

more often here in the House of Representatives.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support the Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 5122, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007.

The motion to instruct offered by my colleague, Representative CHET EDWARDS, would instruct House conferees to insist on Senate-passed language regarding the TRICARE retail pharmacy program. That language would allow TRICARE beneficiaries to purchase prescriptions from their local pharmacies at the same cost as through mail-order services, ensuring that our veterans and military retirees are not forced to pay more merely to visit their neighborhood drug store.

The Veterans Health Care Act of 1992 requires drug manufacturers to grant a Federal pricing discount on all drugs provided to the Department of Defense, Veterans' Administration, the Public Health Service and the Coast Guard. Unfortunately, not all drug manufacturers grant this discount on drugs provided to retail pharmacy stores, instead only applying the discount to mail-order prescriptions.

It is understandable that the Department of Defense would want to contain growing prescription drug costs. However, forcing TRICARE beneficiaries to obtain prescriptions by mail-order is not the solution—rather, we need to clarify that drug manufacturers must provide Federal pricing for all medications dispensed through the TRICARE retail pharmacy network. Section 721 of the Senate version of the Defense Authorization bill would do just this.

Representatives of the Department of Defense have acknowledged that Federal pricing for pharmaceuticals dispensed through the TRICARE retail pharmacy network would "significantly" contain growing prescription drug costs. It has been estimated that if the Senate provision is enacted, it could save taxpayers up to \$251 million in fiscal year 2007, and more than \$300 million annually by fiscal year 2009, by requiring Federal pricing discounts to be applied to these TRICARE retail pharmacies.

I have heard serious concerns expressed by veterans and military retirees in my district about this issue many times this summer. There are times when it is not possible to wait for a mail order to come before a person might need to begin taking their prescriptions. In those cases, for example, the men and women who have bravely served our country should not be punished for buying their prescriptions down the block. Our veterans, military retirees and their families deserve to have the option to use a pharmacy, and the services of a pharmacist, when they have questions regarding their prescriptions and their health. Passing this motion to instruct allows them that option.

We must ensure that our veterans and military retirees receive the benefits they have so courageously earned, and this motion to instruct will help guarantee they are not penalized for doing so. I support this motion to instruct, and strongly urge my colleagues to do as well.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2066. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to establish a Federal Acquisition Service, to replace the General Supply Fund and the Information Technology Fund with an Acquisition Services Fund, and for other purposes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 503, and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

#### AMERICAN HORSE SLAUGHTER PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 981 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. 503.

□ 1200

#### 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. 503) to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes, with Mr. PUTNAM 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.

As designees of the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) each will control 10 minutes.

As designees of the minority leader, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I know that H.R. 503 is an emotional issue for many people. It is my hope that this debate will give us a chance to look beyond the emotion and actually explore the facts of the issue in this particular bill. It is important that this discussion be fair, that it be open; and to that end the committee that I chair, the Energy and Commerce Committee, held a hearing a month ago that included witnesses from both sides and was fair and balanced. We put together a completely balanced hearing; and at the end of that hearing, it was clear to me that the majority of the experts have spoken, and they have spoken that H.R. 503 is bad policy and that it is bad for horses.

It is not a secret that I am opposed to the bill in its current form. Despite what may have been said, it is not because I do not like horses. It is not because I had some bad experience when I was young. In fact, I had and continue to have very positive experiences with horses. My opposition to this bill stems from the simple fact that it comes with negative consequences that I believe are being overlooked.

Ever since the bill has been introduced, I have been bombarded by calls, letters, and meeting requests from people both in my district and all over the country on both sides of the issue. I have heard from ranchers and horse owners as well as the American Quarter Horse Association, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Association of Equine Practitioners, American Farm Bureau, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association. The list goes on and on. I have also been approached by proponents of the bill that are very supportive and very emotionally and strongly attached to this particular bill. Unfortunately for those folks, I must say that I am opposed to the bill because the majority of the evidence is that it is a bad bill. In fact, over 200 national organizations oppose the bill. Yesterday, even the United States Department of Agriculture came out in opposition to the bill. These are groups that, frankly, I consider to be representative of rural America, and they have all said the same thing: H.R. 503 will lead to a miserable existence for thousands of horses and is an outright attack at animal agriculture.

The care and the overall health of the animals, and notably the rights of their owners, should always be the primary concern when taking up legislation of this nature. Processing unmanageable and unwanted horses provides a humane alternative to continuing a

life of discomfort, inadequate care, or possibly even abandonment for thousands of horses.

Mandatory United States Department of Agriculture inspection, which abides by strict laws monitoring the welfare of animals in the processing facility, assures that horses that are going to slaughter are treated humanely. It is also important to note that since last year's agriculture appropriations bill was enacted, the three American processing plants pay for those inspectors out of their own pockets. No expense to the taxpayer.

I might say on this note that the proponents of the bill have said repeatedly that the Cattlemen's Association gets \$3 for every horse that is taken to slaughter. That is a true statement. But the reason that \$3 is paid is because it is the Cattlemen's Association, at least in Texas, that is actually paying for the inspectors to inspect the horses that are brought to the slaughterhouse in Texas. So that is why you have the \$3-per-horse fee. It is because in last year's agriculture appropriations bill, we said that those inspectors could not be paid for with Federal funds; therefore, an arrangement has been made between the slaughterhouses in Texas and the Cattlemen's Association that the inspectors will be paid for by providing this fee to the Cattlemen's Association that pays the inspectors.

H.R. 503 provides no alternative for thousands of horse owners for whom continued care of an animal is no longer economical or in some cases humane.

The other concern the bill raises for me is one of private property rights. While a majority of my constituents live in the Arlington/Fort Worth area down in Texas, the geography of the district that I represent is almost entirely rural. Animal agriculture is a large part of the economy for much of my district, and agriculture is already one of the most extensively regulated industries in the United States of America.

In the name of animal welfare, the United States Department of Agriculture right now tells owners how they can and cannot transport their animals. In the name of consumer safety, the United States Department of Agriculture right now tells them what they can and cannot feed their animals. This bill would tell producers to whom they can and cannot sell their horses. As a long-time proponent of limited government, I take issue with this last statement.

The horse owners in question have fed, housed, and cared for their animals, in some cases for decades, at great personal expense. When an animal reaches the point when he or she is no longer productive for the owner, who are we then to deny an owner the opportunity to recover some small portion of their costs that they have incurred in caring for the animal so far in its life? Why should they not be al-

lowed to sell their animal to a legal, humane, and closely regulated processing facility?

Now, I understand that there are many groups that strongly support this particular bill and some of the thoroughbred associations are strongly in support of H.R. 503. If they have the money to pay for their horses, if they have the money to take care of their horses, that is fine. They do not have to take them to a slaughterhouse. That is freedom of choice. But for many ordinary Americans who do not have the resources that some of the more well-heeled thoroughbred associations and horse farms have, I think having a slaughterhouse option is a humane option.

Again, I understand that this is an emotional issue for many people. But I do not think Congress should vote purely on emotion. I think there should be common sense brought into the equation. And when you really look at the bill in that light, the obvious vote, at least for me, is a "no" vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho will control the remainder of the time at the designation of the majority leader.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 503, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act, which would put an end to the deplorable practice of slaughtering American horses for consumption.

As a strong supporter of animal rights, a horse lover, a former horse owner, I have joined with 202 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle as a cosponsor of H.R. 503. 550 national and State organizations also support H.R. 503, and I have received over 900 communications from constituents in support of the bill.

Congress has already expressed its desire to put an end to horse slaughter by voting to amend the fiscal year 2006 agriculture appropriations bill to ban the practice. That amendment passed by an overwhelming vote of 269-158 in the House, 69-28 in the Senate. However, the language that passed in both the House and Senate stating that no Federal dollars could be used to fund the inspection of horse slaughter plants, thus ending the practice, was stripped out. The Republican leadership, in an act of hubris, changed the language in conference to allow for flexibility in interpretation of that ban and allowed the plants to continue to operate. This is going against congressional intent and has been taken to the courts.

Congress voted to put an end to horse slaughter in this country because horses are some of the most beautiful and beloved domesticated animals on Earth. Earlier this year the story of

Barbaro, the Kentucky Derby winner that shattered his leg at the start of the Preakness, transfixed millions of Americans. Since his injury, the thoroughbred has received an incredible outpouring of letters, flowers, apples, and carrots from Americans across the country. Fans have even made pilgrimages to Barbaro's care facility in Pennsylvania to wish him well in his long recovery. Americans are rooting for Barbaro because they have been inspired by his strength, his beauty, and his strong personality.

Americans have long appreciated horses for transport, on ranches, as police mounts, and as cherished companions. 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 2005 over 90,000 horses were slaughtered at three American-based foreign-owned plants, and I stress foreign-owned plants, so that meat could be shipped to Europe and Asia for consumption as a delicacy.

Horses bound for slaughter must endure inhumane conditions on the way to and during slaughter. Horses are shipped frequently for long distances in terrible conditions. They are crammed together in trucks built for cattle and pigs. Because of the cramped transport, they are often trampled and some horses arrive at the slaughterhouse seriously injured or dead. Once at the slaughterhouse, horses are often not rendered unconscious before they are killed, as mandated by Federal law.

Most people assume that all or most of the horses bought for slaughter are old or injured. In fact, according to the USDA guidelines for handling and transporting equines for slaughter, 92.3 percent of horses that arrive at slaughter plants are in "good" condition, meaning they are not injured, lame, overweight, or underweight. Healthy animals, pets, and former race horses are all sent to slaughter.

We may hear today that it is likened to being humane to animals in order to oppose this legislation. It could not be further from the truth. The humane vote is to vote in favor of this legislation to ban the inhumane slaughter of horses.

Earlier I mentioned Barbaro, the Kentucky Derby winner. Ferdinand, the winner of the 1986 Derby, faced a very different fate. After his momentous Derby victory, Ferdinand was killed for food in a Japanese slaughterhouse in 2002. Just imagine if Barbaro faced the same end.

Not surprisingly, a recent poll conducted by public opinion strategists found that 65 percent of Americans do not support horse slaughter, and 64 percent of Americans believe that horses

are companions like dogs and cats and killing a horse to eat is not different than killing a cat or dog to eat.

I am sure that other Members of this body have received hundreds of letters too from constituents who oppose horse slaughter and support H.R. 503. I think it is time to listen to the American public and finally end the barbaric practice of horse slaughter by passing H.R. 503. Let us not sign off on Barbaro burgers.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 503.

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

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

I submit for the RECORD an editorial from the Dallas Morning News and also an editorial from the Star-Telegram.

A HUMANE END: SLAUGHTER PREVENTS WIDER SUFFERING

[From the Dallas Morning News, Sept. 7, 2006]

Few issues roil the emotions more than those involving the dependent and helpless. Hence, the turbulent debate over a proposal in Congress to end the legal slaughter of horses that feed overseas meat markets.

It's not right to dismiss or belittle the strongly held beliefs of animal advocates on the matter. They argue that the horse is a loyal service and companion animal that should not end up on someone's dinner table. Indeed, most Americans' sensibilities align with that view.

But the grisly alternative to humane slaughter is a slow, painful end for tens of thousands of castoff animals every year.

In a poignant irony, major veterinary groups are lined up against a slaughter ban. They argue persuasively that enough buyers or adoptive homes couldn't be found for all horses deemed too old, unfit or expensive by their owners.

Maintaining a horse for its natural life can exceed \$25,000, even short of veterinary care.

The federal government, despite help from rescue organizations, already fails to find homes for thousands of wild horses culled each year from herds roaming national grasslands. Think of boosting the number of unwanted animals by the 60,000 to 100,000 horses that now go to slaughter annually. That would recklessly invite widespread abandonment and starvation.

Two of the nation's three horse slaughterhouses are in North Texas, the foreign-owned Dallas Crown in Kaufman and Beltex in Fort Worth. It's a closely regulated business aimed at humane treatment, from transport to euthanasia.

Some slaughter opponents say a better end for unwanted horses would be veterinarian-administered euthanasia. That position ignores the pivotal issue of added cost for rendering, incineration or burial.

Exported horse meat heads primarily to Europe and Asia, where no cultural taboo is attached to consumption. Top consumers are mostly developing nations with a need for added protein in the diet. Thus, the slaughtered horse makes a final contribution to the cycle of life.

In this country, at least, the law seeks to guarantee a humane end, in keeping with the horse's honored place in national lore. Congress should devote its energies toward keeping things that way, thus avoiding the unwanted consequence of needless suffering.

[From the Star-Telegram, Sept. 1, 2006]

#### SIRING PROBLEMS

The federal bill grabbing the attention of horse lovers and animal rights activists bans

the "shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes."

The "other purposes" aren't outlined in HR 503, which is scheduled for a House vote on Thursday, but the result of this bill's passage would be to shut down an industry that provides a practical public service: disposal of the remains of dead horses.

It must be acknowledged up front that lots of Americans will never be convinced that allowing the slaughter of horses for sale as meat—for carnivores in zoos, canines at home or connoisseurs in Cannes—is a public service.

To some people, horses are more than "mere property," as Wayne Pacelle, president and CEO of the American Humane Society, wrote in an Aug. 23 guest column. But as horse breeder Jay Novacek rightly pointed out in the Aug. 21 column that triggered Pacelle's response, not all horses are pets, and not every horse owner has the financial resources to keep a horse until it dies of natural causes and then pay to bury or burn the carcass.

Maintaining a horse until its natural death averages \$25,740 per animal, not including veterinary care for sickness or injury, according to a June report (commissioned by the Animal Welfare Council) about the consequences of a horse slaughter ban. The average lifespan of a horse is 20 to 25 years.

Pacelle is correct in that before Americans had trucks and cars to deliver the mail and packages, horses were the common mode of transportation. They were work animals. But romanticizing those relationships as something other than people appreciating the tools they needed to do their jobs is an attempt to play every emotional note possible.

Harkening back to a time when "almost everyone knew how to ride a horse" reveals a nostalgia for a day when people had few alternative forms of transportation other than their own two feet. Pardon us for saying that we aren't anxious to return to that chapter in history.

One can respect and be grateful for the horse's role in U.S. history without ignoring the pragmatic problems of what to do with a dead or unwanted one.

Shuttering the Beltex processing plant in Fort Worth won't put an end to "grim news" for the estimated 70,000 to 100,000 American horses that are slaughtered annually unless there's some way to cheat death for four-legged animals, or a pipeline to 70,000 to 100,000 people financially capable of caring for these animals.

No matter how much their owners appreciate them, horses get old and sick, and they die. Something has to be done with the carcass. And the affordable "something" for tens of thousands of people is the slaughterhouse. Incineration can cost as much as \$2,000, and lots of areas have ordinances that make it illegal to bury Flicka in the back 40.

If public health, humane treatment or nuisance issues are discovered relating to the three horse processing plants operating in the United States (two of them in Texas), it's totally appropriate for government to address them. But U.S. history books are rife with examples of bad laws resulting from emotional appeals.

If passed, HR 503 will not save one horse's life, nor will it do anything to guarantee humane treatment for the animals.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives is voting today on an amendment to the Horse Protection Act that actually would irresponsibly endanger the welfare of the

very animal that it purports to help. I oppose H.R. 503, which is driven by raw emotion and misinformation rather than by the facts. By eliminating the option of humane slaughter of the horses, the bill provides no directive as to what will happen to the 90,000 unwanted horses annually processed in our slaughter facilities. It increases the probability of unwanted horses becoming the victims of neglect, starvation, or abandonment. It criminalizes a legitimate and legal U.S. industry. It eliminates hundreds of U.S. jobs. It mandates costs estimated at \$3 billion to \$4 billion on private citizens. And it creates far more problems than it actually solves.

□ 1215

It limits horse owners' choices for disposing of their animals, and it infringes on the owners' private property rights. Private property rights have long been held dear by the families and the land owners in the west, and for good reason. Their farms and ranches have been their livelihood and part of their national heritage since the frontier was closed and the west was settled.

Not many months ago, many of my colleagues, most of those who are on the opposition side of this bill, on a bipartisan basis, rose in indignation at the Kelo v. New London, Connecticut, the City of New London, Connecticut decision, because it was taking private property rights.

I have stood many times with many of those folks who are now proponents of this bill to protect intellectual private property rights. I see no difference. And like it or not, a horse is private property. They are not humans. They must be treated humanely and cared for appropriately. However, when a horse is no longer wanted or cannot be cared for, Congress should not be in the business of deciding how the animals can or cannot be disposed of.

We fight for the protection of personal property rights and intellectual property rights, everything from dirt to ideas, Mr. Chairman. This is no different. I strongly encourage Members to oppose this misguided effort and continue preserving a strong tradition of private personal property rights in the United States.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bill that is before us. When we all look at all of the important issues waiting for Congress to act on, I cannot understand why we are here wasting so much of our time on an issue that really has nothing to do with the pressing problems that are facing people in this country.

But here we are today considering a bill that would effectively shut down three horse-processing facilities and

eliminate a reasonable option for horse owners who can no longer afford to care for their animals that are no longer productive.

I understand that this issue is an emotional one for many people. But what other options are there for people who own aging horses that are no longer productive? It costs anywhere from, people tell me, \$1,200 to \$1,800 a year, some people say \$2,300 a year. That is a lot of money for most people to care for an animal that has outlived its productive years.

Some of these aging horses are sent to horse rescue facilities. While those facilities can provide a good home for aging horses, there are no Federal guarantees or standards of care that must be met. There is no guarantee that the horses at these facilities will be treated humanely. And this bill does not provide any money to help rescue facilities cover the additional costs that they will incur, and there is no way that we can accommodate all of the horses that will be abandoned if we pass this bill.

While H.R. 503 outlaws slaughter for human consumption, the bill does not prohibit horses from being killed. Some supporters of this bill support euthanasia as an alternative to processing. However, euthanizing a horse is not cheap; it can cost anywhere from \$300 to \$2,000 an animal depending on the local rules for carcass disposal.

Processing provides a cost effective and a humane alternative to neglect and abandonment when horse owners are unable to find another buyer. Caring for a horse properly is expensive, and it is time consuming. The real question of animal welfare lies in what will happen if the slaughter ban is imposed. These unwanted horses are often sick, unfit or problem animals. Many of them are already living in pain or discomfort, and tens of thousands more could be neglected, starved or abandoned if their owners no longer have processing available as an end-of-life option.

If we pass this bill, we will ignore the fate of these animals who find their lives extended but without the necessary standards of care that they need and deserve. So at the end of the day, this bill is not about protecting horses from an untimely death; all it will do is limit the option of horse owners and burden them with additional costs of care and disposal.

The House Agriculture Committee recognized the many weaknesses in this bill and voted to recommend that the House not pass this bill by a vote of 37-3.

The Members of our committee represent agricultural areas around the country, areas where people own and use horses every day. We passed several amendments to this bill during our committee mark-up, but they are not included in the bill that we are considering here today.

This shows a complete lack of respect for the expertise and the effort that the

Agriculture Committee has contributed to this subject. At the end of the day, this debate is about defining what is humane when we are dealing with unwanted horses. Are we going to pass legislation that truly addresses the health and well being of animals, or are we going to pursue bills that amount to little more than window dressing in the name of animal welfare?

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to set aside this emotionally charged issue and oppose this legislation that will tie the hands of horse owners around this country.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, some of us were late coming to the floor. I would like an explanation of the division of the time on this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 981, as designees of the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) each were allocated 10 minutes.

As designees of the minority leader, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, what is the time remaining on this side of the aisle at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. He has 10½ minutes because time was yielded to him.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. The majority leader reallocated time.

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

Mr. Chairman, today we are going to have a serious discussion that in my estimation is long overdue. Since 1979, Members of Congress, with the vast and substantial support of the American people, have tried to have this issue resolved.

What I speak of is H.R. 503, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. Mr. PETERSON, my good friend, made what I think is one point I will agree with him on. This is a debate about what is humane. And despite the words and the rhetoric of the opponents of this legislation, the focus should be on the issue of what is humane and what the will of the people are, because what we are exposing today is a brutal, shadowy, shameful, predatory practice that borders on the perverse.

Public opinion, as I said, is substantially in support. Every poll that I

have seen, 70 percent of the American people want this practice banned and stopped, the practice of horse slaughter for human consumption, something culturally the United States has never accepted nor have any of the Indian territories within the United States.

Editorials were recited a bit earlier, but I will give you some editorials. Today the Washington Post, with a diametrically different view of the world than the Washington Times, both editorialized saying that this practice should end. It reflects on our culture. It reflects on our priorities inappropriately and improperly.

In California, a referendum was passed with 60 percent of the vote saying that that practice should be banned in California. And there is Texas law, and many other States have laws that ban the practice. What H.R. 503 does is it prohibits the shipping, the transporting, the moving, the delivering, the receiving, the purchasing, selling or donation of horses and other equines for slaughter for human consumption.

What I really want to emphasize though is what this practice is. The opponents have said this is a humane process. The opponents have said that this is going to limit individuals' rights and individuals' property rights, none of that being true.

What this is going to do is stop a practice that, first of all, is in violation of many State laws and, secondly, is not adhered to or supported by substantial populations, and it is brutal.

This picture here, this is a horse's head. This is a horse's head that was discovered in transport to one of the slaughter houses. What we have here are three slaughter house factories, two in Texas, one in Illinois, both operating with substantial local opposition and presenting substantial environmental and economic problems to those communities.

What we have are horses from all over the country, thousands of miles away, transported in cramped cattle or pig trailers or trucks. Not designed or built for horses, not designed to transport horses. They are often purchased in a predatory fashion by killer-buyers who do not disclose what the purpose of their purchase is going to be, who, as I said, operate in a shadowy way.

They bring these beautiful animals those thousands of miles in these cramped conditions with all different types of horses cramped in, despite USDA regulations that say you cannot transport them that way. The irony, Mr. Chairman, is on the day the Agriculture Committee marked up its bill, a bill which the amendments will be to the floor in a little while, all meant to continue that practice, to kill H.R. 503; on the very day they were marking up that bill, an arrest was made in Mississippi of one of those predatory killer-buyers who had 20-25 horses in his care. He stopped because he got a flat tire. And the owner of the service station he stopped at saw the condition, the condition of these animals, and

called the police, thus allowing us to finally enforce the law.

Mr. Chairman, we need to pass this bill because USDA has not done their job. In fact, they have been on the other side of the issue consistently. They surreptitiously overturned Congressional action last year. Ms. SCHAKOWSKY pointed that out earlier. We need to bring an end to this practice because it says too much about us.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has 15 minutes remaining.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I am an original cosponsor of this bill, along with Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. SWEENEY. This bill is to prevent the violent practice of slaughtering horses for human consumption. Why are we offering it?

If you have grown up with horses, you know why we are offering it. They are as close to human as any animal you can get. Why are we offering it? Because there are three foreign-owned slaughter houses, just three, in the United States where these horses are slaughtered, various means, jacking them up by their hind legs, slitting their throats.

Why does this practice continue? So that these slaughter houses can keep a steady flow of horse meat to the dinner tables and meat markets, not in the United States, but of Asia and Europe where horse meat is still eaten. Americans do not even eat horse meat.

The Horse Slaughter Prevention Act before us today, if passed into law, will simply end this practice once and for all across the entire United States.

The opponents of this bill have come up with a number of objections, reasons they think it is a bad idea. First of all, they would have us believe that this is a first step down a slippery slope. That next will come cows and then hogs and then chickens and then other animals consumed by Americans.

But the Horse Slaughter Prevention Act does nothing of the kind, and it will not lead in that direction, because horses are unique and distinct. We all know that.

Second, the opponents claim that banning horse slaughter will result in an overpopulation of horses in this country. Once again, this is not true. There are currently three slaughter houses in the United States in two States. In five States, including California, a law banning horse slaughter has been in effect for 7 years. What has been the effect? There have been no effects. There have not been animals that are left derelict. There haven't been animals that are not buried. There have not been too few euthanasias.

Practically speaking, in all five States where this law is already the

law of the land, there has been no effect whatsoever.

Each year, about 90,000 horses are slaughtered. So there is no real impact in a country as large as the United States in the disposing of those 90,000 horses by means other than horse meat slaughtering.

Third and finally, our opponents have touted letters from cattlemen and chicken farmers and all sorts of livestock raisers who say they oppose the bill.

We have and we will gladly display to anyone who wants to see it a seven-page memorandum, single spaced, of supporters all over the country who know horses, who love horses; they are horse raisers, horse racers, horse lovers, you name it. Everybody has signed on to this saying it is time we do something like this.

□ 1230

Last year, when it appeared that the Horse Slaughter Prevention Act would never get its day on the House floor, Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. WHITFIELD and I offered an amendment to the House appropriations bill to ban Federal funding to facilitate horse slaughter for 1 year. That amendment drew 269 votes in support; 269 Members passed it by a substantial majority. I hope that today my colleagues will remember the vote they cast last year and will see fit to end the brutal practice of killing horses and will vote not only for the bill but against all amendments because they would only debilitate and defeat the bill.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and thank him for taking on this battle with others.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 503, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. I oppose the cruel and senseless slaughter of American horses for human consumption in the United States or for foreign markets. I just think we should not be allowing this.

Last year, more than 90,000 American horses were either slaughtered in one of three foreign-owned slaughterhouses in the U.S. or shipped to Canada or Mexico for slaughter.

Horses have never been raised for human consumption in America. This slaughter is done for export.

Legislation is necessary because the Department of Agriculture is blatantly circumventing clear congressional intent on horse slaughter in last year's fiscal year 2006 Agriculture Appropriations Act.

This legislation would prohibit the transportation, possession and sale of horses to be slaughtered for human consumption in the U.S. It does not remove the rights of owners to do what they want with their horses.

Under H.R. 503, owners can humanely euthanize sick, dangerous, or old horses. Horses can continue to be kept by their owners, can be sold to a new

home, or placed in one of the many horse sanctuaries located across the country.

The way a society treats its animals, particularly horses, speaks to the core values and priorities of its citizens. Horses are not just companions and recreational animals. They are a vital part of our Nation's culture and history.

I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation and oppose all amendments aimed to weaken it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), a real rancher, horse owner and outstanding member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

I have been a farmer and rancher all of my life, still live on the original family farmstead that my great great grandfather settled back in 1860. Horses have been a real part of the way we do business on the Salazar ranch. As a matter of fact, we still use horses to round up cattle and move them from pasture to pasture.

I know that H.R. 503 is a well-intended act, but if it becomes law, it will have very poor results.

The act will seriously, in my opinion, compromise horse welfare. Under this bill, care must be potentially provided for the additional 90,000 horses that are going to be out there annually.

It will eliminate a humane end-of-life option for horse owners and force them to send their horses out to already overcrowded rescue centers or sentence them to live out their final years in suffering.

Processing provides a cost-effective alternative to neglect and abandonment when horse owners are unable to find another buyer. It is not such a problem out in rural areas, but it is a major problem in urban areas.

In 2005 alone, it saved owners and rescue facilities an estimated \$220 million in total costs of caring for unwanted horses.

The Animal Welfare council estimated that cumulative annual maintenance costs of otherwise processed horses since the year 2000 would have exceeded more than \$513 million in 2005. It would cost \$1,900 per year to house each unwanted and abandoned horse, not including veterinary or farrier services. It will cost \$127 million in the first year to properly care for these animals if this legislation is enacted.

Who will pay for this cost? You will pay for the cost in the end. These facilities do not receive public money at the moment; but I can assure you that if these horses become a nuisance, you, the taxpayer, will end up paying for their care.

H.R. 503 does not specify who will bear the costs of the ban if this ban is

implemented. What will happen to the management tools the Bureau of Land Management has to manage the wild-life of wild horse bans out in the western United States? If this bill is enacted, none of these horses who are unwanted, and although BLM does try to auction them off or to give them to pet owners, what will happen to those horses? What will happen when I am out riding, rounding up my cattle and my horse falls into a prairie dog hole and breaks his leg? Will I then not be able to send him to some rendering facility? What will happen or what is the next step? Will people take away our right to be able to go out and hunt elk? Is that the next step?

I know that H.R. 503 is a well-intended act, but it will have very serious consequences on our agricultural community. I would urge my colleagues to oppose the ban of horse slaughter and to vote "no" on H.R. 503.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the words of my colleague and his sentiments, and I need to make a couple of points because there is a substantial skewing of the record here.

First of all, in 1989, 350-some-odd thousand horses were slaughtered. We have that number down to below 90,000. That is 1 percent of the horse population that is put down every year.

Secondly, the gentleman says that this will preclude an option for putting down his horse if his horse becomes lame. I would make two points. One is that 90-plus percent of the horses that are sent to slaughter facilities are rated by the USDA as being healthy and strong and fit animals.

So this is not about putting down animals, and if you have that problem, there still are humane procedures. You can go to a local vet and have your local vet for \$50 to \$250 oversee the process of putting your animal down.

Frankly, this bill does not stop an owner from putting a horse down themselves by any means.

This bill prohibits the public transportation of that. This bill prohibits the slaughter for human consumption at these three facilities.

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

Mr. SWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Chairman, I have been around horses all of my entire life. Do you consider the slaughtering of animals such as beef inhumane?

Mr. SWEENEY. This is not about that. This is about horses which are in a special place. This is about a practice that is profusely out of whack with the standards of America.

Reclaiming my time, I want to talk about the slaughter facilities themselves. These houses do not contribute to this economy. In his written testimony during the committee hearings on H.R. 503, Dick Koehler, vice president of Beltex Corp., a slaughter plant

in Fort Worth, Texas, described the horse slaughter industry as a tax-paying legitimate business. Yet witnesses at that same hearing revealed tax returns showing that Dallas Crown, Inc., based in Kaufman, Texas, made \$12 million in revenue 1 year and paid only \$5 in U.S. taxes.

The U.S. exports 18,000 tons of horse meat, netting \$65 million in 2005; and the profits went back to the countries of the owners of those plants. Two of them are from Belgium. One of them is from France.

There are costs to the local economies. It is a practice that is abhorrent and that is not supported.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 503; and like many of my colleagues, I have been around horses all my life. I am a former horse owner and my father had a farm. The humane vote is to vote "yes" on H.R. 503.

I thank my colleagues, Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. SPRATT and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for their really outstanding leadership and for clarifying the points that have been so made in this debate.

Over 90,000 horses were brutally slaughtered last year at three foreign-owned slaughterhouses in the United States, and their meat was then shipped to countries in Europe and Asia for human consumption. Americans do not eat horse meat. They love horses. They are cherished companions. They are sporting animals. They are not food.

If you look at the history of America, horses have played such an important part in our Nation's development, and I would say they are probably the most beloved animals native to the United States.

The American people strongly support banning horse slaughter. They recognize that it is a deplorable practice that needs to end.

Over 70 percent have expressed this opinion in opposition to slaughtering horses for human consumption. Again, no American would eat horse meat. This is to be shipped to a foreign country, and they are slaughtered in a gruesome manner, as my colleague pointed out on the floor.

While it is technically required that horses be unconscious prior to slaughter, the method used to render them unconscious is not effective due to a horse's instinctive flight response to stress. As a result, the horses are sometimes conscious while being slaughtered. This is unconscionable.

I call upon my colleagues for a humane vote and to vote "yes" on this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are going to hear in a little while that there is substantial support in the ag community and other places, and I will grant that there is substantial opposition to this bill, as well as substantial support, within 500 horse organizations.

But what I find most sad and in a way ironic is that an organization like the American Veterinary Medical Association opposes this legislation when employees of a slaughter plant blatantly do not follow the AVMA procedure for slaughtering a horse.

Again, an important notion to understand is that slaughter is not the same as humane euthanasia by a qualified veterinarian. Euthanasia, according to AVMA, is an act of inducing humane death that is respectful and is painless and as distress free as possible.

Yet we saw in that picture, that was transport, that was not even slaughter. That was a horse in transport. Horses suffer horribly on the way to and during slaughter, where they often endure repeated blows to the head and upper body before being hoisted up for slaughter, sometimes still conscious. That is not euthanasia.

Slaughter is markedly different than acceptable forms of euthanasia. The AVMA requires that a captive bolt method must be administered by trained, skilled and monitored personnel and that the horse must be adequately restrained. These requirements are typically not met in equine slaughter plants, thus raising significant welfare concerns.

Let me say something about the plants, too. One of the issues raised is that you are going to shut these plants down and people are going to lose their jobs. We are talking about something in the range of 150 employees. To my friends on my side of the aisle who talk all the time about how we have got to be tough on immigration, I suggest to you that a substantial number of those workers are not in this country under legal means. They are low-level laborers. It is the only people they could find to do this.

I would also inform my colleagues that all three of these facilities, all three of these facilities operate and slaughter for other means, other livestock, and that they could simply go to that business. This is a practice that is not adhered to or supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

□ 1245

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would point out that the two largest horse associations in the United States, the American Quarter Horse Association and the American Paint Horse Association, are opposed to this bill, and they represent the biggest number of horse owners in the country. So people need to understand that.

I wondered if Mr. SWEENEY would yield on the points he was making. I wanted to ask him a question.

You know, you keep talking about the way they are treated as they are hauled to slaughter. As I understand it, in this bill, there are no requirements put on so that, if you are hauling these animals to a rescue facility, there is no regulation or any kind of requirements put on anybody to haul them to those rescue facilities. So what have you accomplished?

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SWEENEY. Well, there are requirements for the transport under USDA. The problem is USDA does not enforce those requirements.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 more minute.

But, you know, nothing will change under this bill.

Mr. SWEENEY. I would suggest, Mr. PETERSON, that people who are rescuing horses have a different mindset and intent than those who are slaughtering for human consumption.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I am not sure that is the case, because you are going to have 90,000 horses, and you are going to have people rescuing them basically under duress because they are not going to know what to do with them.

In my part of the world, we already have people letting horses out, out in the country, just like dogs and cats, because we don't have a processing facility close enough to us. It is a huge problem.

Mr. SWEENEY. And 20 percent of the horse population, in reporting data out of California and everywhere else, suggests absolutely the opposite.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Well, they are hauling them to Texas because there is a processing facility.

The only point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that some of these issues they are claiming they are going to solve with this bill are not going to be solved. They are actually going to create more problems.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), the chairman of the Livestock Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 503. This is a bill that has tremendous shortcomings, will cause major negative disruptions throughout the horse industry and lacks any strategy of how to deal with the problems that it will undoubtedly create.

The bill is based on emotion. If you stop to think about what will happen to these 60,000 to 90,000 horses being diverted from processing each year, you will realize the bill does not provide a single answer to truly the problem.

I find it deeply troubling that the sponsors of H.R. 503 care more about what happens to the animal after it is

euthanized than what happens when it is alive. If these animals are no longer able to be processed at federally regulated plants, where will these horses go? Yes, these animals will be alive, but if it is a life of negative abuse, abandonment and starvation, what good have we served? We want to make sure all these animals are cared for humanely throughout their life.

Owning a horse is a privilege that should be taken seriously. Horses are high maintenance animals that require feed, water, veterinary care and safe-keeping. The care of horses is expensive. The Animal Welfare Council estimates it costs \$2,340 per year per horse. Public animal rescue facilities and horse sanctuaries across the country are currently saturated with unwanted horses and in desperate need of funds. Even the proponents of this bill have acknowledged this fact. How does adding thousands more horses help this already dismal situation?

H.R. 503 does not provide a single answer to ensure the proper care of these animals. Where will these animals go? How will we fund their care? How do we ensure they are not starved and abandoned? Why should we burden our local communities with problems created by this bill?

More than 200 reputable horse organizations, animal health organizations and agricultural organizations oppose this legislation, and they represent some of the most respected and knowledgeable people who own and care for horses in the United States. In my home State, the North Carolina Horse Council, Quarter Horse Association, the North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, the North Carolina Farm Bureau, the North Carolina Pork Council and the North Carolina Cattlemen's Association all oppose this legislation and the precedent it would set for other livestock.

If you look at the facts and not the emotional hype, I believe the choice here is really quite simple. My stand against H.R. 503 is a stand for the humane treatment of these animals. I urge my colleagues to do the right things for horses and horse owners. Vote "no" on H.R. 503.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I would like to yield 3 minutes to our distinguished whip, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman. This is about politics not policy. The policy, I am going to support. This is about politics. It is about the election of one Member in a very hotly contested race in New York.

I hope the American public are tuned in. With all the pressing critical issues that confront our Nation, what is the one issue in the one-fifteenth of the session that we have left that we are according our time to? The Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. This is an important issue that should be considered. I do not mean to make light of the legislation. But is this the issue that the American people expect their elected representatives to be considering at this moment?

On Monday, we commemorate the fifth anniversary of the worst terrorist attack in our Nation's history. 9/11 is a day of remembrance and resolve, and it is also a time to recognize that we are not as safe as we should be. Apparently, horses aren't either. But people aren't as safe as they should be.

Just today, a former Republican Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, wrote, and I quote, "Five years have passed since the horrific attack on our homeland, and still there is one serious undeniable fact we have yet to confront. We are today," said the former Speaker, Newt Gingrich, "not where we wanted to be and nowhere near where we need to be."

Yet one-fifteenth of the time we have left before the election is spent on horses. Osama bin Laden is still on the loose. This Congress has failed to enact the 9/11 Commission's recommendations. The nuclear threat from North Korea and Iran has increased. Afghanistan is backsliding, and Iraq simmers in a low-grade civil war, yet we are focused on this act.

Last week, I joined more than 20 of my Democratic colleagues in visiting New Orleans and the gulf coast, areas devastated by Hurricane Katrina 1 year ago. We observed incredible courage and optimism on the part of the citizens there, but we all saw an area that is still a shell of its former self.

In New Orleans, nearly 60 percent of homes and businesses do not have electricity. Much of New Orleans lacks a dependable supply of potable water, and only \$44 billion of the \$110 billion appropriated for rebuilding assistance to victims has been spent. Yet what are we doing today? Focusing on horses.

This bill was defeated 37-3 in committee. The Patient's Bill of Rights, cosponsored by Mr. DINGELL, was supported by the majority of this House and the majority of the Senate, and it died in conference, for political reasons. This bill here is for political reasons.

While this body considers this legislation today, the Republican leadership refuses to allow an up-or-down vote on providing a long overdue increase for the minimum wage.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, the chairman of the committee, soon to be, maybe. Who knows. Mr. GOODLATTE, I apologize for that.

The Republican leadership refuses to allow an up-or-down vote on the minimum wage. And that is not about horses; it is about 6.6 million Americans working every day and living in poverty. I have concern about these horses, but I have much, much more concern about 6.6 million Americans who are living in poverty while working 40-hour weeks.

We have still not passed legislation that moves our Nation towards energy independence, yet we focus on horses.

Reforms are broken in the immigration system, yet we focus on horses.

We have not addressed the fact that 46 million Americans do not have health insurance, yet we focus on horses.

We need fixes to the Republicans' flawed prescription drug program and reforms to our convoluted tax system, yet we focus on horses. I am concerned about horses, but I am much, much more concerned about the American people. That is what we ought to be focused on. That's where we ought to be paying attention.

That is why I call this the "do less than 'do-nothing Congress of 1948.'"

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

Mr. Chairman, I would say on behalf of this Congress that we did pass an energy bill. We did pass a prescription drug bill. We did pass a bill to expedite refinery building in this country. We did pass an outer continental shelf exploration bill. And we would have had this bill on the floor 2, 3, 4 years ago if the Ag Committee had been willing to cooperate with us.

But to talk about this business of horse slaughter, I think the American people have every right to know what this business is really all about. It is a secretive, illicit and grossly inhumane business. Now, you listen to the members of the Ag Committee and the Department of Agriculture, and they talk about the transportation of these animals as regulated and that there is no ill will coming to these animals.

I have a picture here of a horse that was transported from Mississippi to Texas to Beltex on August 10, 2006. Now, if you look, I will show you that picture, and then I want to show you this picture. Now, the reason this happened is because a killer buyer by the name of Robbie Solomon from Belmont, Mississippi, put 17 stallions in one trailer.

Now, Mr. SALAZAR was here talking about his knowledge of horses, and I am sure he is quite knowledgeable, but anyone knows that you do not put stallions together. And the only way they were able to keep them from fighting was to beat these animals. This is going on all across the country because the USDA is not enforcing the transportation regulations.

And so when we talk about slaughter, we are not talking about the actual slaughter of the horse per se; we are talking about the horse theft involved. We are talking about the killer buyers getting animals any way they can get them. We are talking about them putting them in trailers like this and transporting horses.

I find it so interesting that the American Association of Equine Practitioners, the leadership, and the leadership of the American Quarter Horse Association talk about their concern for these horses. They are looking out for their welfare, yet they see nothing wrong with the method of transport, the double-deck trailers being used,

where horses full grown cannot even stand up straight on the upper deck.

Just think, stallions put together. You never do that. And that is precisely what Mr. Robbie Solomon of Belmont, Mississippi, did. So I did want to point out exactly what is going on in this transportation of these animals to slaughter, and this is not something that is uncommon.

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

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman. In Nebraska, we have a great many horses that are used for roping, cutting horses, riding horses and quarter horses. Not many racehorses. These horses are primarily for a function, and when a horse can no longer fulfill that function, something has to happen to the horse. Now, you can retire the horse and pay \$2,000, \$3,000 a year to house it, to feed it and to take care of it, but some people that own 15, 20, 30, 40, 50 horses simply cannot afford to do that.

So I have been hearing from a great many horse owners, and these are people who care about horses, who love horses and who are concerned about horses, who have working ranches, and they say this is a bill that they cannot live with because of the cost. So I think we have to look at that.

I certainly don't tolerate and don't condone any shipment that is, as has been mentioned, injurious. We don't want to see that. But we have to have some way, because this will decrease the value of the average horse about \$300 simply because of the burial fees and the extra costs of taking care of horses.

So this is not a solution to the problem. The people in my area oppose it, and I would strongly urge we defeat the bill.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the Dean of the House, the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, my good friend, JOHN DINGELL.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I love the people who are pushing this bill, but it is a bad bill. It is triumph of emotion over common sense. We have before us a solution, a poor one, to a nonexistent problem.

We have many things that need to be addressed in this Congress, but here we are putting on the floor a piece of legislation poorly thought out, without having had proper hearings or proceedings, over the opposition of a committee, when we have many other things that need doing; health care for Americans, minimum wage, a budget deficit of terrifying proportions, and the appropriations bills and the budget

have not yet been completed. While the Nation is at war, working families struggle to make ends meet, and government runs record deficits the leadership has put this curious piece of legislation on the floor.

The bill would eliminate humane slaughter of horses. If there is a complaint about how the horses are being slaughtered or transported, there is a way for this body to address that, and I am sure in good will this body would in the exercise of its oversight powers do exactly that.

The bill does not count for the high cost of caring for these unwanted animals, nor does it consider the impact that this legislation is going to have on the environment.

□ 1300

You know, we have a curious situation where we are going to have to wind up cremating every horse that dies in the country, or we are going to have to incinerate them. I have no idea how we are going to dispose of a huge number of 1,500 to 2,000 pounds of horse each time one of these events happens.

Now, basic care costs \$1,800. There is no requirement here that a person sell or slaughter his horse. The owner of the horse can do what he wants with it. That makes eminent good sense to me.

But I don't think anyone has thought out the consequences of this legislation, what is going to happen with regard to the massive number of horses that are going to have to be incinerated or cremated and the consequences of that with regard to the environment.

This is a bad piece of legislation. It should be rejected.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Madam Chairman, I thank my colleague from Illinois for allowing me the 3 minutes on this particular issue.

I think much has been said, but I think if we look at it as legislators, our profession, our duties and our service to our constituents, what is it that we do? We pass laws that reflect the standards, the norms and the mores of American society.

It is already acknowledged, and I think even the opponents of this piece of legislation that I support here today would acknowledge we have already established a norm and a standard, and that is in this country we will not destroy a horse for human consumption. That is a done deal, that is recognized, and it is based on the historical significance of the horse in our society, which is very unique.

Now, this is the question that I pose: How can you prohibit the human consumption of a product, that is the law, that is the norm, that is the standard, that is the American value, without prohibiting the production of the product? And that is what this piece of legislation accomplishes. It is not a difficult legislative equation.

And there will be consequences, but consequences that can be dealt with responsibly by the horse owner. And I truly believe that. I am from the State of Texas, and we have a few horses in Texas. My brother owns horses. Now, does he agree with me on this particular piece of legislation, because it may prove to be inconvenient and pose some economic cost to him? I am not really sure. But this is in keeping with what we have already established, and that is how we treat horses in our society.

Now, we have individuals that will say this is about property rights. Members of Congress, please. We pass laws every day that regulate the manner that we conduct ourselves with pieces of property, personal and real. We have zoning laws. We have ordinances. And this is just another aspect of that, in keeping, though, with what has already been established as societal norms, and that is what we do here today.

People will simply say, but it is not about consumption of horse meat in the United States, that we are just simply going to cater to the culinary needs of the French. That is not the point. The point is that you still have everything that entails the entire process of how you prepare, how you slaughter the horse for human consumption. Whether it is domestic or internationally, it is not in keeping with the established norms and values as reflected in our laws, State and Federal, when it comes to the treatment of horses.

The bottom line is we have to sometimes tweak existing laws to make sure that they reflect those mores and that value, and that is what we are doing here today.

We cannot condone the slaughter of horses for human consumption.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chairman, I would like to address one issue that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan raised, and we all have great admiration and respect for the gentleman from Michigan. He raised the question about how are we going to take care of all these horses that are not slaughtered when they die and the impact of those animals on the environment.

I would remind the body that there are 133 million cows in America today. Every year many of them die out in the fields. Some of them are picked up by renderers and processed, but many of them are drug to the back 40 where they are decomposed, eaten by scavengers and whatever. The same thing would happen to horses that die out in the fields.

In my State of Kentucky, only about 40 percent of the animals that die in the fields are picked up by renderers. This bill would not affect what happens to natural death to animals in the field in any way whatsoever.

I would remind the body that only 1 percent of the entire horse population in America, which is about 9 million, is

being slaughtered. Less than that. I also would like to reiterate, once again, we have heard so much about unwanted horses. I would say to you, many of these horses being slaughtered are not unwanted, there is not anything wrong with them. Many of them are stolen and obtained by misrepresentation. So to leave the impression that every horse slaughtered is old, decrepit, unwanted, is certainly not what the facts show.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to say that that is 1 percent of the horses per year, 90,000 or 1 percent of the 9 million per year. The average life expectancy of a horse is over 25 years. So about 25 percent of the horses go through this process in this country, and we will have a huge problem if we don't resolve that, if we pass this bill.

Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding and for leading this cause.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 503. H.R. 503, the Horse Protection Act, would ban the processing of horses for human consumption. There is no evidence that suggests that products derived from horses pose any food safety or public health risk. Because processing facilities process meat intended for interstate shipment, they must be inspected by USDA for compliance with the Horse Slaughter Act, the Federal Meat Inspection Act, and other Federal animal health and food safety regulations.

The people who want this bill passed claim that horses are not raised for meat. However, there are at least three breeds that are raised for meat: the Yili, the Altai and the Bashkir, among others, that are raised for dual purposes.

Every year, 80,000 to 100,000 of these horses are abandoned in the U.S., and this number is expected to double in just a few years. But there are no provisions to address disposal or care of the unwanted 100,000 horses.

When horses are euthanized on private lands, it is normally done with a heavy dose of barbiturates. Once that horse succumbs to the barbiturates, the carcass becomes an environmental concern. And if the horse is disposed of on private land, we have to be concerned about the issues that lead to contamination, human exposure to zoonotic disease and related problems.

The individuals who support H.R. 503 and argue unwanted horses can be moved to adoption facilities or resold are selling us short on the resources. The total take capacity for all these facilities is 6,000 head; 6,000 head. These facilities are already at overcapacity. Where would the additional 100,000 horses go? I would add that is a cumulative total of perhaps a 10-year rolling total of 100,000 a year. It may be 1 million horses. But these horses are eating our cellulose and costing us ethanol.

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

Madam Chairman, I want to address this unwanted horse issue again. Everyone keeps talking about slaughter as the answer to unwanted horses. Has anyone ever thought about the responsibility of the breeders that are breeding these horses?

The one horse industry association that most advocates horse slaughter is the American Quarter Horse Association. That is because they are the most prolific breeders in the country. They are registering 144,000 foals a year, compared to 32,000 thoroughbreds, 12,000 standardbreds.

Has anyone ever asked the question, what is the responsibility of the breeder? And for them to have the audacity to come to the Congress and say you have to pay us if you pass this bill to take care of all these horses that we are breeding every year.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Chairman, I just wanted to say, unless I don't know something here, I don't believe it is illegal to consume horse meat in the United States. If you want to shoot your horse and butcher it and eat it, you can do it. So people need to understand that, number one.

Number two, I am in receipt of a letter here from Ron DeHaven, who is the administrator of APHIS, and I would just like to make folks aware of this, that contrary to what has been said, they have enforcement going on in terms of the transport of horses.

There are 187 cases that have been opened since 2002. They have issued 69 warnings. Eighty-one cases remain open. Three of those are being investigated. Seventy-eight are on final review. Twenty-one cases included stipulations. There have been fines anywhere from several hundred dollars to \$60,000 for violation of humane transport requirements. One case is currently being adjudicated by an administrative law judge requesting that the violator submit \$85,000 in penalties.

APHIS says that they take very seriously their responsibility to ensure safe and humane transport of horses to slaughter. So they have been trying to enforce this law; and if there is problems going on, you ought to get a hold of APHIS and do what they should do.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just to respond to the gentleman from Kentucky, who asks a very good question about the responsibility of horse owners and horse breeders, I guess my question to the gentleman is, why doesn't his bill contain any provisions to prevent the creation of unwanted horses? That is one of the principal objections that these respected

national organizations have to this legislation, is that he does not address that in his bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. WALTER JONES.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Madam Chairman, I decided I wanted to come to the floor today and not share my thoughts on this issue, but the thoughts of an American citizen. This lady lives in Carlinville, Illinois. She wrote me a letter on Saturday, and I was so impressed with the letter that I called this lady yesterday, Mrs. Betty Scheldt. I asked permission that I might read two paragraphs from her letter that I think speaks to this issue.

First: "Horses are an integral part of the American culture and I am extremely distressed over the fact that our horses, icons of our culture, are being slaughtered in foreign-owned slaughterhouses to please the palates of wealthy gourmets in Belgium and France. Horse slaughter and human consumption of horse meat is not and never will be acceptable in American culture. Americans overwhelmingly agree that horse slaughter should be banned. Several national voter surveys reveal that 77 percent to 90 percent of Americans feel that horses in the United States are not bred, raised or produced as food stock, and as such should be afforded the same protection from commercial slaughter as are all other non-food producing animals.

The last paragraph: "Horses are our companions and partners. They carry our children in competition at the county 4-H fair, make our country proud in the Olympic games, win Kentucky Derbys and Triple Crowns, carried our soldiers into battle and helped our forefathers to settle this country. They deserve better than ending up served on the plates of fancy restaurants from Belgium and Paris."

Madam Chairman, I join my colleagues today who support H.R. 503, and I hope and pray that this Congress will pass this legislation because horses are part of the history of this Nation and the West would never have been settled if it had not been for the horses working with the American citizens to build America.

SEPTEMBER 1, 2006.

Subject: Please vote for H.R. 503 as originally introduced.

Hon. WALTER JONES, Jr.  
U.S. Representative,  
Greenville, NC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JONES: I am writing to urge you to vote for H.R. 503, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act, as originally introduced by Representatives John Sweeney (R-NY), John Spratt (D-SC) and Ed Whitfield (R-KY). This bill would prohibit permanently the slaughter of horses for human consumption overseas, as well as the exportation of horseflesh and live horses intended for slaughter, making sure that no American horse is slaughtered abroad.

Over the past 20 years, due to ever increasing public awareness of the trade of horses

for human consumption, the vast majority of plants that slaughter horses are no longer in operation. However, 3 foreign owned and operated horse slaughter plants still operate in our country today despite overwhelming objection by the majority of Americans. The meat produced in these plants is sent to certain European and Asian countries where it is considered a delicacy.

Horses are an integral part of the American culture and I am extremely distressed over the fact that our horses, icons of our culture, are being slaughtered in foreign-owned slaughterhouses to please the palates of wealthy gourmets in Belgium and France. Horse slaughter and human consumption of horse meat is not, and never will be, acceptable in American culture. Americans overwhelmingly agree that horse slaughter should be banned. Several national voter surveys reveal that 77%-94% of Americans feel that horses in the United States are not bred, raised or produced as food-stock, and as such should be afforded the same protection from commercial slaughter as are all other non-food producing animals.

The slaughter process is inhumane: Horses endure repeated blows to the head with stunning equipment that does not render the animals unconscious and many horses are still conscious during the remaining stages of the process. The transportation of these horses to the slaughter plants is also cruel and inhumane since they are hauled several thousand miles without water, food or rest in double-deck trailers, forcing them to travel in a bent position which can result in prolonged suffering and death.

Arguments from the AVMA and AAEP defending the "humanity" of horse slaughter are simply ludicrous. To suggest that a process in which horses endure repeated blows and are often slaughtered while conscious is somehow humane is not only absurd but also shows a total disregard towards the welfare of the animals these two organizations claim to protect.

I strongly disagree with the claims of the horse slaughter industry that it provides a way to dispose of old and ailing horses. This is simply not true: According to official data from the Department of Agriculture, 92.3% of the horses slaughtered are in good or excellent condition. Pictures of the slaughterhouses' pens showing healthy, young horses further corroborate this data.

It is also false that the horse slaughter industry is rooted on a presumed "unwanted horse" problem as the horse slaughter industry maintains, simply because these plants are importing thousands of Canadian horses each year in order to cover the increasing foreign demand of horse meat. If there are so many unwanted horses in the U.S. as they claim why do they have to import them from Canada? The truth is that the "unwanted horse" theory is a bald-faced lie.

Horse slaughter promotes theft and abuse. After California banned it in 1998 horse theft dropped by 34% while there were no reported increase on abuse as the foreign-owned industry maintains. In addition, there was no documented rise in Illinois following closure of the state's only horse slaughter plant in 2002.

Horses are our companions and partners, they carry our children in competition at the county 4-H fair, make our country proud in the Olympic games, win Kentucky Derbies and Triple Crowns, carried our soldiers into battle and helped our forefathers to settle this country. They deserve better than ending up served on the plates of fancy restaurants from Brussels and Paris.

Again, I urge you to vote for H.R. 503 as originally introduced by Reps. Sweeney, Spratt and Whitfield. I also please request a response from you stating your position on

this issue. Thank you for your time and consideration of this letter.

Sincerely,

BETTY SCHELDT,  
Carlinville, IL 62626.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

□ 1315

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for yielding me the time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. The House has gone on the record three times now in strong opposition to horse slaughter.

I hope my colleagues will maintain that record, maintain their consistency and give overwhelming support of this bill. It is a sad state of affairs when we have to fight to prevent the slaughter of more than 90,000 American horses a year.

Horses are an integral part of the tapestry of this country, an American icon. The horse is a symbol, a promise of possibility. Most of all, the horse is a companion, as we just heard in the letter of Mr. JONES's constituent in North Carolina. The horse is tied to the spirit of the American frontier, the homesteaders in covered horse-drawn wagons, a cowboy and the wild mustangs. All symbols of America.

The horse is a promise of possibility. How often Americans have sat in anticipation, watching the pageantry of thoroughbreds racing for the roses in the annual Kentucky Derby, while fully hoping for the triumph of some deserving underdog, perchance to see a rare Triple Crown winner, a truly American story.

But most importantly, the horse is a companion for many Americans in a treasured childhood memory. Little boys and girls for generations have ridden a carousel pony dreaming that some day they will have a real horse to ride, a companion.

Horses are a part of our identity and our heritage, and in America they are not for human consumption. But, unfortunately, that is the fate of many of these animals.

Today, three foreign-owned slaughter houses operate in the U.S., serving an overseas market in horse meat. Thousands more horses are shipped annually out of the U.S., destined for other foreign slaughter houses. Horse slaughter is an export-driven market. Americans do not want it, and we should not be facilitating it.

The horse slaughter industry and its allies are going to extreme lengths to prevent this ghastly, but lucrative, practice.

I hope that the House will once again pass this much-needed legislation and not see the Department of Agriculture circumvent the intent of Congress.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), a member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I want to thank Mr. PETERSON for allowing me to speak today.

To set the record straight, I love horses. I own a horse. In fact, my horse, Skychief Poco, and I won the 1997 SandHills Rodeo and quarter horse show team penning championship. I have got the wherewithal to let him live out his days in the pasture behind my house. But if you notice, I have used the possessive pronoun "my" each time I describe my horse.

At its core, this isn't about people who love horses. This isn't about the American icon. This isn't about the kid who rides a carousel and wants to own a pony. This is about personal property rights. I have personal property that is a horse. He is not a pet necessarily. He is never going to be eaten, but that is not the issue here.

The title of the bill on the other side makes constant reference to the Slaughter Prevention Act or Slaughter Protection Act. Nothing in the bill has anything to do with the actual slaughter of the horses, the euthanasia of the horse, not the methods. Because if we are talking about methods that need to do it better, let's do that.

But this is an attack on the personal property rights of all horse owners out there in America. At its core, this is also about what happens to the carcass of a dead horse, whether it is an affront to the icon of America to process that horse carcass into food or whether to chop that horse up and put it in a landfill, or chop that horse up and bury it in your back yard. However you treat the carcass of that horse, that is really what this is about.

This strips out the personal value, the personal property value of every horse owner that chooses to dispose of their horses in various ways and that we all should take great interest in how that is done. That is not what this bill does. This strips simply strips out my right, my personal property rights, to own that horse and dispose of him at the point when I want to.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. It is an attack on personal property rights without due process and is unfortunate.

One other piece of this bill is that, which is added toward the end of it, is that if you have a horse that is sore, and you are at a competition or at an event, the Secretary of Agriculture is allowed to come take that horse from you. So I would urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. It is ill conceived and should not pass.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chairman, I have been around and worked

with horses all my life. I think I have as much appreciation and admiration for these creatures as anyone in this body; but I am very much opposed to this bill, first, because, contrary to, I am sure, the intentions of this authors, this bill will result in more abuse, more neglect and more inhumane treatment of horses.

I would just say that those who are so certain that horses are better off to die peacefully out in the field have never come across an old horse out in a field or a pasture who cannot get up and stand on its legs and continues to beat its head against the ground in an effort to get leverage to stand back up. Such people have never come across an older horse down in the pasture or field and begins to be eaten by predators and can do nothing about it because he can't get back on his feet.

The idea that it is more humane to let all horses die peacefully in a field, rather than dealt with in a regulated, inspected manner, is just wrong. So the bottom line is, this bill results in more neglect and more abuse, more mistreatment of horses, as owners cannot afford to take care of them, or they are left to, quote, die peacefully in a field.

Secondly, it is a tremendous blow to private property rights. If anyone thinks there is any reason for the Congress to stop with a regulation of how we govern horses and not go right ahead and say what owners ought to do to their pigs and their cattle or their dogs and their cats or their fish in the aquarium, then you haven't realized the consequences of this bill. It is a bad idea. It should be rejected.

Madam Chairman, I have been around and worked with horses all of my life, and I think that I have as much appreciation and respect for these magnificent creations of God as anyone in this body. And I am strongly opposed to this bill.

The motives behind this proposal are, I am sure, honorable. But the consequences of it in the real world will be so detrimental to what the authors say they hope to achieve, that I wonder if some are intentionally turning a blind eye to them.

If old horses cannot be dealt with humanely, many of them will be left to suffer. Those who are so certain that all horses are better off being allowed to die of old age have never seen a horse that has been unable to get up and continues to beat its head against the ground for leverage to try to stand. How is that better for the animal?

If older horses cannot be sold here, they will be sold in Mexico, without our standards and inspections. How is that better for the animal?

The bottom line is that more horses will starve, more horses will be abused or neglected, more horses will suffer unnecessarily if this bill were to become law.

In addition, the precedent this bill would set would be deeply disturbing to the basic American principle of private property rights. If the Federal Government can dictate what individuals may and may not do with personal property—to whom it may or may not be sold—the fundamental right to own property will suffer a terrible blow.

Of course, there is no reason for the Federal legislation to stop with horses. Federal

law could regulate treatment of cattle and pigs, dogs and cats, or fish in the aquarium.

Criminal abuse of animals is a crime prosecuted by State and local authorities. A Federal law restricting the ability to sell private property based on some people's misguided idea of how that property should be treated is a dangerous thing, and this bill should be rejected.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WHITFIELD. A parliamentary inquiry. Could you explain the remaining time that is available.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. CAPITO). Yes. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Illinois has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the majority leader's designee, Mr. GOODLATTE, for the closing speech.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the Chairman of the Energy and Commerce subcommittee that dealt with this issue, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my distinguished colleague. As the gentleman from Virginia pointed out, we had a hearing on July 25, 2006, on this same issue. My colleagues, I think it was a balanced hearing. I think Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. SWEENEY were both there. Mr. SWEENEY testified, also Chairman GOODLATTE testified. I think it brought out the pros and cons of this.

Whatever is proposed, however, must have a full understanding of the ultimate effects on the American horse population and their caregivers, because arguments presented on both sides seem to paint a pretty bleak, bleak picture for a large number of horses. But I am concerned that H.R. 503 does not solve the problem of unwanted horses.

Unfortunately, it provides no solution to the unfortunate reality of the life of these horses. Horses are a beloved part of our American heritage and deserve more humane approaches at the end of their lives. I think we all agree.

But this bill, H.R. 503, does not solve the problem. In fact, as many point out, it is a property rights issue; and we should be concerned ultimately where these horses will finally graze and who will pay for it.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

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

Mr. FARR. Madam Chairman and Members, I rise in support of this bill. I have been listening to this debate all

day. I don't think most people have read it. The bill deals with the slaughter for humane consumption. Now, I represent California, the most populous State in the Union, which has the most horses.

Guess what, this has been the law in California for many years, and all of these naysayers and predictors of bad happening just doesn't happen in California. Change this debate; change this debate.

What if we were up here talking about slaughtering cats and dogs for profit for human consumption? You wouldn't have people up here saying, well, the cats and dogs population will ruin everything; it will stop the world. We take care. The slaughterers don't buy sick horses, injured horses. They buy fresh horses, and they buy them for human consumption. This bill says you can't do that.

Now this is the day and age in America when we ought to be not allowing people to for profit buy horses merely to slaughter them for human consumption. That is wrong. This bill is right.

I urge a rejection of the amendment and a passage of the bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the bill as well, H.R. 503, the Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. As a cosponsor of this bill, I believe this legislation is necessary to prevent the inhumane disposal of beautiful animals.

Horses hold a special place in this country. They were vital during our settlement, allowing us to travel great distances quickly and providing the necessary strength for farming. Today, we are able to appreciate their grace and speed in a variety of different venues from racing to recreational horses. They are all part of America.

The fact, though, is important to underscore. We don't allow horse meat to be eaten in this country. To allow the shipment of meat overseas is a bit hypocritical. While some may have expressed concern about the cost of disposing of sick horses, the fact is, according to the USDA, 90 percent of horses arriving in slaughter are in good condition.

There are many alternatives other than horse slaughtering, and among those options are horse welfare associations and equine sanctuaries. The bill responds to a strong American concern about the treatment of horses, in addition to prohibiting the trade and transfer of live horses intended for human consumption.

H.R. 503 lessens the USDA's workload by reducing the number of animals requiring inspection.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As has been said very ably by the Dean of the House, Mr. DINGELL, this is

a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. There have been a lot of assertions made out here that I think are a little bit suspect.

But one of the things that I want to point out, the previous speaker, Mr. FARR, my good friend from California, claims that they have done this, and there are no problems, well, there was a peer-reviewed article in the Journal of Agribusiness which highlights the lack of enforcement in California of their law, anecdotal evidence of increased horse abandonment, malnutrition, greater numbers of thin and crippled horses at auction in California. So this is a peer-reviewed article that refutes that assertion that was made by Mr. FARR.

This is a bill that on the merits is a bad bill. It was defeated in the Agriculture Committee by a vote of 37-3 because those of us on the Agriculture Committee represent rural America, represent the areas that have horses and use horses every day. The American Quarter Horse Association, the American Paint Horse Association, the biggest horse associations in the country oppose this bill.

There are a lot of good reasons; but the main reason, in my opinion, is that this is just absolutely the wrong way to do business in the House of Representatives. As has been pointed out by Mr. HOYER and by others, we have many more priorities that we ought to be working on in this Congress other than this bill. That is, you know, obvious.

But, you know, it really offends me to take the work of the committee, and this can be any issue, and overturn it and put a bill on the floor that is completely opposed to what the committee decided. I think it is absolutely the wrong way to run this institution and probably is the best reason for us not to pass this legislation.

I just have to say one other thing. I just was up in Hallock, Minnesota, the other day, and one of the main things that we ought to be doing in this Congress, that we haven't done, that we have been trying to do since last December, is get disaster legislation passed to help those people that got wiped out in 2005 and to help the people that have been wiped out here in 2006. That would be a much better use of the Agriculture Committee's time on the floor of the House of Representatives than dealing with this bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and send this bill where it belongs, that is, back to the committee.

□ 1330

Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the chairman of the committee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to point out there is a book called, "Alternatives to Auction and Slaughter: A Guide for Equine Owners (A Better Way)," that lists all kinds of

places that welcome animals that are at the end of their lives and are unwanted.

Quite frankly, I find really disingenuous those on the other side who oppose this legislation who say those of us who support ending horse slaughter are actually going to be hurting horses more, that we somehow don't get it. I think that is very disrespectful to the well over 500 organizations that support this bill, including the American Horse Defense Fund, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Animal Protection Institute, the Humane Society of the United States. Clearly, I could go on and on. These are organizations that are in business for the sole purpose of making sure that animals are treated humanely. They are not mistaken in supporting this legislation.

Those of us who truly care about the welfare of horses should support this legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I would say this: The State of Texas tried to close these slaughter houses down for many years. Officials there did. A lawsuit was filed by the slaughter houses. Remember, they are foreign-owned, Belgian, Dutch and French. In that lawsuit, the slaughter houses owned by the foreign companies won that lawsuit because the Federal judge said that this is an interstate commerce issue; and there is Federal preemption involved; and if you are going to shut down slaughter houses in operation in interstate commerce, then the U.S. Congress has to act.

Now this bill came before the Energy and Commerce Committee because of the lack of action on the Ag Committee for many years. They never wanted it to see the light of day.

I would urge Members to vote for H.R. 503. As I have said before, the unwanted horse argument is not a real argument because horses being slaughtered are not unwanted. To think that we would have the responsibility of reimbursing owners who are overbreeding, who have the responsibility to take care of their own horses, they make it appear that the government has that responsibility. Owners have their own responsibility.

Private property rights, this bill protects private property rights. Because of the number of horses being stolen, we are protecting those private property rights.

This bill allows an owner, a rancher or farmer who owns a horse to do whatever he wants to with the horse. He can shoot it or slaughter it and eat it himself. We simply are shutting down an illicit, secretive business, and that is what this bill is all about.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

There is no doubt in anyone's mind that this is an emotionally charged issue. But passion when left unchecked can have negative consequences. That

is exactly the situation we find ourselves in today.

I have asked my colleagues to consider the consequences of this legislation, as did I and the 36 bipartisan members of the House Committee on Agriculture. And the gentleman wonders why they have never dealt with it; the committee voted 37-3 to report this bill unfavorably with the recommendation that it not pass the House. And I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his leadership on his side of the aisle and for yielding me some of his time.

Also, more than 200 reputable national and State organizations, including the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Association of Equine Practitioners, the horse doctors who polled their members, 80 percent were opposed to this legislation. Also opposed are the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Quarter Horse Association, the National Association of Counties, and every State horse council in the country that has taken a stand on this issue, including New York, Florida, Texas, Ohio, Illinois, Virginia, North Carolina, have all opposed this legislation.

The consequences of this legislation are far-reaching and stand to jeopardize the welfare of America's horse population and will potentially place a significant financial burden on horse owners across the Nation.

Instead of solving problems, H.R. 503 creates problems. It provides no directive as to what will happen to the 90,000 unwanted horses annually processed in slaughter facilities, and it increases the probability of unwanted horses becoming victims of neglect, starvation and abandonment. That is not just my opinion; that is the opinion of the American Veterinary Medical Association and the American Association of Equine Practitioners.

H.R. 503 provides no funding for alternatives and no instructions for the regulation of rescue or shelter facilities to ensure the welfare of these unwanted and unusable horses. The influx of unwanted horses would flood the already inadequate, overburdened, unregulated rescue-and-adoption facilities. There are roughly 6,000 slots in America's horse shelters and rescue facilities, 6,000. The majority of these shelters are operated by individuals who are able to take one, maybe two, horses at a time. These shelters and rescue facilities cannot possibly accommodate many, many times, 20, 30 times that number of horses that would be created by this bill.

It limits horse owners' availability of choice of how to dispose of their animals and infringes on owners' private property rights.

Horse owners have a variety of options when seeking to get rid of an unusable or unwanted horse, including rescue or retirement facilities, private sale, donation, euthanasia and processing facilities. Depending on the indi-

vidual needs of the owner and the horse, some options may be more feasible than others. By eliminating this option, we are dictating what horse owners can and cannot do with their own private property. We must respect the right of responsible owners to choose the option best suited for their unique circumstances.

It mandates costs on private citizens. If the bill were enacted as written and the processing of horses for human consumption was no longer a legal option for owners to dispose of unwanted horses, estimates place the additional number of unwanted horses at 272,000 within the first 6 years.

Today we take care of 20,000 wild horses in corrals out west that cost us \$50 million a year. Imagine having 10, 15, 20 times as many horses to take care of who are in that same situation. The cost to private horse owners of maintaining these horses has been conservatively estimated to be between \$3 and \$4 billion. By eliminating the option of horse processing facilities, thereby limiting the option of owners to dispose of their property, Congress would be forcing a \$3 to \$4 billion burden on private citizens and maybe perhaps to State and local governments, one of the reasons why the National Association of Counties is concerned about protecting private property rights.

The bottom line, H.R. 503 does not solve problems; it creates problems. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. CUBIN. Madam Chairman, I would like to make this very clear: if you believe in the humane treatment of animals, this bill takes us a step backwards. If you believe in preserving a balanced and natural ecosystem, this bill moves us in the wrong direction. If you believe in personal property rights, this bill represents an outright assault on that uniquely American ideal.

There are many who will come before the House today and will say that Americans are thoughtlessly slaughtering young, strong horses—symbols of the American West—and that there can be no good reason for this slaughter. I am here today to tell you that this is not the case.

In my home State of Wyoming, we proudly display a bucking bronco as a symbol of our Western heritage. In fact, one of the first memories of my life is sitting on the back of a horse. I love horses as much as anyone here, and just like the proponents of this bill, I do not want to see these animals suffer. But I rise today to say that if enacted, this legislation would create more suffering for both horse and human.

By opposing this bill, we are not striking out at symbols of the American West. In fact, we are making a responsible herd management decision that protects horses, humans, and the ecosystem. Many of these horses are old, ill, starving due to overpopulation, or they have otherwise ceased in their proper function.

But you don't need to take my word for it. As many have already stated, over 200 reputable horse organizations, animal health organizations, and agricultural organizations have voiced their strong opposition to this bill.

Most importantly, I have heard loud and clearly from folks who know and love horses more than anyone in this chamber—Wyoming's ranchers. These hard working ranching families breed their own horses, they help deliver them at birth, they train them, they feed and raise them, and they care for them when they are sick. Every day of their lives they are interacting with the horses that they love. Wyoming's ranchers depend on horses for their livelihood. They know all there is to know about caring for a horse, because in the harsh seasons on the high plains and in the Rocky Mountains, they have to know in order to survive.

These folks know their animals like they know themselves. And yet, today, we are considering a bill that will tie their hands, preventing them from making a humane choice for their horses. Today we are considering a bill that will sentence innumerable horses to a life of starvation and suffering. Today, we are considering passing a bill that will have untold disastrous effects on the ecosystem.

I sincerely admire the motivation of those in favor of this bill today. If only their love for these regal creatures was enough to care for the needs of the 90,000 unwanted horses this bill will create each year, then there would be no need for this debate. If only their zeal to defend these animals could somehow control the overpopulated wild horse herds roaming the plains of Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Utah and Colorado, then we would have no need for humane population control. But the honest truth, Madam Chairman, is that this bill offers no solutions. We cannot absorb 90,000 horses a year. If we pass this bill, we will be putting rhetoric above the realities of ranch life; and we will be elevating a mistaken idea about Western symbols above the livelihood of Wyoming's ranchers. I cannot support such a measure.

I urge my colleagues to put their emotions aside, look past the surface, and into the real policy problems this bill will create. Vote "no" on H.R. 503.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I strongly oppose the slaughter of horses for human consumption.

For this reason I am a cosponsor of H.R. 503. This bill prohibits the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption.

An overwhelming majority of my constituents from the Dallas, Texas, area are opposed to horse slaughter, and my vote reflects their will.

My office phone has been ringing off the hook with constituents opposed to horse slaughter. I have received more than 500 letters in the past few days. All are opposed to horse slaughter.

Horses are a symbol of American freedoms. They are a part of our history, our culture, and they deserve better.

Three slaughterhouses remain in the United States, and unfortunately two of them are in Texas. These meat factories kill about 100,000 American horses per year, sending the meat to countries overseas for fine dining.

Madam Chairman, I vigorously oppose this gruesome practice. And I don't agree with the argument that shutting down these slaughterhouses will hurt the local economies or be inhumane for horses.

In my opinion, this bill protects American horses from being raised—and slaughtered—for human consumption.

I support H.R. 503 and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, this week the census bureau released a report showing that for the first time since 1998, the number of uninsured children increased. Of the 8.3 million children without health insurance, minority children constitute a disproportionate share. The latest census figures also show that a record 46.6 Americans lack health insurance. With crucial issues facing the country such as the health care crisis, a broken immigration system, shortfalls in homeland security, and a stagnant minimum wage, I am baffled that the Republican leadership would spend precious time on horse slaughter legislation.

I do not want to minimize the importance of banning inhumane slaughter of horses for purposes of human consumption overseas. In fact, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 503, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act and support clean passage of that legislation. However, it is distressing that with only approximately 15 legislative days before the election, Republicans are ignoring the priorities of the American people.

I am troubled that the 109th Congress will be remembered in history as a “do-nothing” Congress. According to the Library of Congress, the House of Representatives in 2006 is on track to be in session for the fewest number of days since 1948. When the Congress has been in session, Republicans have pushed divisive and unproductive legislation such as constitutional amendments banning gay marriage and flag burning.

The time is long overdue to address the people’s business. Several months ago, both the House and Senate passed immigration and border security bills. Instead of working out an agreement on illegal immigration, Republicans scheduled new field hearings in swing districts. With more talk and less action, the Republican led Congress and White House have failed to gain control over the border. They have failed to conduct workplace enforcement of immigration laws and have thus failed to protect American workers from declining low wages.

Republican inaction on homeland security is even more disconcerting. The bipartisan 9/11 Commission has given this Administration and the rubberstamp Republican congressional leaders poor grades for failing to implement the Commission’s recommendations. We must take immediate steps to secure our borders, strengthen security around sensitive infrastructure, and give our first responders the necessary resources to protect the country.

Republican leadership has failed to improve the American people’s economic security. As CEO compensation has soared, real family income is down since 2001. Since 1997, Republicans have repeatedly rejected a minimum wage increase for 6.6 million of the hardest working Americans. We must provide a livable wage so families can afford to make ends meet.

With the American people paying our salaries, we in the Congress have a duty to solve their problems. It is about time the Republican-led Congress earned its paycheck.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I cannot support this bill in its present form.

I understand and appreciate the views of its proponents, many of them in Colorado, who are distressed about the fact that three slaughterhouses in this country are in the business of preparing horse flesh for human consumption—primarily in other countries.

The bill’s supporters do not think this is appropriate, and that Congress should exercise its authority over interstate commerce in order to put an end to this business. That is what this bill is intended to do.

I can understand the discomfort many Americans have about consumption of horse flesh, although of course it has been and remains an accepted practice in some places.

But emotional concerns cannot be the only guiding force in legislation regarding the way livestock is managed, and prohibiting slaughter of horses for human consumption—the main market for horse flesh at this time—would have unintended consequences this legislation fails to address.

The hearings held by the Agriculture Committee made it clear that there the current horse sanctuaries do not have the capacity to care for the additional unwanted horses—which otherwise would be handled by slaughterhouses that would result from the bill’s enactment. That was one reason the committee, on a bipartisan basis reported the legislation unfavorably.

I voted for an amendment that would have delayed implementation of the bill until the Agriculture Department determined that adequate sanctuaries were ready. Unfortunately, that amendment was not adopted. Similarly, state and local governments—including the Colorado Department of Agriculture and the Commissioners of Adams County—are concerned that shutting off the slaughterhouse outlet will lead to an increased number of unwanted horses being abandoned and left to be dealt with by local authorities. I am attaching letters from the Colorado Commissioner on Agriculture and Adams County Commissioners who oppose this legislation. I voted for an amendment to provide federal reimbursement to local governments faced with such a problem. However, that amendment also was rejected.

Because of these problems, I cannot vote for the bill as it stands. Finally, I must note that with the nation at war in Iraq and Afghanistan, everyday Americans struggling with a mediocre economy and high energy costs, there are more pressing issues Congress needs to address than this one.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Chairman, I rise today in honor of our country’s beloved horses. It is my hope that Congress will pass H.R. 503 unamended, the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. This bill will end horse slaughter for human consumption in the United States and the cruel practices associated with this inhumane industry.

When horses are sold to slaughter they are often transported in overcrowded trucks, deprived of food and water, exposed to the elements and made to stand in their own waste. The slaughter bound horse can be sick or injured but forced to suffer a lack of appropriate veterinary care. The stress that horses are subjected to, both during transportation and at the slaughterhouse, triggers horses’ natural flight response. At the slaughterhouse a horse can be ineffectively stunned before dismemberment, meaning that a horse may remain conscious while being bound and then

elevated by one leg prior to having its throat slit.

H.R. 503 encourages responsible horse ownership. For horse owners, who are no longer able or willing to care for a horse, H.R. 503 finds appropriate alternatives to slaughter that may range from finding a new home for the horse to humane euthanasia preformed by a licensed veterinarian.

Documentation from the three remaining equine slaughterhouses in the United States show that America’s wild horses have been among their victims. Additional victims include stolen, as well as healthy horses. This legislation will stop the sale of wild, stolen or healthy horses to slaughter houses for human consumption at a profit.

The word humane is defined as being marked by compassion, sympathy and consideration for animals. The question we must ask ourselves is if subjecting horses to this kind of circumstance is indeed humane? Is horse slaughter marked by compassion, sympathy and consideration for the animal? The only realistic conclusion is no.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 503 and to oppose all amendments designed to weaken this important bill.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have joined 202 of my colleagues in cosponsoring the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act and I rise today in support of its passage. It is time to put a stop to a business that has been allowed to go on for far too long.

Many Americans have made their stance on this issue clear: a recent poll shows that almost 7 percent of Americans are in favor of banning horse slaughter. The slaughtering process is one that is shockingly inhumane—when transported to slaughtering houses, horses are crammed into trucks and may go unfed for as many as 28 hours. Animals that survive this ordeal often die by the captive bolt, an instrument meant to cause immediate trauma to the brain but is often used improperly, resulting in slow and painful deaths.

Those who oppose this law believe H.R. 503 will result in an overpopulation of horses. Yet the Department of Agriculture has found that 5,000 horses have been imported to slaughter plants since August 2004. As the Humane Society of the United States rightly observes, there would be no reason to import horses if we have an overpopulation.

Opponents of this bill have also warned that horses who would otherwise be slaughtered would not receive adequate care once they are transferred to alternate homes or rescue facilities. But horse rescue groups are required to abide by state and local animal welfare laws. California banned horse slaughter in 1998 and there has been no documented rise in cruelty and neglect cases. Similarly, there was no increase in brutality toward horses following the closing of Illinois’ only slaughter plant in 2002.

There is no reason why the inhumane treatment of these animals should continue, particularly when our horses are being slaughtered solely for the purpose of pleasing foreign diners. I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support in H.R. 503, which would prohibit the slaughtering of horses for human consumption. Last year more than 90,000 American horses were slaughtered in this country by three foreign-owned plants. Horse meat is

not eaten in the United States, but it has been exported to overseas markets, such as France, Belgium, Japan and Italy. Animals deserve to be treated humanely, and I do not support this industry.

This Congress made its opposition to horse slaughter clear in the Agriculture Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2006. I supported an amendment introduced by Representative SWEENEY and Representative WHITFIELD that would have essentially tied the hands of the horse slaughter industry. Unfortunately the language approved by both the House and Senate, which had the clear intention of ending this industry, was altered in conference and allowed the slaughtering of horses to continue.

H.R. 503 would permanently shut down this inhumane practice. This legislation has wide bipartisan support in the House as well as extensive backing from the animal welfare community. I want to specifically thank Representative SWEENEY and Representative WHITFIELD for their hard work and leadership on this important issue.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 503

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

**SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON SHIPPING, TRANSPORTING, MOVING, DELIVERING, RECEIVING, POSSESSING, PURCHASING, SELLING, OR DONATION OF HORSES AND OTHER EQUINES FOR SLAUGHTER FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 2 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1821) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (2), (3), (5), and (6), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

“(1) The term ‘human consumption’ means ingestion by people as a source of food.”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

“(4) The term ‘slaughter’ means the killing of one or more horses or other equines with the intent to sell or trade the flesh for human consumption.”.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Section 3 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1822) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as paragraphs (6) through (10), respectively;

(2) by adding before paragraph (6), as so redesignated, the following new paragraphs:

“(1) horses and other equines play a vital role in the collective experience of the United States and deserve protection and compassion;

“(2) horses and other equines are domestic animals that are used primarily for recreation, pleasure, and sport;

“(3) unlike cows, pigs, and many other animals, horses and other equines are not raised for the purpose of being slaughtered for human consumption;

“(4) individuals selling horses or other equines at auctions are seldom aware that the animals may be bought for the purpose of being slaughtered for human consumption; and

“(5) the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture has found that horses and other equines cannot be safely and humanely transported in double deck trailers.”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (8), as so redesignated, and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(8) the movement, showing, exhibition, or sale of sore horses in intrastate commerce, and the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation in intrastate commerce of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, adversely affect and burden interstate and foreign commerce.”.

(c) **PROHIBITION.**—Section 5 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1824) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (11) as paragraphs (9) through (12), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

“(8) As a pilot program to evaluate the feasibility and practicability of imposing such a prohibition nation-wide, the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of any horse or other equine in the States of Kentucky or New York to be slaughtered for human consumption, unless the equine—

“(A) is owned or controlled by a State or local government or owned by an individual who purchased the equine from a State or local government;

“(B) will be slaughtered at a facility operating before the date of the enactment of this paragraph; or

“(C) will be slaughtered for human consumption for charitable or humanitarian purposes.”.

(d) **AUTHORITY TO DETAIN.**—Section 6(e) of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1825(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking the first sentence of paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(3) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

“(1) The Secretary may detain for examination, testing, or the taking of evidence—

“(A) any horse at any horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction which is sore or which the Secretary has probable cause to believe is sore; and

“(B) any horse or other equine which the Secretary has probable cause to believe is being shipped, transported, moved, delivered, received, possessed, purchased, sold, or donated in violation of section 5(8).”.

(e) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—Section 11 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1830) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 11. REIMBURSEMENT OF OWNERS FOR LOSS OF VALUE OF HORSES.**

“The Secretary shall compensate the owner of an equine who disposes of such equine due to the prohibition under section 5(8). The Secretary shall compensate such owner for the total amount of—

“(1) the loss in value of the equine due to such prohibition; and

“(2) the costs incurred in the disposal of such equine.”.

(f) **RESPONSIBILITY FOR UNWANTED HORSES.**—The Horse Protection Act is further amended by inserting after section 11 (15 U.S.C. 1830), as amended by subsection (e), the following new section:

**“SEC. 11A. RESPONSIBILITY FOR UNWANTED HORSES.**

“The Secretary shall assume responsibility for any equine that is unwanted by an owner.”.

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 12 of the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1831) is amended by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$5,000,000”.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 109-642. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the re-

port, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chair has been notified that amendments No. 1 and 2 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 109-642.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. GOODLATTE:

In the paragraph (8) of section 5 of the Horse Protection Act, which is being added by subsection (c)(2) of section 1 of the bill, strike “consumption.” and insert the following: “consumption, except that this prohibition shall not take effect until 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of Agriculture certifies to Congress that sufficient sanctuaries exist in the United States to care for any horses that may be unwanted as a result of this prohibition.”.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 981, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

We have discussed many problems that the Sweeney-Whitfield bill will create with not a single solution in sight. While it is not possible to address all of those problems, we must address the fate of the horses affected by this bill.

I am joined by my ranking member, Mr. PETERSON, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the gentleman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH), and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOX) in offering an amendment to address this concern.

The amendment would very simply say that until the Secretary of Agriculture can certify that sufficient sanctuary space is available to accommodate the unwanted horses created by this bill, the drastic step of a Federal mandate will be delayed.

Everyone debating this issue today is dedicated to the best care possible for horses. We profoundly disagree on how to achieve that laudable goal. The co-sponsors of this amendment believe it would be a tragedy to take the dramatic step of closing off a humane method of disposal of animals that the owners can no longer care for only to see them abandoned or killed wholesale at greater cost to their owners.

If we are to take this drastic step, we should at least ensure that the horses for whom it is being done continue to live out their lives in humane circumstances.

Nothing in this amendment would prevent the operation of H.R. 503 as long as there was assurance that a humane living alternative to the current system exists. It is impossible for me to believe that the supporters of H.R. 503 intend to replace the death of horses that they decry with abandonment or wholesale death at the hands of their owners.

The proponents of this bill have assured us there will be no flood of unwanted horses with no place to go as a result of this bill. If this is true, and reputable organizations like the American Veterinary Medical Association and the American Association of Equine Practitioners strongly dispute that, but if it is true, our amendment will be an easy procedural step to meet.

If, however, the Association of Equine Practitioners and major horse-owning groups who oppose H.R. 503 are correct that hundreds of thousands of unwanted horses with no place to go would be created in just a few years, this amendment can prevent a catastrophe for horses in this country.

I ask my colleagues to join us in passing this amendment that provides a solution for at least one of the problems created by this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) to respond.

Mr. SWEENEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition. Let's be very clear, all of these amendments have one intended purpose, and that is to destroy the bill. So if you are in favor of the ban of horse slaughter for human consumption, you need to vote against all of the amendments.

This number, this establishment of an arbitrary number, is false. It will not be obtained because there are so many other options for horse owners other than horse sanctuary, but let's understand the facts.

The current horse population is estimated at 9 million. As has been said, each year, roughly 900,000 horses die. About 90,000, or 1 percent, are actually slaughtered. Furthermore, in 1989, the U.S. slaughtered over 342 horses. In 2005, they slaughtered 90,000. Since then, the United States slaughtered approximately 200,000 fewer horses. So 90,000 horses can be easily absorbed into the population. And not all of these horses will need to be absorbed into rescue and sanctuary populations. Horses will die or become sick or dangerous to their owners. These horses will need to be replaced. These horses will become pets or workhorses or show horses.

Both the Bureau of Land Management and hundreds of private organizations and agencies provide adoption programs for people to replace these horses by adopting new ones. Additionally, thousands of these horses are humanely euthanized each year.

Madam Chairman, this amendment, this proposal, is simply meant to en-

sure that this bill is never enacted. We should vote it down, and we should vote it down very strongly.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of this amendment. This bill displaces 90,000 horses a year, 90,000. In spite of what my good friend Mr. SWEENEY says, that is a lot of horses. Currently the horse facilities are already full. They can only take approximately 6,000 horses a year.

What do we do, Mr. SWEENEY, with those other 84,000 horses? This bill should not pass until the Secretary of Agriculture can certify to this Congress that there is enough space in these rescue facilities to accommodate all of these unwanted horses that have no place to go, no funds to care for them and no humane end-of-life option left for them.

So I support this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Talking about an amendment to create a problem that is not there, this is a perfect example of that. We have all of these organizations around the country who are voluntarily spending their time and money to provide a safe haven for horses, and this amendment basically is a killer amendment to defeat H.R. 503.

□ 1345

I would point out once again that each year the number of horses that have been slaughtered has been going down. We have gone from 300,000 down to 90,000. There is no evidence that society has had any problem in absorbing these horses. And I would also remind the gentleman many of these horses are stolen; so they are not unwanted horses. There is a need for them. So we know for a fact that the only purpose of any of these amendments is to make this bill ineffective, to kill this bill.

I am delighted that we are on the floor and have an opportunity to debate this, and I would urge every Member to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side and who has the right to close.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has the right to close.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I will respond to the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from New York, who called this a poison pill.

This is no such thing whatsoever. They say there is no problem with unwanted horses. Then there will be no problem getting a certification that there is sufficient horse sanctuary facilities around the country to take care of them. I strongly dispute that.

I think the gentleman from New York and I, while we may disagree on numbers, can agree that 90,000 is 10 percent of 900,000, not 1 percent. But whatever that is, that is a substantial number of unwanted horses.

And, remember, the average life expectancy of a horse is 25 years. Many of these horses have many years of life expectancy left in them; so they are going to accumulate over a period of years. In fact, the American Veterinary Medical Association says over 6 years they will grow to 272,000 in number. That is far, far more than the capacity of all the horse sanctuaries around the country that exist today. And there is no sign of their growing rapidly to meet this need because they cannot even meet the current need to take care of the unwanted horses that exist in this country right now as we speak.

So I would urge my colleagues to support this very good amendment that will cure a very serious flaw in this legislation, and then we will have the opportunity to see who is correct about how many unwanted horses we are going to have in this country. Are the experts, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the horse doctors, the Horse Owners Associations around the country, who strongly support this amendment, correct, or are they correct?

I think this is a fair amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I must say I am shocked that the gentleman would want to get the government involved in this kind of an issue. These are private property rights people who are out there voluntarily providing their property, their money to take care of these unwanted horses.

And one of the reasons we opposed this amendment, you talk about sufficient horse sanctuaries. We know who would be defining "sufficient." The Department of Agriculture, who must work with your committee to get anything that they want on the farm bill or anything else; so you would be dictating what is sufficient, and we know that there would never be enough sanctuaries sufficient to meet your demands.

So I would say once again we do not have to speculate about unwanted horses in the future. We know for a fact that unwanted horses is not a problem, as we have gone from 300,000 to 90,000 a year. No one has complained about it. No study has shown it. UC Davis in their study in California indicated that there have not been any additional increases of unwanted horses.

So I would urge every Member to oppose this amendment, which is designed to defeat this bill.

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

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

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam 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 Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, the additional amendments that have been made in order under my name or my designee we do not intend to bring up.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 109-642.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

In the paragraph (8) of section 5 of the Horse Protection Act, which is being added by subsection (c)(2) of section 1 of the bill, strike "consumption." and insert the following: "consumption, unless the horse or other equine will be slaughtered for human consumption by Native Americans or persons of cultures who have traditionally consumed the meat of horses or other equines, as determined by the Secretary."

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 981, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I am offering this amendment today that would allow a cultural exemption for Native Americans and people from cultures that consume equine meat.

Specifically, my amendment would permit equine to be shipped, transported, moved, delivered, received, possessed, purchased, sold, all of the list that is in the bill, Madam Chairman, by Native Americans or people from cultures who eat equine meat.

Horses have played, and continue to play, an important role in Native American culture. It is particularly true for the tribes of the Great Northern Plains, including the Great Sioux Nation. Many tribal members raise and sell horses. In addition, the Apache people and the Pueblo people from the Southwest have consumed horse meat. They were very skilled on horseback, but they valued and cherished the horse as food as well.

The Native American cultures are not the only people to eat or raise horses for meat. The people from the cultures of Japan, Belgium, France,

Austria, Quebec, Chile, Germany, Iceland, Kazakhstan, including also the Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and Italy, all eat horse meat today and all have recipes today.

People in support of this bill have a romantic view of the horse because it helped build America, and in their mind it is not in our culture to eat the horse for that reason. But they fail to understand that the oxen, bovine, was also a great assistance to us and maybe even a greater assistance in building America; but we do not have an aversion to beef, Madam Chairman.

So for these reasons, I would ask support for this cultural exemption amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) in opposition.

Mr. SWEENEY. Madam Chairman, there are two giant loopholes created here, and I will submit for the RECORD statements by a number of Indian tribes, the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association, the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada, and the National Congress of American Indians, in opposition to this amendment.

GREAT PLAINS  
TRIBAL CHAIRMAN'S ASSOCIATION,  
*Eagle Butte, SD, September 6, 2006.*  
RESOLUTION OF THE GREAT PLAINS TRIBAL  
CHAIRMAN'S ASSOCIATION

Whereas, the Great Plains (formerly Aberdeen Area) Tribal Chairman's Association (GPTCA) is composed of the elected Chairs and Presidents of the sovereign Indian Tribes and Nations recognized by Treaties with the United States that are within the Great Plains Region of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

Whereas, the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association was formed to promote the common interests of the sovereign Tribes and Nations and their members of the Great Plains Region; and

Whereas, the United States has obligated itself both through Treaties entered into with the sovereign Tribes and Nations of the Great Plains Region and through its own federal statutes, the Snyder Act of 1921 as amended, the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1976 as amended, and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act of 1976 as amended; and

Whereas, the Tribes of the Great Plains have strong spiritual, cultural, and historical ties to wild horses; and

Whereas, the Tribes of the Great Plains are disheartened and alarmed by the new language in Appropriations Bill H.R. 4818 that would allow the slaughter of these sacred animals; and

Whereas, the Tribes of the Great Plains are concerned that wild horses are fast disappearing and that soon there will not be sufficient numbers to sustain healthy populations; and

Whereas, the Tribes of the Great Plains recognize wild horses as one of the last living symbols that represent our ancestral past; and

Whereas, the wild horses have no one to speak for them and the Tribes of the Great Plains are compelled to step forward on behalf of the last remaining wild horses in the United States; and: Now, therefore be it

*Resolved;* That the Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association opposes the slaugh-

ter of wild horses and supports adoption of wild horses with the federal government waiving the adoption fee and providing funds for transportation in order to prevent their slaughter; and: Now, therefore be it further

*Resolved;* That the Great Plains Tribes support and encourage the reintroduction and reinstatement of protective legislation in the 109th United States Congress to prevent wild horses and burros from being slaughtered and maintain a viable number of animals on the public lands; and: Now, be it finally

*Resolved;* The Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association call upon other Tribes and Indian Nations to join with us in all efforts to find solutions for the preservation of wild horses.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS  
RESOLUTION

Whereas, we, the members of the National Congress of American Indians of the United States, invoking the divine blessing of the Creator upon our efforts and purposes, in order to preserve for ourselves and our descendants the inherent sovereign rights of our Indian nations, rights secured under Indian treaties and agreements with the United States, and all other rights and benefits to which we are entitled under the laws and Constitution of the United States, to enlighten the public toward a better understanding of the Indian people, to preserve Indian cultural values, and otherwise promote the health, safety and welfare of the Indian people, do hereby establish and submit the following resolution; and

Whereas, the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) was established in 1944 and is the oldest and largest national organization of American Indian and Alaska Native tribal governments; and

Whereas, the NCAI recognizes that many of the Tribes have strong spiritual, cultural, and historic ties to wild horses; and

Whereas, the Tribes oral history remembers wild horses from ancient times and concurs that wild horses evolved on the North American continent for eons of time; and

Whereas, the NCAI acknowledges wild horses as one of the last living symbols that represent our ancestral past when people and animals were free to live and roam in harmony with Mother Earth; and

Whereas, the Tribes are disheartened and alarmed by the passage of the Burn's amendment to PL 92-195 that allows for the slaughter of these sacred animals; and

Whereas, the Tribes are concerned that wild horses are fast disappearing and that soon there will not be sufficient numbers to sustain healthy populations; and

Whereas, the wild horses have no one to speak for them and the Tribes of the NCAI are compelled to step forward on behalf of the last remaining wild horses in the United States; and Now therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the NCAI opposes the slaughter of wild horses and supports the relocation of wild horses to Tribal lands with the Department of the Interior waiving the adoption fee and not charging more than \$1.00 per animal and providing transportation of the animals at no charge to the accepting Tribes; and Now therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the Tribes of the NCAI support and encourage the reintroduction and reinstatement of protective legislation in the 109th United States Congress to prevent wild horses and burros from being slaughtered and to maintain a viable number of animals on public lands; and Now be it finally

*Resolved,* That the NCAI Tribes call upon other Tribes and Indian Nations to join us in all efforts to find solutions for the preservation of wild horses.

INTER-TRIBAL  
COUNCIL OF NEVADA, INC.  
*Reno, NV, September 6, 2006.*

## RESOLUTION No. 05-ITCN-02

Whereas, the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada, Inc., is organized and operates in accordance with its Constitution and By-Laws, amended in November 1974; and

Whereas, the purposes of Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada, Inc. (ITCN), are stated in its Constitution, Preamble; and

Whereas, the Executive Board, a body comprised of the twenty-seven (27) elected representatives of the member tribes in the State of Nevada and whose charter is ratified by these same tribes; and

Whereas, the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada has a continuing interest in the health, education and well-being of their Indian people; and

Whereas, the Nevada tribes are disheartened and alarmed by the new language in Appropriations Bill H.R. 4818 that would allow the slaughter of these sacred animals; Now therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada opposes the slaughter of wild horses and supports adoption of wild horses with the federal government waiving the adoption fee and providing funds for transportation in order to prevent their slaughter; and Be it further

*Resolved*, That the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada supports and encourages the reintroduction and reinstitution of protective legislation in the 109th United States Congress to prevent wild horses and burros from being slaughtered and utilized for food consumption and maintain a viable number of animals on the public lands: Now be it finally

*Resolved*, That the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada call upon other Tribes and Indian Nations to join with us in all efforts to find solutions for the preservation of wild horses.

Madam Chairman, the two loopholes are simply this: first, it would encourage the slaughter facilities to simply relocate to reservations and simply export the meat from there. This would allow the practice of slaughter to continue.

Secondly, the amendment gives "persons of cultures who have traditionally consumed the meat of horses" an exemption. It is not defined in the bill, Madam Chairman. These persons of cultures are not specified. The amendment offered, I understand, has given us some definition, saying essentially this bill would say the French, the Belgians, whomever else may continue this practice simply because it is part of their culture. It is not defined. And, therefore, I think it is inappropriate to have it in the bill. It is a poison pill for this bill, and I strongly oppose it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, in response to the gentleman from New York, I would point out that I have a letter here from the United Sioux Tribes of South Dakota that I will introduce into the RECORD. And in this letter it says: "Horses have played, and continue to play, an important role in the Indian culture. That is particularly true for Tribes of the Great Northern Plains."

And it says: "Many tribal members raise and sell horses." This is currently, today. "Some of these horses are used for food and exported. It is inconceivable to think the Congress

might extinguish our property rights and lessen our income even more."

And I would point out to the gentleman from New York that we have in this amendment language that says it would be determined by the Secretary as to which cultural exemptions. So it is not simply a blanket exemption. I did not list the Irish in that, and maybe I am remiss in that. But I do not intend to build a record here of all of the cultures that have traditionally eaten horse meat, but there are many of them that do. They do so today. They have recipes today. And this is something that infringes upon people's property rights and their cultural rights. And if we are going to say this to the Native American people that we are going to pull these assets out from underneath you and you can't do with a horse what you have done for hundreds of years, I think that is a message that we are not going to want to send across America.

UNITED SIOUX TRIBES  
OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
*Pierre, SD, August 22, 2006.*

Hon. STEPHANIE HERSETH,  
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

Attention: Ryan Stroschein & Phil Assmus

DEAR STEPHANIE: We greatly appreciate your opposition to H.R. 503. This bill would, in short, prohibit the marketing of our horses to slaughter.

Horses have played, and continue to play, an important role in the Indian culture. That is particularly true for Tribes of the Northern Great Plains, including the Great Sioux Nation. The United States has taken our land and if this bill passes you will be taking our property without compensation.

Many tribal members raise and sell horses. Some of these horses are used for food and exported. It is inconceivable to think the Congress might extinguish our property rights and lessen our income even more. We urge you to ask your colleagues to follow your lead and oppose H.R. 503. Thank you.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE W. SKYE,  
*Executive Director.*

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

I would also submit for the RECORD a letter that we have from Chief Arvol of the Lakota Nation, and he wrote a very long letter in opposition to this amendment. He says: "I am writing to ask for your support in co-sponsoring the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act and for our tribe."

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: My name is Chief Arvol Looking Horse of the Lakota, Dakota, Nakota Nation. I am also known as "Sung Wakan" (Horse Man). My position with my People is the 19th Generation Keeper of the Sacred White Buffalo Calf Bundle. I am the spiritual leader for our Nation.

It has been recorded in ancient petroglyphs and in our oral stories that the horse nation was around our people long before the Spaniards brought the other relative of the horse nation to this land. These ancient horses were much smaller in size and not so much in numbers, to a point of extinction.

With this ancient Bundle, almost 2,000 years old, existed a horse ceremony acknowledging the horse nation in respect to their wise and gentle spirit, as they offered a gift

of healing for our own human spirit. My work has involved many efforts in bringing awareness to the importance to all life upon Mother Earth, including Mother Earth herself so that all life may live in Peace. I was raised with the understanding that all forms of life have their own meaning of importance and should not be taken for granted. To ignore and not to try to learn this precious truth of all living beings to live in Peace with us as humans of power and decisions, will affect the lives of our own children in their health of body mind and spirit. We need to teach all children to look at all life as sacred.

The Horse Nation is an important spirit being. The Nation deserves the protection and awareness of what we humans can offer. They have saved, assisted, and given of themselves for all humans throughout history. Whether it was being ridden in battles, or in traveling, and most recently discovered by therapists through friendship, they can give healing to our troubled spirits. The Native Nations always understood these gifts and that was why we had our horse dance ceremony.

This awareness of the horse's gifts to humans has transformed into a strong respect. This awareness has been gathering People across the country to protect this fine spirit from a very negative attack on their health and existence, by unconscious disrespectful humans in the name of greed. A horse can feel impending trauma in their environment. Yet, horses trust humans and so are being led to slaughter.

This is not a way of respecting life that children need to learn, as we adults having positions as role models and leaders in our communities. This energy, as we understand these actions to be, will indeed backfire, if people do not educate themselves about the importance of the different spiritual roles of all life forms. Some animal nations, indeed, give themselves for food. They actually know their purpose in the human's food chain, as long as humans understand this with respect. We should understand the Horse Nation has earned the right to live in Peace for what they have contributed to all our lives throughout history.

I am writing to ask for your support in co-sponsoring the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. The AHSPA (H.R. 857) has been introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by Representative John Sweeney (R-NY) who is chair of the Congressional Horse Caucus and Congressman John Spratt (D-SC). A similar bill will soon be before the U.S. Senate.

Despite the passage of the Wild-Free Roaming Wild Horses and Burros Act of 1971 which was enacted to protect the wild horse from slaughter, hundreds, perhaps thousands, continue to be slaughtered each year. The Bureau of Land Management removed too many wild horses from their ranges resulting in ongoing sales to the slaughterhouses. If you wish to learn more about these activities, please contact Chris Heyde of the Society for Animal Protective Legislation.

In a Sacred Hoop of life, where there is no ending and no beginning!

Thank you for your attention to this effort.

Mitakuye Oyasin (All my relations),  
Chief ARVOL LOOKING HORSE,

*19th Generation Keeper of  
the Sacred White Buffalo Calf Pipe.*

Madam Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 503 has never been to dictate to other cultures what they can and cannot eat. The purpose of H.R. 503 is simply to prohibit the French, the Belgians, the Dutch from offering slaughterhouses in America, taking our

horses, many of which are stolen, obtained by misrepresentation, and shipping the meat to France, Belgium, and Japan.

So this amendment would do one thing. It would make the bill ineffective. It would defeat the bill in its entirety. And so I would urge the Members to oppose this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Chairman, in this position that we are in today, to be objective in our perspective about how we deal with this issue, I don't know that there is a precedent in America that we have told an entire country no matter what your culture, no matter what your beliefs, no matter what your traditions, we do not want them here in this country. There are many other elements of other cultures that this civilization would be more healthy without, and yet there is not a single piece of legislation before this body that would define those components of another culture and rip them out and say, in our best judgment we think you ought to quit doing these things.

We accept all beliefs in America. That is part of who we are. Freedom of speech, religion, press, all of our cultural composition comes with all immigrants into this country and with the Native Americans too. And this amendment says to the Native Americans specifically and other cultures inclusively, if certified by the Secretary, we are going to accept your beliefs. We are going to accept your traditions. It is part of who we are as America to blend all those cultures and those civilizations together and come out with this robust nature of our great American culture, and that is what this amendment is about. It is about protecting our traditional values.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I very much thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

I oppose this amendment because it is not about Native Americans. It is about creating one more loophole. And I oppose the other amendments because they would undermine the intent of this bill.

We cannot be a Nation or a society that reduces everything to dollars and cents, that commoditizes everything. When you see an eagle take wing and soar above the clouds, that is not a commodity. It is a source of inspiration. When you see a horse galloping gracefully across the plains, that is not a commodity. That is a source of inspiration.

Horses have been part of the strength of this country for 400 years. We depended upon the horse. We explored this continent. Our commerce was

heavily dependent upon the horse. So many major battles where we prevailed were on horses.

Look at our monuments. Look at the monument in front of the Capitol. It is a horse. And when the horse has one leg up, it means that that person was wounded in battle. But there has been an intrinsic relationship.

Everything cannot be reduced to economics. We need to be inspired by some things, and these amendments would gut a bill that says there is no reason to be slaughtering horses. Three major slaughterhouses owned by foreign nations. Americans don't want to consume meat. Listen to the mayor of the city in Texas. It has ruined her economy. It is a stench. No one wants it. This is not about economics. This is about doing the right thing. And we have been tied to the horse, the eagle. These symbols of American strength, of American greatness, are sources of inspiration.

My very good friend Mr. WHITFIELD understands what this is really about. This is about preserving a symbol. We cannot allow the kind of slaughtering that takes place. More than 100,000 horses. Imagine. And the fact is they are slaughtering the healthy, fatter horses that have been well taken care of. They do not want the infirm, the old, the lame horses. That is not who they want to slaughter. So many of these arguments have been false arguments.

□ 1400

This amendment is doing the right thing. The Department of Agriculture circumvented the right thing that we have already passed. I support Mr. WHITFIELD. Let's pass this amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, does he have the right to close or do I have the right to close?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. CAPITO). The gentleman from Kentucky has the right to close.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Madam Chair, I would reiterate that this amendment is about the cultural exemption to horse slaughter and consumption for human purposes. And this is something that has gone on in this country for hundreds of years.

Since the Spaniards brought the horses here, there have been horses consumed for human consumption. It has been part of the plan, part of the breeding, part of the raising, part of the feeding and part of the strategy.

In fact, as I stand here today, this date here in September is almost very close to the date that, 200 years ago, Lewis and Clark returned, back down the Missouri River. It was in September of 1806. They bought horses from the Native Americans out west for the purposes of taking those horses as pack horses up into the mountains. They knew they would not need those

horses when they got to the end of the line. And they bought those horses. Part of their strategy when they left St. Louis was, buy horses in that region and when you are finished working them, eat them. Louis and Clark ate horses. All of these ethnicities and countries that I have named all eat horses.

I do not think there is an ethnicity that has been exempt from having horses in their diet, but particularly Native Americans who, the Great Plains Native Americans, the Sioux Nation, and I represent Sioux County, and I represent two reservations in my district that I have had for over 10 years now, or almost 10 years now; all of those cultures are rooted in this. We need to provide a cultural exemption, Madam Chairman. If we send this message off to Native Americans, in particular, that we would not even let the Secretary of Agriculture designate an exemption for Native Americans no matter how long their tradition is, that will be an insult to Native Americans, an insult to multiculturalism in America. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say that this bill certainly does not prevent individual owners from slaughtering a horse and eating the horse if they want to. I think that this amendment is unnecessary. It would defeat the purpose of the bill. All the correspondence we have had with Indian tribes indicates that they do not eat horse meat.

Horses have not been a part of the food chain in America. I would urge the defeat of the amendment and passage of H.R. 503.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment in my capacity as the Ranking Member of the Resources Committee which has legislative jurisdiction over Indian Affairs.

This amendment is an insult to Indian Country. It suggests that Native Americans consume horse flesh. And in doing so, it is derivative of their culture and their society.

The fact of the matter is that Indians do not eat horse flesh, and the three horse slaughter operations in this country do not sell horse flesh to Indians.

The meat of slaughtered horses is all exported by these slaughterhouses to foreign markets.

Indeed, I have before me resolution after resolution from Indian Country opposing the slaughter of horses, including from the National Congress of American Indians.

But to be clear, there is another purpose behind this amendment, because it seeks to also allow horses to be slaughtered for the consumption of people from cultures that eat equine meat. As a general matter.

The fact of the matter is that all of the meat from American slaughtered horses is consumed in European or Asian countries by people who traditionally eat horse flesh.

Adoption of this amendment would gut the pending legislation. It would render it null and void.

My colleagues, do not be fooled, do not be lulled into complacency by the attempt of this amendment to garner sympathy for Native Americans, when no such sympathy is required.

A vote for this amendment is the same as a vote against final passage of H.R. 503.

I urge the defeat of the pending amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. 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 Iowa will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting 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 No. 3 by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) 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 177, noes 229, answered “present” 1, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

AYES—177

Akin	Bradley (NH)	Davis (TN)
Alexander	Brady (TX)	Deal (GA)
Baca	Brown-Waite,	Dingell
Bachus	Ginny	Doolittle
Baker	Burgess	Drake
Barrett (SC)	Butterfield	Duncan
Barrow	Buyer	Edwards
Barton (TX)	Camp (MI)	Ehlers
Berry	Cannon	Emerson
Bishop (GA)	Cantor	Etheridge
Bishop (UT)	Cardoza	Everett
Blackburn	Carter	Feeney
Blunt	Chocola	Finer
Boehler	Coble	Flake
Boehner	Cole (OK)	Ford
Bonilla	Conaway	Fortenberry
Bonner	Cooper	Fox
Boozman	Costa	Franks (AZ)
Boren	Cramer	Garrett (NJ)
Boswell	Cubin	Gillmor
Boucher	Cuellar	Gingrey
Boustany	Culberson	Gohmert
Boyd	Davis (KY)	Goode

Goodlatte	Marshall	Rehberg	Sanders	Snyder	Walsh
Gordon	Matheson	Reyes	Saxton	Solis	Wasserman
Granger	McCaul (TX)	Rogers (AL)	Schakowsky	Spratt	Schultz
Graves	McCrery	Rohrabacher	Schiff	Stark	Waters
Gutknecht	McDermott	Ross	Schmidt	Sweeney	Watson
Hart	McHenry	Rush	Schwartz (PA)	Tanner	Waxman
Hastings (FL)	McHugh	Ryan (WI)	Scott (GA)	Tauscher	Weiner
Hastings (WA)	McIntyre	Ryun (KS)	Scott (VA)	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (PA)
Hayes	McKeon	Salazar	Serrano	Thompson (CA)	Weller
Hefley	McMorris	Schwarz (MI)	Shaw	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Hensarling	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner	Shays	Tierney	Whitfield
Hergert	Melancon	Sessions	Sherman	Turner	Wilson (SC)
Herseth	Mica	Shadegg	Shuster	Udall (NM)	Wolf
Hinojosa	Miller (MI)	Sherwood	Simmons	Upton	Woolsey
Hobson	Moran (KS)	Shimkus	Slaughter	Van Hollen	Wu
Holden	Murtha	Simpson	Smith (NJ)	Velázquez	Wynn
Honda	Musgrave	Skelton	Smith (WA)	Visclosky	Young (FL)
Hulshof	Myrick	Smith (TX)			
Jenkins	Neugebauer	Sodrel			
Kennedy (MN)	Northup	Souder			
Kind	Norwood	Stearns			
King (IA)	Oberstar	Stupak			
Kingston	Ortiz	Sullivan			
Knollenberg	Osborne	Tancredo			
Kolbe	Otter	Taylor (NC)			
Kuhl (NY)	Pastor	Terry			
LaHood	Pearce	Thomas			
Larsen (WA)	Pence	Thornberry			
Latham	Peterson (MN)	Tiahrt			
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (PA)	Tiberi			
Lewis (KY)	Petri	Udall (CO)			
Lucas	Pickering	Walden (OR)			
Lungren, Daniel	Poe	Wamp			
E.	Pombo	Weldon (FL)			
Mack	Pomeroy	Westmoreland			
Manzullo	Putnam	Wicker			
Marchant	Radanovich	Wilson (NM)			

NOES—229

Abercrombie	English (PA)	Leach
Ackerman	Eshoo	Lee
Aderholt	Farr	Levin
Allen	Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Andrews	Ferguson	Linder
Baird	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lipinski
Baldwin	Foley	LoBiondo
Bartlett (MD)	Forbes	Lofgren, Zoe
Bass	Fossella	Lowey
Bean	Frank (MA)	Lynch
Becerra	Frelinghuysen	Maloney
Berkley	Gerlach	Markey
Berman	Gibbons	Matsui
Biggert	Gilchrest	McCarthy
Bilbray	Gonzalez	McCollum (MN)
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	McCotter
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	McGovern
Bono	Grijalva	McNulty
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Meehan
Brown (OH)	Hall	Meek (FL)
Brown (SC)	Harman	Meeks (NY)
Brown, Corrine	Hayworth	Michaud
Burton (IN)	Higgins	Miller (NC)
Calvert	Hinche	Miller, George
Campbell (CA)	Hoekstra	Mollohan
Capito	Holt	Moore (KS)
Capps	Hooley	Moore (WI)
Capuano	Hostettler	Moran (VA)
Cardin	Hoyer	Napolitano
Carnahan	Hunter	Neal (MA)
Carson	Hyde	Ney
Case	Inglis (SC)	Olver
Castle	Inslee	Owens
Chabot	Israel	Pallone
Chandler	Issa	Pascrell
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Paul
Cleaver	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Clyburn	(TX)	Pelosi
Conyers	Jefferson	Pitts
Costello	Jindal	Platts
Crenshaw	Johnson (CT)	Porter
Crowley	Johnson (IL)	Price (GA)
Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Davis (CA)	Jones (NC)	Pryce (OH)
Davis (FL)	Jones (OH)	Rahall
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	Ramstad
Davis, Jo Ann	Kaptur	Regula
Davis, Tom	Keller	Reichert
DeFazio	Kelly	Renzi
DeGette	Kennedy (RI)	Reynolds
DeLahunt	Kildee	Rogers (KY)
DeLauro	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Dent	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirk	Rothman
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kline	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Kucinich	Royce
Doggett	Langwin	Ruppersberger
Dreier	Lantoso	Ryan (OH)
Emanuel	Larson (CT)	Sabo
Engel	LaTourette	Sanchez, Loretta

Saxton	Snyder	Walsh
Schakowsky	Solis	Wasserman
Schiff	Spratt	Schultz
Schmidt	Stark	Waters
Sweeney	Sweeney	Watson
Tanner	Tanner	Waxman
Tauscher	Scott (GA)	Weiner
Taylor (MS)	Scott (VA)	Weldon (PA)
Weller	Serrano	Thompson (CA)
Wexler	Shaw	Thompson (MS)
Whitfield	Shays	Tierney
Wilson (SC)	Sherman	Turner
Wolf	Shuster	Udall (NM)
Woolsey	Simmons	Upton
Wu	Slaughter	Van Hollen
Wynn	Smith (NJ)	Velázquez
Young (FL)	Smith (WA)	Visclosky

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Obey  
NOT VOTING—25

Beauprez	Johnson, Sam	Nussle
Bilirakis	McKinney	Oxley
Cummings	Millender-	Rangel
Doyle	McDonald	Sánchez, Linda
Evans	Miller (FL)	T.
Gallely	Miller, Gary	Strickland
Green (WI)	Murphy	Towns
Harris	Nadler	Watt
Istook	Nunes	Young (AK)

□ 1432

Mrs. BIGGERT and Messrs. WYNN, PRICE of Georgia and CLEAVER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. MCHUGH, FORD, OSBORNE, KUHLE of New York, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. AKIN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 431, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) 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 149, noes 256, answered “present” 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—149

Akin	Bonner	Cardoza
Baca	Boozman	Carter
Baker	Boren	Chocola
Barrow	Boswell	Cleaver
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Coble
Berry	Boyd	Cole (OK)
Bishop (GA)	Brady (TX)	Conaway
Bishop (UT)	Brown-Waite,	Cooper
Blackburn	Ginny	Costa
Blunt	Butterfield	Cubin
Boehler	Buyer	Cuellar
Boehner	Camp (MI)	Culberson
Bonilla	Cannon	Davis (KY)

Davis (TN) Kuhl (NY) Pombo  
Deal (GA) LaHood Pomeroy  
Dingell Larsen (WA) Putnam  
Doolittle Latham Radanovich  
Drake Lewis (CA) Rehberg  
Duncan Lucas Rogers (AL)  
Edwards Mack Rohrabacher  
Emerson Manzullo Ross  
Etheridge Marchant Ryan (WI)  
Feeney Marshall Ryan (KS)  
Flake Matheson Salazar  
Fortenberry McCaul (TX)  
Foxy McCreery Schwarz (MI)  
Franks (AZ) McHenry Sensenbrenner  
Garrett (NJ) McHugh Sessions  
Gingrey McKeon Shadegg  
Goodlatte McMorris Sherwood  
Gordon Rodgers Shimkus  
Granger Melancon Simpson  
Graves Mica Skelton  
Gutknecht Miller (MI) Smith (TX)  
Hart Moran (KS) Snyder  
Hastings (FL) Musgrave Sodrel  
Hastings (WA) Neugebauer Souder  
Hayes Northup Stearns  
Hefley Norwood Stupak  
Herger Oberstar Sullivan  
Herseth Ortiz Tancredo  
Hinojosa Osborne Terry  
Honda Otter Thomas  
Hulshof Pastor Thornberry  
Jenkins Paul Tiahrt  
Kennedy (MN) Pearce Walden (OR)  
Kind Pence Wamp  
King (IA) Peterson (PA) Weldon (FL)  
Kingston Petri Westmoreland  
Knollenberg Pickering Wilson (NM)  
Kolbe Poe

## NOES—256

Abercrombie DeLauro Johnson (IL)  
Ackerman Dent Johnson, E. B.  
Aderholt Diaz-Balart, L. Jones (NC)  
Alexander Diaz-Balart, M. Jones (OH)  
Allen Dicks Kanjorski  
Andrews Doggett Kaptur  
Bachus Dreier Keller  
Baird Ehlers Kelly  
Baldwin Emanuel Kennedy (RI)  
Barrett (SC) Engel Kildee  
Bartlett (MD) English (PA) Kilpatrick (MI)  
Bass Eshoo King (NY)  
Bean Everett Kirk  
Becerra Farr Kline  
Berkley Fattah Kucinich  
Berman Ferguson Langevin  
Biggert Filner Lantos  
Bilbray Fitzpatrick (PA) Larson (CT)  
Bishop (NY) Foley LaTourette  
Blumenauer Forbes Leach  
Bono Ford Lee  
Boucher Fossella Levin  
Bradley (NH) Frank (MA) Lewis (GA)  
Brady (PA) Frelinghuysen Lewis (KY)  
Brown (OH) Gerlach Linder  
Brown (SC) Gibbons Lipinski  
Brown, Corrine Gilchrest LoBiondo  
Burgess Gillmor Lofgren, Zoe  
Burton (IN) Gonzalez Lowey  
Calvert Goode Lungren, Daniel  
Campbell (CA) Green, Al E.  
Cantor Green, Gene Lynch  
Capito Grijalva Maloney  
Capps Gutierrez Markey  
Capuano Hall Matsui  
Cardin Harman McCarthy  
Carnahan Hayworth McCollum (MN)  
Carson Hensarling McCotter  
Case Higgins McDermott  
Castle Hinchey McGovern  
Chabot Hobson McIntyre  
Chandler Hoekstra McNulty  
Clay Holden Meehan  
Clyburn Holt Meek (FL)  
Conyers Hoolley Meeks (NY)  
Costello Hostettler Michaud  
Cramer Hoyer Miller (NC)  
Crenshaw Hunter Miller, George  
Crowley Hyde Mollohan  
Cummings Inglis (SC) Moore (KS)  
Davis (AL) Inslee Moore (WI)  
Davis (CA) Israel Moran (VA)  
Davis (FL) Issa Murtha  
Davis (IL) Jackson (IL) Myrick  
Davis, Jo Ann Jackson-Lee Napolitano  
Davis, Tom (TX) Neal (MA)  
DeFazio Jefferson Ney  
DeGette Jindal Olver  
Delahunt Johnson (CT) Owens

Pallone Sanders Tierney  
Pascrell Saxton Turner  
Payne Schakowsky Udall (CO)  
Peterson (MN) Schiff Udall (NM)  
Pitts Schmidt Upton  
Platts Schwartz (PA) Van Hollen  
Porter Scott (GA) Velázquez  
Price (GA) Scott (VA) Visclosky  
Price (NC) Serrano Walsh  
Pryce (OH) Shaw Wasserman  
Rahall Shays Schultz  
Ramstad Sherman Waters  
Regula Shuster Watson  
Reichert Simmons Waxman  
Renzi Slaughter Weiner  
Reyes Smith (NJ) Weldon (PA)  
Reynolds Smith (WA) Weller  
Rogers (KY) Solis Wexler  
Rogers (MI) Spratt Whitfield  
Ros-Lehtinen Stark Wicker  
Rothman Sweeney Wilson (SC)  
Roybal-Allard Tanner Wolf  
Royce Tauscher Woolsey  
Ruppersberger Taylor (MS) Wu  
Rush Taylor (NC) Wynn  
Ryan (OH) Thompson (CA) Young (FL)  
Sabo Thompson (MS)  
Sanchez, Loretta Tiberi

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Obey

## NOT VOTING—26

Beauprez McKinney Pelosi  
Bilirakis Millender Rangel  
Doyle McDonald Sánchez, Linda  
Evans Miller (FL) T.  
Gallegly Miller, Gary Strickland  
Gohmert Murphy Towns  
Green (WI) Nadler Watt  
Harris Nunes Young (AK)  
Istook Nussle  
Johnson, Sam Oxley

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1440

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. MCINTYRE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 432, the King of Iowa amendment, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. THOMAS was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF FORMER MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BOB MATHIAS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of Mr. COSTA, Mr. NUNES and myself, I would like to advise the House that this past week an individual passed away, a former Member of the House of Representatives.

Some of you didn't have the privilege of knowing him in person, but all of you knew of him. Bob Mathias as a 17-year-old high school student went to London and came home with a gold medal in the decathlon. Four years later, he went to Helsinki and came home with a gold medal in the decathlon. Bob Mathias was a member of this House from 1966 to 1974.

Bob Mathias thought of himself as an ordinary person. Could we please, in recognition of an extraordinary human being, offer a moment of silence?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Members will rise and observe a moment of silence.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no other amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 503) to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 981, 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.

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

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 503 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to instruct on H.R. 5122, and the motion to permit closed conference meetings on H.R. 5122.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 263, noes 146, answered "present" 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

## AYES—263

Abercrombie	Capuano	Ehlers
Ackerman	Cardin	Emanuel
Aderholt	Carnahan	Engel
Alexander	Carson	English (PA)
Allen	Case	Eshoo
Andrews	Castle	Etheridge
Baca	Chabot	Everett
Bachus	Chandler	Farr
Baird	Clay	Fattah
Baldwin	Cleaver	Ferguson
Barrett (SC)	Clyburn	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Bartlett (MD)	Conyers	Foley
Bass	Costello	Forbes
Bean	Cramer	Fossella
Becerra	Crenshaw	Frank (MA)
Berkley	Crowley	Frelinghuysen
Berman	Cummings	Gerlach
Biggert	Davis (AL)	Gibbons
Bilbray	Davis (CA)	Gilchrest
Bishop (NY)	Davis (FL)	Gillmor
Blumenauer	Davis (IL)	Gonzalez
Bono	Davis (KY)	Goode
Boucher	Davis, Jo Ann	Green, Al
Bradley (NH)	Davis, Tom	Green, Gene
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Grijalva
Brown (OH)	DeGette	Gutierrez
Brown (SC)	Delahunt	Hall
Brown, Corrine	DeLauro	Harman
Burgess	Dent	Hart
Burton (IN)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hastings (FL)
Calvert	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hayworth
Campbell (CA)	Dicks	Hinchee
Capito	Doggett	Hobson
Capps	Dreier	Holt

Hooley  
Hostettler  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inglis (SC)  
Insee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Jefferson  
Jindal  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
King (NY)  
Kirk  
Kline  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lungren, Daniel E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy

McCullum (MN)  
McCotter  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Mica  
Michaud  
Millender-McDonald  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Ney  
Northrup  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Pitts  
Platts  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sabo  
Sanchez, Loretta

Sanders  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz (PA)  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Solis  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sweeney  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Turner  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (FL)

Shadegg  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Smith (TX)  
Snyder  
Sodrel

Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Tancredo  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt

Udall (CO)  
Walden (OR)  
Weldon (FL)  
Westmoreland  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)

Clyburn  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cuellar

Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
Jindal  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski

Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

NOT VOTING—22

Beauprez  
Bilirakis  
Doyle  
Evans  
Gallegly  
Green (WI)  
Harris  
Istook  
Johnson, Sam  
Lewis (CA)  
McKinney  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Nadler  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Rangel  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Strickland  
Towns  
Young (AK)

□ 1501

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that, because I was taking my children to their first day of school, I missed one vote on September 7, 2006. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on H. Res. 981 (Providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 503 to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption.)

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

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). The pending business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 5122 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 374, nays 30, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

YEAS—374

NOES—146

Akin  
Baker  
Barrow  
Barton (TX)  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Boyd  
Brady (TX)  
Brown-Waite, Ginny  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Camp (MI)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Cardoza  
Carter  
Chocola  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cubin  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis (TN)  
Deal (GA)  
Dingell  
Doolittle  
Drake

Duncan  
Edwards  
Emerson  
Feeney  
Filner  
Flake  
Ford  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Gutknecht  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth  
Higgins  
Hinojosa  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Honda  
Hulshof  
Jenkins  
Kind  
King (IA)  
Kingston  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Latham  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marshall

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bass  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart

Bilbray  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Boehlert  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd  
Bradley (NH)  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine

Brown-Waite, Ginny  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carson  
Carter  
Case  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Chocola  
Clay  
Cleaver

Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis (TN)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fitzpatrick (PA)  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Gerlach  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harman  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Herseth  
Higgins  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hostettler  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hyde  
Inglis (SC)  
Insee  
Israel

Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline  
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  
Lungren, Daniel E.  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul (TX)  
McCullum (MN)  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
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  
Myrick  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Ney  
Northrup  
Norwood  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Otter  
Owens  
Pallone

Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz (PA)  
Schwarz (MI)  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Sodrel  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters