

Saxton	Snyder	Udall (NM)
Schiff	Sodrel	Upton
Schmidt	Souder	Van Hollen
Schwartz (PA)	Spratt	Visclosky
Schwarz (MI)	Stearns	Walden (OR)
Scott (GA)	Stupak	Walsh
Sensenbrenner	Sullivan	Wamp
Sessions	Tancredo	Weldon (FL)
Shadegg	Tanner	Weldon (PA)
Shaw	Tauscher	Weller
Shays	Taylor (MS)	Westmoreland
Sherman	Taylor (NC)	Whitfield
Sherwood	Terry	Wicker
Shinkus	Thomas	Wilson (NM)
Shuster	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Simmons	Thompson (MS)	Wolf
Simpson	Thornberry	Wu
Slaughter	Tiahrt	Wynn
Smith (NJ)	Tiberi	Young (AK)
Smith (TX)	Turner	Young (FL)
Smith (WA)	Udall (CO)	

NAYS—65

Abercrombie	Lee	Pelosi
Ackerman	Levin	Rangel
Baldwin	Lewis (GA)	Rothman
Capps	Lofgren, Zoe	Rush
Capuano	Maloney	Sánchez, Linda
Carson	Markey	T.
Conyers	McDermott	Sanders
DeGette	McGovern	Schakowsky
Delahunt	Meehan	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Meeks (NY)	Serrano
Farr	Michaud	Solis
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Stark
Grijalva	Moore (WI)	Tierney
Gutierrez	Moran (VA)	Towns
Hastings (FL)	Nadler	Velázquez
Hinchey	Napolitano	Waters
Holt	Neal (MA)	Watson
Honda	Olver	Waxman
Jackson (IL)	Owens	Weiner
Jackson-Lee	Pallone	Wexler
(TX)	Pascarell	Woolsey
Kucinich	Pastor	
Lantos	Payne	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Green, Al Watt

NOT VOTING—18

Culberson	Filner	Skelton
Davis (FL)	Ford	Strickland
Davis (IL)	Fossella	Sweeney
Deal (GA)	Harris	Wasserman
Duncan	Kilpatrick (MI)	Schultz
Emerson	McKinney	
Evans	Radanovich	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG) (during the vote). The Chair announces that the time for resumption of proceedings on House Concurrent Resolution 190 and on H.R. 4944 is re-designated as tomorrow. After completion of the electronic vote now in progress, no other votes are planned for today.

□ 1926

Ms. PELOSI and Ms. CARSON and Messrs. LANTOS, TOWNS, HASTINGS of Florida, DELAHUNT, ROTHMAN, MORAN of Virginia and RANGEL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. ESHOO and Messrs. MARSHALL, OBERSTAR, KENNEDY of Rhode Island, REYNOLDS and CROWLEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CAPUANO changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, personal business requires my presence in the congressional district, and I am unable to be present for legislative business scheduled for today, Tuesday, March 14, 2006. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H. Con. Res. 354, a resolution expressing the support of Congress for requiring an institution of higher education to provide military recruiters access to the institution's campus and students at least equal in quality and scope to that which is provided to any other employer in order to be eligible for the receipt of certain Federal funds (rollcall No. 39).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 39, on H. Con. Res. 354, I was en route from my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4857

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 4857.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4297, TAX RELIEF EXTENSION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, under rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 4297, the tax reconciliation conference report.

The form of the motion is as follows:

I move that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4297 be instructed, to the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, to insist on a conference report which will neither increase the Federal budget deficit nor increase the amount of the debt subject to the public debt limit.

REPUBLICAN RECORD ON NATIONAL SECURITY

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, our first responsibility is to protect our country from all of those who wish to harm us. House Republicans have built a record of action on national security issues, supporting our military, providing for a strong national defense, and aggressively prosecuting the war on terror.

The PATRIOT Act that the President signed last week will give our law enforcement personnel the tools that they really need to continue to keep our Nation safe from terrorist threats. This week, we will take up another very important national security bill, the supplemental appropriations bill to fund the war on terror.

This bill provides for essential tools for our troops, such as armored Humvees and tracking vehicles, training for Iraqi and Afghani security forces, and it has increased oversight of war expenditures to ensure that taxpayers' dollars are spent wisely.

House Republicans remain committed to giving our troops the resources they need and funding, fighting, and winning the war on terror. We will continue to meet our obligation to defend our Nation from every threat, at home and abroad.

□ 1930

NEW SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to reintroduce the "Expand and Rebuild America's Schools Act," H.R. 4945.

This important piece of legislation would create a class of bonds that would provide for much-needed construction of new schools. The bonds will be targeted to help overcrowded, high growth rate schools that are struggling to provide a learning space for their students.

To be eligible to participate in this program, schools must be able to fulfill certain requirements: Schools must seek out more assistance from local, private businesses and corporations through public-private partnerships; they must demonstrate that programs to alleviate overcrowding have already been implemented; and they must have high growth rates and high teacher-to-student ratios.

My bill will help schools with limited financial resources combat their major overcrowding problems, and help stop the continuing infrastructure crisis in our schools.

If passed, this bill will provide local school districts with a real incentive to pass their own local school construction bonds. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this new school construction by cosponsoring the Expand and Rebuild America's Schools Act.

COMMENDING NORTH CAROLINA'S EIGHTH DISTRICT AMERICAN IDOL FINALISTS

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that not one but two talented individuals from the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina have made it to the final 12 on the hit show "American Idol." Stanly County's Kellie Pickler and Richmond County's Bucky Covington are using their God-given talents to compete and make their dreams come true. Both Kellie and Bucky's communities are

pulling for them, watching every week and dialing and texting as many votes as possible to keep them in the competition. Their local newspapers keep everyone informed of their progress on the show and their thoughts when the cameras are turned off.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Kelly and Bucky all the best. Even judge Simon Cowell cannot deny their talent and drive to compete.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THIRD CASE OF BSE IN UNITED STATES

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the United States' third case of BSE or mad cow disease was diagnosed. The first case was December 2003, which was a Canadian-born cow that was diagnosed in Washington State. The second case was last June, a cow from Texas, and now this latest case, a cow from Alabama, and it is assumed that it is at least 10 years old or older. If so, this cow was born before the 1997 feed ban went into effect, and that is significant because in 1997, it was decreed that no ruminant animal feed would be fed to livestock; and, of course, ruminant feed means it contains some parts of animal within the feed.

It is assumed BSE is acquired by an animal eating part of another animal that is BSE positive. As a result, we think that this feed ban should control the spread of BSE over time, but this apparently was an older animal that may have been prior to the ban.

Also, it is duly noted that roughly 150 people in the United Kingdom have died from a related disease to eating BSE-positive animals, so it is a concern.

So this leads to some questions:

Number one, is U.S. beef safe?

The answer is yes, despite this third case. Annually we slaughter roughly 35

million cows in the United States, and we have had three positive since 2003, and our testing system is sophisticated to the degree if there is one animal that is positive for BSE in 10 million cows, we would be 99 percent certain to find that one cow. So the testing, the surveillance has been ramped up considerably. We have tested 640,000 animals since June of 2004. Also, any animal in the United States that is slaughtered has the brains and spinal tissue removed, which is the tissue that normally carries the BSE prion.

The second question: Will this hurt beef exports from the United States?

The answer is it will certainly not help, and it may hurt to some degree. However, I think people around the world have become more familiar with BSE, what it is and how it can be prevented, and so it might not be quite as alarming as it was 2 or 3 years ago.

Japan closed their border to U.S. beef 3 years ago. The border was opened last December, and it was closed again in January due to a breach in our export procedures. So we have lost that market which is roughly \$1.4 billion a year in U.S. trade to Japan. A lot of this depends on confidence on the part of the Japanese public that we have rectified the problem. So this latest case is not going to help.

Hong Kong has also suspended beef imports from one U.S. packing plant here in the United States rather recently.

That leads us to the final question: What needs to be done?

It is very important that we have animal ID in the United States. Most other countries have it. We need to be able to determine where this animal from Alabama came from, what feed yard. It has only been on this one farm for 1 year, so the previous 9 years, where was it and what animals might have been contaminated along with it? Until we have that knowledge, until we have animal ID, it is going to be very difficult for us to maintain a positive trade climate around the world. So it is imperative that we begin to work on this and get this done as quickly as possible.

URGING CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF IRAQ

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, in order to solve the problem, you have to recognize that you have a problem in the first place.

For 3 years, the President and his administration contended that everything was going fine in Iraq, that we were winning, and they openly questioned the motivations and the patriotism of anyone who questioned or disagreed with them.

Now we are finally getting some straight talk from people who have been in the administration since the

very beginning. The U.S. Ambassador to Iraq says the country is nearing a civil war and we have opened "Pandora's box" by toppling Saddam Hussein.

Director of National Intelligence, John Negroponte said, "Even if a broad, inclusive national government emerges, there will almost certainly be a lag time before we see a dampening effect on the insurgency."

And today, General Peter Pace, the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said, "The Iraqi people themselves are standing at a crossroads, and they are making critical decisions for their country right now about which road they want to take," whether it is going to be a civil war or the road to democracy.

These are sobering assessments, but they were a welcome change from the standard White House line of everything is fine, everything is hunky-dory, we are winning in Iraq, the road to victory is in Iraq. In fact, we are at the precipice of a civil war. We are on the doorstep of a civil war.

Now that we have this honest talk finally, we are finding from people who are telling us what the beginnings were because we did not get here by accident. We got here by people not listening to the people on the ground. Our first ambassador, Paul Bremer, writes in a recent book, even on page 10, you don't even have to finish the book, he had asked for more troops. The President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense for years maintained nobody had asked for more troops. We had enough troops, if the generals needed more troops, they would have told us. Now the lead ambassador, the point man for the President of the United States, in fact, asked for more troops.

One of the big problems we had, we had 500,000 troops to get Iraq out of Kuwait, but somehow some genius over at the Department of Defense, that is the Secretary of Defense, thought you could do it for less than 100,000, both occupy Iraq, win a war in Iraq, and do it for less than 100,000 when we needed 500,000 just to get them out of Kuwait. In fact, somebody did ask for more troops, and the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense refused to listen to the ambassador, their point person.

That is not the only mistake they made. In fact, today, going back to one of the early days of the insurgency, we now realize from the last 2 days of The New York Times, generals were saying we had to not try to topple Iraq, we had to deal with the Feyhadeen. Otherwise, we are going to have the beginnings of an insurgency. The generals on the ground were overruled.

Again, contrary to the line, which is, we are going to listen to the generals and whatever they need, we did not listen to the generals. When we finally get to Baghdad and did finally topple the government, and there was all this chaos going on, the Secretary of Defense once again used his famous line