permitted to sell wild horses and burros that are over 10 years of age for commercial purposes for approximately $10 per animal, if the animals have not been successfully adopted in three auctions. If the animals are not adopted and BLM cannot sell the animals, then it will have to provide long-term care for them.

Implementing this bill, H.R. 249, will cause the Bureau of Land Management to lose the minimal revenue it is currently able to generate from the sale of the animals and incur additional costs by requiring it to provide long-term care for the animals that they otherwise wouldn't have to, essentially, by mandating a new responsibility.

Now, according to the CBO report accompanying this bill, it says, ''Based on information from Bureau of Land Management about the number of animals sold and the cost to care for them, CBO estimates that the resulting net changes in discretionary spending under H.R. 249 would not exceed $500,000 annually, assuming the availability of appropriated funds.''

However, it costs BLM roughly $25 million a year to feed and shelter roughly 30,000 wild horses in its management program. In 2006, 100,000 horses were slaughtered for consumption, which raises concerns that the cost of this legislation could turn out to be much more significant than CBO and the bill's proponents predict.

My amendment is very simple. It will apply the principle of pay-as-you-go to any new spending authorized by this legislation. It would require that any new spending as a result of this legislation must have a specific offset before this legislation can take effect.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as you know, an excerpt of the New Direction For America, which was proposed by the new majority, the House Democrats, in the 109th Congress as their plan once they were to take the majority, reads, ''Our new direction is committed to pay-as-you-go budgeting. No more deficit spending. We are committed to auditing the books and subjecting every facet of Federal spending to tough budget discipline and accountability, forcing the Congress to choose a new direction and the right priorities for all Americans.'' And I agree, Mr. Chairman.

On April 18, the majority leader was quoted as saying, ''We want to get the budget deficit under control. We've said that fiscal responsibility was necessary, but we are not going to be hoisted on the torrent of fiscal responsibility.'' That was just prior to the new majority ignoring their own PAYGO rules in order to pass a bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would submit that rules aren't rules if you only follow them when you want to. Democrats promised to use PAYGO rules for everything, and instead they are picking and choosing when to do so. At home, we call that breaking a rule and breaking a promise.

So I urge the new majority to rededicate itself to the principle of pay-as-you-go spending. Fiscal responsibility shouldn't be something that is talked about only on the campaign trail.

This might not seem like a lot of money to my friends on the other side of the aisle, but Mr. Chairman, the American people deserve for us to be good stewards of their hard-earned money all the time, not just when it's politically convenient.

I urge adoption of this quality, commonsense, simple PAYGO amendment.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Price of Georgia amendment. The gentleman is attempting to put PAYGO requirements on a bill that neither authorizes nor contains any spending. I repeat that. The gentleman is attempting to put PAYGO provisions on a bill that neither authorizes nor contains any spending.

H.R. 249 merely returns the law the way it existed for 33 years prior to changes made in the law by an appropriations writer in 2004. Both the CBO and the Budget Committee have determined that there are no PAYGO implications with H.R. 249.

What the gentleman from Georgia is proposing to do is an unnecessary, unwise addition to the legislation. He has attempted it many times before. It has been rejected by the Homeland Security many times before. Those times include identical amendments to H.R. 569 and H.R. 700 which were considered by the House in March, and in both cases the House rejected the Price amendments, the first time by a vote of 166–260, and the second time by a vote of 176–256.

So again, I repeat, there should be no PAYGO requirements because it neither authorizes nor contains any spending.

I would urge the House to reject this unwise and unnecessary amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what Representative PRICE is trying to do. Let me try and put in context, once again, what the issue at hand in this very narrowly crafted bill is.

As of today, by rule, by court order, and by regulation and law, BLM, if it sells an animal, may not sell that animal for consumption. If the buyer resells that animal for consumption, that is a felony. It violates the contract they signed, which means the ability of selling, which is different from adopting, is a management tool of BLM. If this bill passes, it would take the option of sale away.

Last year, there were 2,400 horses that were sold. That would no longer be the case. And indeed, BLM would then incur a new burden for keeping those animals and providing for those animals. That is why we support Representative PRICE's amendment that applies PAYGO standard to this bill. There will be an additional cost because the policy will change.

If H.R. 249 passes and the BLM can no longer sell, not for consumption, but just sell wild horses, this agency estimates it will cost $12- to $15 million over the next 10 years. Long-term care and feeding of these animals were not considered when the CBO scored this bill.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word and to address the House for 5 minutes in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my very strong support for the bill that Mr. RAHALL, the Chair of the Resources Committee, has brought to this floor because it restores a longstanding prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild horses and burros.

This amendment that we are currently debating is designed to defeat the substance of this bill. The reality is that this is not a bill that costs the Treasury money, but it does cost our country something of great value.

At the turn of the 20th century, some 2 million wild horses roamed freely in the wild. But by the 1950s, just half a century, their population had dwindled to fewer than 20,000. The population went from 2 million to 20,000. Ninety-nine percent of these majestic creatures were taken off the face of the American continent, and many of them were being inhumanely captured by profiteers who would slaughter them and then sell their meat for pet food and human consumption in European and Asian restaurants.

So, after enough awareness and concern, Congress passed the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971 that protects wild horses and burros on Federal lands from such atrocities. But then in the 108th Congress, under different leadership, longstanding Federal policy that protects wild horses from being sold at auctions and subsequently shipped to slaughter plants was reversed.

Last year, two Texas plants and one in Illinois slaughtered nearly 105,000 horses for human food, mainly for European and Asian consumers. I think it's time to end this senseless for-profit massacre, really, of the symbol of the spirit of the American West.

Animals are given into our care, and we ought to treat them with some greater respect than we do, particularly in the case of horses.

I believe that a generation from now we will shudder at how recklessly we treated these animals which are so symbolic of the spirit, the strength, the stamina of this country. In the event of survival, so many of them face neglect and abuse today, and that is the argument that is raised. But that is not an excuse not to pass this legislation nor to implement a more humane policy, because this policy is inhumane at every step in the process, from how they're purchased at auction, to their transportation to the slaughterhouse, to how they are killed.

Many of the horses that are transported to the slaughterhouse are bought by what are called ''killer buyers'' at auction. These unscrupulous buyers prey on the trust of horse owners who believe that their horse is being bought by a good family and will lead a comfortable life. They are unaware that they are being misled by professional slaughterhouse agents, with their companion animal being sent to a very painful death.

The reality of the slaughtering process is difficult and uncomfortable for many of us to hear, but the suffering begins during the transportation of horses to the slaughterhouse. They are shipped with no food or water or any ability to rest. Often due to overcrowding and slippery floor surfaces, the horses fall and they are trampled during transportation. If they survive the trip to the slaughterhouse, the horse's suffering needlessly continues. Due to their cautious nature, many of these horses are not properly stunned before slaughter. Many are completely conscious when they have their throats cut. Simply put, this is not in the American tradition.

Despite what some of my colleagues will have you believe, the practice is not needed to control the number of horses in the United States. California banned horse slaughter in 1998, and since then there has been no corresponding rise in cruelty or neglect cases.

□ 1115

There has even been a 34 percent drop in horse theft since the ban went into effect.

The fact is that the American public wants to protect horses and is horrified that they are being slaughtered for use as food in other countries. Poll after poll shows that 70 percent of Americans believe that we should end the slaughter of horses. They are right, we should end this slaughter, today. And that is why we should pass this bill and defeat the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I certainly admire and respect the gentlemen who are offering this amendment and making arguments in favor of it. I agree, however, with the gentleman from West Virginia that it has very negligible fiscal impact on the Federal budget.

As has been stated, there are less than 20,000 wild mustangs and burros left on Federal lands in the West. And if they are concerned about the fiscal impact of not slaughtering a few horses, I would say there are over 214 million acres of Federal lands in the West that the ranchers and corporations that are leasing that land are paying the Federal Government less than 10 cents per acre per year.

Now, that is much less being paid than what my farmers that I represent in Kentucky are paying for leased land. I recognize that this land in the West, much of it is arid, it is not really that rich. But there are lots of people who would be willing to lease land for less than 10 cents per acre. And I think we at the Federal level have a responsibility to protect these wild mustangs and burros; and as the gentleman before me said, at one time the population was around 2 million, now it is around 20,000 head, and we have an obligation to protect these animals.

I want to commend the gentleman from West Virginia for offering this bill, H.R. 249, to restore the Federal protections of these animals that have been in effect since 1971. And the only reason that it was changed in the omnibus bill a couple of years ago without anyone's knowledge, those Federal protections were removed. And so H.R. 249 simply restores that protection.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Members to vote against this amendment and to support H.R. 249.

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

Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to the amendment and in support of the underlying bill, Mr. RAHALL's bill, to restore the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros.

A lot of people bet on horses. Today, the horses are betting on us. They are betting that we remember something essential about the America of long ago to which these wild horses and burros connect us, betting that we do not misuse our power to cause these horses, these wild animals to be subject to slaughter. They are betting that we have the sense to put together policies that can provide for the protection of the wild horses and burros.

Now, it is the responsibility of the Bureau of Land Management to enforce the laws on public lands that related to the bill that Congress passed 36 years ago that established as national policy that wild free-roaming horses and burros shall be protected from capture, branding, harassment, and death. And this Bureau of Land Management has not done the job. They haven't properly managed their responsibilities,

they haven't enforced the law. Why should we permit the wild horses to be further victimized by the Bureau of Land Management?

This legislation exposes part of the spirit of America to an attack because of the ineffectiveness and inefficiency and indeed the callous disregard of those at the Bureau of Land Management. Rather than pass a law which opens up wild horses to commercial sale and slaughter, we should be looking at a dramatic revision of the Bureau of Land Management's responsibilities here. We should be looking at that agency which took the responsibility by law in 1971 to make sure that these horses were protected, because they haven't done that. And now we are having Members advocate that we continue a condition where these horses are subjected to slaughter.

I think that occasionally we reconnect to our greatness as a country when we remember where we came from, when we remember our connection with the land, when we remember our connection with Native Americans, when we remember our connection with the sky, when we remember our connection with the water, and when we remember our connection with God's creatures who still, through the grace of God, freely roam the plains of this country as wild horses and burros.

Support the Rahall bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say a couple of things to try and set the record straight about the last couple of speeches which haven't actually been dealing with the amendment nor necessarily the bill itself.

There are approximately 33,000 wild horses on public range lands today. There are 28,000 wild horses that are standing in pens today. That is the total amount.

Those animals are not slaughtered. If they are sold or adopted, it is a felony to slaughter those animals. That is the BLM practice today. Any kind of talking about animals being slaughtered for consumption are not the animals owned by the Federal Government nor the animals that are subject to this particular bill. All this bill does is take away the opportunity of selling these animals, not for consumption or slaughter, to someone else. And it takes away a standard which the BLM has estimated will cost them between $10 million and $12 million over the next 10 years to try to keep these animals standing in a pen all day.

The problem is, we do have an arid topography. This is not the land that can support these animals. All of my good friends in the east have perfect land for that. And, to be honest, if they would open up some of their land so that wild horses can run freely back in their districts, you might be able to solve this problem again. But it is not going to happen unless you actually give them the tools to do it on this limited number of animals we are actually speaking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

Are there further amendments?

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) 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 186, noes 238, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

AYES—186

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Fallin
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—238

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Eshoo
Everett
Faleomavaega
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Cannon
Clyburn
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Engel
Etheridge
Fattah

Feeney	Lampson	Spratt
Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez	Westmoreland

□ 1152

Messrs. MURPHY of Connecticut, BOUCHER, ROTHMAN, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. LEE, Messrs. BAIRD, GORDON of Tennessee, WELCH of Vermont, WATT, MELANCON, CUELLAR and DONNELLY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. TANCREDO, BARTLETT of Maryland, GILCHREST, WELDON of Florida, TURNER and CARNEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, 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. 249) to restore the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros, pursuant to House Resolution 331, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Price of Georgia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 249 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 2, after line 13, insert the following:

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This legislation shall not take effect until 60 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies to Congress that the long-term care of all animals not sold as a result of this Act does not exceed $500,000 annually.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit offers an effective date for fiscal responsibility.

H.R. 249 prohibits the commercial sale of wild horses and burros by the Bureau of Land Management. Implementing this bill will cause the BLM to lose the ability to sell these animals and incur additional costs by requiring it to provide long-term care for the animals that they otherwise would not be required to, thus mandating a new responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, according to the CBO report accompanying this bill, it said, based on the information from BLM about the number of animals sold and the cost to care for them, CBO estimates that the resulting net changes in discretionary spending under H.R. 249 would not exceed $500,000 annually, assuming the availability of appropriated funds.

However, the Bureau of Land Management spends roughly $25 million a year to feed and shelter 30,000 wild horses in its management program. This motion to recommit will establish an effective date for the legislation, requiring the Secretary to certify to Congress that the long-term care of animals spared by this act will not exceed the cost of $500,000, which is noted in the bill and is the CBO estimate.

We all know that the CBO is noted for outrageously poor estimates. The capital gains tax reductions from 2003 to 2006, from 20 to 15 percent, that were enacted, CBO estimated revenue at $197 billion. In fact, Mr. Speaker, $330 billion were gained, an error of 68 percent. This is after the CBO underestimated capital gains revenue following the 1997 decrease by $217 billion. Further, CBO underestimated Federal tax revenue due to the responsible tax decreases that were enacted earlier this decade by $255 billion. Of course, Mr. Speaker, we all know that CBO estimated the Medicare part D premium would cost $38 a month, and in fact, it costs $22 per month, an error of 72 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this week in The Hill newspaper, former Congressman Charlie Stenholm appealed to Congress not to pass this legislation for budgetary reasons. Under the new PAYGO regime, Congress should not be perpetuating long-term options when another, less costly, option is available.

As of December 2004, 8,400 wild horses and burros became eligible for sale, and as of April 2007, the Bureau of Land Management has sold more than 2,300 horses. If the remaining horses which are available for sale are safe for long-term care, then the Secretary should be required to clarify that the care will not create an undue financial burden on the American people.

If the Secretary can certify that this legislation will not exceed $500,000 annually, then this proposal goes forward. If the Secretary cannot certify this requirement, then the legislation should be stopped, and the onus is on Congress to revisit the proposal and find new money.

I urge the new majority to rededicate themselves to the principle of fiscal responsibility. Fiscal responsibility should not be something that is just talked about on the campaign trail. This may not seem like a lot of money to my friends on the other side of the aisle, but the American people deserve for us to be good stewards of their hard-earned money all the time, not just when it is politically convenient.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the motion to recommit.

□ 1200

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, first, I will respond to the gentleman from Georgia that this was an open rule. All Members knew that, and I cannot understand why the gentleman would not have offered this as an amendment during the normal process of legislative consideration of this bill. Instead, he comes at the last moment in the recommittal, which is true to his nature on previous legislation that has passed this body.

The gentleman's motion to recommit would change the effective date until 60 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Interior certifies to Congress that the long-term care of all unsold wild horses and burros as a result of this act does not exceed $500,000 annually. There is no time limit placed on that period during which the Secretary of the Interior has to certify. I am assuming that the gentleman is entrusting the same Federal agency, the Bureau of Land Management, that has so mismanaged this whole process in the beginning, entrusting with that agency the same responsibility to do such certification. Again, there is no time limit. It could be 30 days, it could be 30 years, it could be 300 years before the Secretary so certifies.

So the amendment is purely a killer amendment. The Members know that is the intent of the gentleman from Georgia, and I would urge its rejection.

In addition, as I have emphasized so many times on this bill, there is no PAYGO issue with this bill. The CBO estimated that the administrative cost of this bill is less than $500,000.

Third, the impact of this amendment is to allow slaughter for another 60 days, at the minimum, but more likely, indefinitely, as I said, because there is no time limit on the certification procedure stated in the motion to recommit. There is no time frame. The certification is open-ended. We have no idea as to how long that process will take.

Again, I respond to the gentleman from Georgia, this is a killer amendment. Every Member that voted against the previous amendment and has voted for this legislation in the past knows that is such.

I would urge opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 234, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

AYES—182

Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
English (PA)
Fallin
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOES—234

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Ellison
Emanuel
Emerson
Eshoo
Everett
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Platts
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Reynolds
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Cannon
Clyburn
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Engel
Etheridge
Fattah
Feeney
Harman
Johnson, E. B.
Lampson
Meehan
Rodriguez
Spratt
Sullivan
Westmoreland

□ 1222

Mrs. EMERSON changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. GILLIBRAND and Messrs. MURPHY of Connecticut, LAHOOD, BARROW and CUELLAR changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL HAYS UPON HIS RETIREMENT AS READING CLERK FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to think of our institution without the services of our reading clerk, Paul Hays. Before we get back, Paul will retire, after some 41 years of service here in the House.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. Speaker, Paul's distinctive voice, I think, is familiar to all of us. I think all of you know that Paul is a patriot. He even got married on the 4th of July. From his service in the National Guard, to his service with the Capitol Hill Restoration Society, Paul has given much to our country, and he has given much to all of us and to our institution.

Paul, thank you.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHNER. I would be happy to yield to my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise to join him in thanking Paul Hays for the extraordinary service he has given to this institution.

Our reading clerk, Paul Hays, who after 19 years in this position as reading clerk and, as has been noted by the distinguished minority leader, 41 years as an employee of this House, has announced he will retire effective Monday, April 30, and begin a new phase of his life.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, Paul Hays, with his deep, crisp, commanding voice is perhaps most recognized to our viewers on C–SPAN, perhaps more than many of the rest of us, because he is here all the time and that voice is heard and his visage is seen.

It has been a privilege, I know, for him to serve here, but as I have noted on other occasions when other members of the desk have retired, they serve our country as well as those who have been elected to serve, and we appreciate their service.

Since 1789, the House has employed reading clerks, who are responsible for reading aloud, obviously, the text of bills, amendments, motions, messages, special rules and other privileged resolutions and veto messages. Our reading clerks almost always, almost always, have been appointed from the ranks of existing House employees who have extensive prior floor experience. Paul was one of those.

Paul, a graduate of Georgetown University, is no exception. In fact, Paul was appointed reading clerk in 1988 by one of the most distinguished persons with whom I have served, one of the most decent Americans that has served in this House, the distinguished minority leader, Bob Michel.

It is no coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that given his speaking talents, Paul, as I understand it, intends to do voiceover work in the future.

Now, Paul, we want you to be very discriminating in what voiceovers you do. There may be a lot of requests. We want you to know how nice we are being to you today.

Paul, I want to thank you. I want to thank you for your service to this institution and to our country. As you go from this phase of your very successful life into the next successful phase of your life, not only do we thank you, but we wish you well.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his remarks.

Paul, we all wish you well, and no more excuses about your golf game.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill, H.R. 249.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 137, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

YEAS—277

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono
Boozman
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Emanuel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Everett
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Goode
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Pitts
Platts
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—137

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Cardoza
Carter
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Cramer
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dingell
Doolittle
Drake
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Melancon
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Weldon (FL)
Wicker
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—18

Cannon
Clyburn
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Engel
Etheridge
Fattah
Feeney
Gonzalez
Harman
Johnson, E. B.
Lampson
McNulty
Rodriguez
Rush
Spratt
Sullivan
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1238

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, Mr. BLUNT, for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 12 noon in pro forma session. No legislative business.

On Tuesday the House will meet at 10:30 for morning hour business and noon for legislative business. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of those bills will be made available by the close of business tomorrow.

On Wednesday and Thursday the House will meet at 10 a.m.

On Friday no votes are expected, assuming we complete our business scheduled for Wednesday and Thursday.

We'll consider H.R. 1429, the Head Start reauthorization bill; H.R. 1867, the National Science Foundation reauthorization bill; H.R. 1868, the NIST reauthorization bill; and H.R. 1592, the Local Law Enforcement and Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that information. And on the discussion of Tuesday, I want to say, first of all, I appreciate the early information you were able to give us on Monday and Tuesday, and wonder, as Members are planning on traveling either Monday or Tuesday, if you have any further sense of when votes may occur on Tuesday.

Mr. HOYER. Votes could occur as early as 12 noon. It will be a full day. Even though we are not here Monday, usually you're in 6:30 the next day. But because of the shortness of the week, we will be in, as I indicated, at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour and then 12 for business. There could be votes as early as 12 noon.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate that, and I think that is helpful to Members to know where the leader is headed on that topic.

Two bills you mentioned for next week. I know the local law enforcement, the hate crimes, some of our Members are beginning to be, I think, concerned about this bill, refer to it as a thought crimes bill. But there was a long markup in committee, lots of amendments, and I am thinking on that bill we're hopeful that we can have the same kind of opportunity for a wide-ranging discussion on the floor that the committee had; and on both that and the Head Start bill, we are hoping for a rule that allows that. I wonder if the gentleman has any sense of what the rule on those two bills will look like.

Mr. HOYER. The answer is I have not talked to Rules Committee Chairman