Committee and the Senate Finance Committee as progress is being made. But we need this one additional week to iron out the differences with the other body, and I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 2903

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

SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS AND SUSPENSION OF PERMANENT PRICE SUPPORT AUTHORITIES.

Effective April 25, 2008, section 1 of Public Law 110–196 (122 Stat. 653) (as amended by Public Law 110–200 (122 Stat. 695)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''April 25, 2008'' and inserting ''May 2, 2008''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''April 25, 2008'' and inserting ''May 2, 2008''.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLDEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1126 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2830.

□ 1240

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2830) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes, with Mrs. JONES of Ohio (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 110–604 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 110–604.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. MARKEY:

At the end of title VII add the following:

SEC. 708. REVIEW OF LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS FACILITIES.

(a) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—Consistent with other provisions of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security must notify the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission when a determination is made that the waterway to a proposed waterside liquefied natural gas facility is suitable or unsuitable for the marine traffic associated with such facility.

(b) FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION RESPONSE.—The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall respond to the Secretary's determination under subsection (a) by informing the Secretary within 90 days of notification or at the conclusion of any available appeal process, whichever is later, of what action the Commission has taken, pursuant to its authorities under the Natural Gas Act, regarding a proposal to construct and operate a waterside liquefied natural gas facility subject to a determination made under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1126, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chairman, it's good to see you back up in the Chair again. I'm glad that you have returned up there.

I would like to thank, first of all, Chairman JIM OBERSTAR, a great chairman of the Transportation Committee for his excellent work; Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON for his perspicacious leadership; to Chairman JOHN DINGELL, whose omniscient and ubiquitous presence on so many issues is always an essential ingredient in passing legislation of this magnitude.

And I encourage all of my colleagues to ensure that this commonsense provision, which will ensure that siting decisions for proposed LNG facilities are coordinated and informed by homeland security considerations.

My amendment requires the Department of Homeland Security to notify the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission of the Homeland Security Department's determination of whether the waterway to a proposed liquefied national gas facility is suitable for the marine traffic associated with the proposed facility.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in turn must respond to the Department of Homeland Security within 90 days or at the conclusion of any available appeals process of what the action the commission will take on the LNG application.

My amendment does not dispute the need for more LNG. We need more LNG. What my provision says is that before we build a new LNG facility, we must first make sure we are not creating a giant terrorist tiger. In Boston, we've always known that the LNG facility on land in my congressional district was a huge potential fire hazard. But after the September 11 attacks, when we learned how many terrorists had actually gotten off the LNG ships themselves in Boston coming in from overseas, we learned that it was a huge potential terrorist tiger.

In the face of this kind of risk, my provision mandates that we should have the Homeland Security Department involved at the beginning when any new LNG facilities are being proposed so that the department can assess the potential homeland security risk of building one of these facilities before we blindly move forward to put more LNG terminals in various parts of the country.

The need for coordination between the Coast Guard and the commission was recently reinforced in Fall River, Massachusetts. In Fall River, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission approved the construction of an LNG facility in 2005. Two years later, the Coast Guard determined that the waterway was not suitable for the marine traffic associated with it. So we have a situation where the FERC has approved a license for the LNG facility that the Coast Guard says, 2 years later, shouldn't be built because the waterway to the facility is not suitable.

□ 1245

But despite this action by the Coast Guard, which effectively blocks the facility, the FERC license remains in place. This lack of coordination makes no sense.

There currently is an interagency agreement among the FERC, the Coast Guard and the Office of Pipeline Safety that is supposed to coordinate efforts on the siting of LNG facilities and safety and security issues associated with proposed sites. But as the review process for the proposed LNG facility in Fall River makes clear, more structure and a timeline is needed to make sure that there is better coordination so that the FERC is not approving proposed facilities only to have the Coast Guard, years later, reject the proposals due to concerns over the suitability of the waterway to the facilities.

At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, though I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. It was truly delightful to hear the discourse of the gentleman from Massachusetts, perspicacious, omniscient. It is rare that tediological inquiries occur in this body. And for that reason, it is rare to hear such felicitous language used in discourse on the floor, especially important on this aftermath, the day

after the 444th celebration of the birth of Shakespeare. I thank the gentleman for his distinguished presentation.

Madam Chairman, I would be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the chairman for yielding. We are also prepared to accept this amendment. We think it's a good amendment.

Although I was very taken by the gentleman from Massachusetts' prose, I would indicate we did have a pretty extensive hearing in the Coast Guard Subcommittee on this particular bridge and this waterway up in Fall River. I'm never caught short about the imagination of the Massachusetts delegation.

Just to be clear, the FERC approval of that site was based upon one bridge. After the delegation applied for the construction of a new bridge and there was a proposal to demolish the old bridge 100 yards from the new bridge, the Massachusetts delegation has fallen in love with this old bridge. As a result, it is not a navigable waterway. That was the basis for the Coast Guard's decision in this matter. I congratulate Mr. MARKEY for not only his good amendment but also the Massachusetts delegation in general for their ingenious work.

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

Mr. MARKEY. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute.

Mr. MARKEY. The purpose of my amendment is not the prevention of LNG facilities, but rather to promote coordinate between the Coast Guard and the FERC in siting. We have two other offshore facilities which we are also going to be licensing in Massachusetts. We need more LNG. We just want to make sure that there is good policy, good sense, good coordination.

Again, it's my great honor to have the support of the polysyllabic professor of transportation legislation, the gentleman from Minnesota, who has a mastery of the English language that when the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is reviewed, no matter how many compound, complex sentences that he utters, they always parse. And that's a special gift that the chairman has. In the area of transportation that is so complex, we need people with those abilities to be able to put together complex policies as he does. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for those thoughtful remarks.

I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished Chair of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 3½ minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chairman, I rise in full support of this amendment. It is another one of those makes-sense amendments that strengthens the legislation.

We have a situation here where currently, under an existing memorandum of understanding between FERC and the Coast Guard, the Coast Guard already provides the results of its waterway suitability reports to FERC. This amendment would simply codify that practice. The amendment would then require FERC to inform the Secretary of the actions the commission has taken regarding the proposed terminal's application.

It simply makes sense. We've got to have the Coast Guard and FERC working together. Of course the Coast Guard determines suitability of the waterway leading into the location where the LNG is going to be, and then of course FERC takes a look at other things. So the combination of them working together is so very, very, very important, and so we wholeheartedly support the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. ZOE LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 110–604.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 8 offered by Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

At the end of title VII add the following:

SEC. ___. USE OF SECONDARY AUTHENTICATION FOR TRANSPORTATION SECURITY CARDS.

The Secretary of Homeland Security may use a secondary authentication system for individuals applying for transportation security cards when fingerprints are not able to be taken or read to enhance transportation security.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1126, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment is a simple one. It allows the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to use a secondary authentication system to verify the identity of individuals who are applying for transportation worker identification credentials when those individuals have failed in their biometric verification due to the quality of their fingerprints.

Since this is the Department of Homeland Security, these credentials are called TWICs. And it is necessary currently, in the bill and under law, to have your fingerprints taken to enroll to get this TWIC. However, and this is very interesting, Stanford University has done the research. It turns out that about 5 percent of the population is unable to have their fingerprints taken. Now the reasons for this can be many; genetics, age, there is an ethnicity component, illness, hard labor. And when that happens, what that means is that individuals who would otherwise need the card will not be able to get the card unless this amendment is adopted.

I'll give you an example of an individual who has been impacted. George Thomas of Houston, Texas. Mr. Thomas is 85 years old and he is the president of Higman Marine Services. Higman Marine has been in the inland towing business since 1917. When Mr. Thomas applied for his TWIC card, he was told that his skin was too thin to have his fingerprints read and to come back in a couple of months to apply again. Well, what happens to Mr. Thomas, his company, and all his employees? What happens to his business without the president able to comply with TWIC requirements through no fault of his own?

The TWIC procedure already requires TSA to send pertinent parts of the enrollment record to the FBI as well as within the Department of Homeland Security so that appropriate terrorist threat, criminal history and immigration checks can be performed. This amendment authorizes the Secretary of DHS to perform a secondary check if a person's prints cannot be read instead of telling them to come back in a couple of months. This would mean an additional check of the name, but in the future, when the technology has been accepted for broad use, it could also include the use of other biometrics, such as iris, facial or retina scans, voice recognition and the like. It merely gives discretion to the Secretary to either do the name check, or use alternative biometrics.

The point of this amendment is to enhance security, but also to allow workers who are applying for TWIC to avoid being rejected unfairly.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment as well as the underlying bill. I would like to thank the chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR, and also Mr. CUMMINGS for their wonderful work on this bill.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control the time in opposition although I will not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Chairman, we're prepared to accept this amendment, although I must say we have concerns about the overall effect

the language will have on the requirements under the Transportation Worker Identification Credential program and port security levels in general.

As we all know, and the committee has received voluminous testimony, TWIC readers will not be available for some time. However, in my opinion, we should not relax identification requirements once the readers are in place in our Nation's ports. The evidence at the committee is that we're not dealing with an unknown universe of individuals, we're dealing with a universe anywhere from 750,000 to 1.5 million people who will eventually come and require a TWIC card.

I look forward to working with Representative ZOE LOFGREN and commend her on behalf of this 85-year-old gentleman, and others, for bringing this matter to our attention. I look forward to working with Chairman OBERSTAR and Chairman CUMMINGS and Representative ZOE LOFGREN in the conference to perhaps tweak the TWIC language and make sure that we're not saying that, in fact, the alternative identification measures are biometric, and they're not saying that we're going to use someone's driver's license as a substitute for those procedures.

I look forward to the conference, and would be happy to yield to the chairman for his observations on the amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I share those concerns.

Lockheed Martin, which has the contractor responsibility for issuance of TWIC cards, has reported that fingerprint rejection rate due to poor print quality has been in the range of 2 percent. If you happen to be one of those 2 percent, then you really have a problem. And so that requires those who are rejected to keep coming back to an enrollment center. And the amendment would alleviate mariners from having to make several trips.

I remember myself, when I was working my way through college, I was working at a concrete block factory. I eventually wore out gloves and I said I can't afford any more gloves, so I just moved the concrete blocks with my hands until eventually I had such thick calluses I had no fingerprint whatever, no markings on any of my fingers. It took months afterwards, back in college, to shed those calluses. So I can imagine workers on the docks and all having similar problems. And I think this relief for mariners will be very, very beneficial.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I would ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if he has any observations.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I support this amendment, also.

Under section 7–105 of title 46, United States Code, the Department of Homeland Security is required to issue a biometric credential to individuals who are authorized to have unescorted access to secure areas, vessels and facilities. And some people are unable to accomplish that. I was just talking to my aid, who said that she went to see the rollout and they didn't pick up her fingerprints, which was a bad day for them. And so I think we have to address this.

We will work to ensure that this amendment would not alter the standards in which a TWIC is issued in any way; however, we need to provide options for individuals whose fingerprints, like my aid's, cannot be used to authenticate the cards.

I strongly support the amendment, and we will tweak the TWIC. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the chairman and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. At this point, I would also like to thank Chairman THOMPSON of the Homeland Security Committee for his hard work on this bill.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Representative ZOE LOFGREN. As you know, in order to obtain a TWIC, a port worker must be fingerprinted. The problem is that it's not always possible to get an image of the person's fingerprint, as has been mentioned a few minutes ago. From excessive sweating to dry skin, all of that can impede the capture of a useable fingerprint. Dry skin is a common occurrence, age, genetics, disease can also cause dry skin. We need to address this.

As you know, the TSA is supposed to issue credentials to at least 850,000 workers by the end of September. Because of these limitations, we need to have a plan, TSA needs to have a plan, and this is why this amendment is important. A person's skin should not prevent them from getting credentialed for a job that they need. I urge support of this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time?

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Chairman, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I would indicate to the gentlelady that if you're prepared to close, I will yield back when you're done.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Before I yield back, let me just note that I have no motivation to weaken the security of the——

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will suspend.

The Chair would note that the gentlewoman from California has the right to close.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Then I am happy to yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1300

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Because the gentleman is not managing time in opposition, the proponent has the right to close.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I just want to be clear as we move forward, Madam Chairman. This has happened a couple of times. And I am not questioning the ruling of the Chair, but a couple of times, the chairman of the committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, has risen to claim time in opposition without being opposed to the amendment and has claimed the right to close, and I just want to make sure we're all squared away.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The assertions of a Member from the floor are not rulings.

Mr. LATOURETTE. No. You're doing a great job and making great rulings. I just want to be clear as we move forward, because we have about six more amendments. It is my understanding that the chairman closed because he was defending the position of the committee, which I'm doing. If that's not the ruling of the Chair, I'm happy to live with the ruling of the excellent Chair, but I just want to make sure we're squared away.

But in the meantime, I'm yielding back my time.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Chairman, I will just note there is not much of a closing. We are in agreement on this amendment. I appreciate the support. I look forward to working further on this.

Certainly, we don't want to weaken our security, but we don't want hardworking people who just can't get their fingerprints taken to be put out of a job. So we are of one mind on this. I thank the committee, all the Members.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 110–604.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. BISHOP of New York:

At the end of title VII add the following:

SEC. ___. REPORT ON STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AUGMENTATION OF COAST GUARD RESOURCES WITH RESPECT TO SECURITY ZONES AND UNITED STATES PORTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the extent to which State and local law enforcement entities are augmenting Coast Guard resources by enforcing Coast Guard-imposed security

zones around vessels transiting to, through, or from United States ports and conducting port security patrols. At a minimum, the report shall specify–

(1) the number of ports in which State and local law enforcement entities are providing any services to enforce Coast Guard-imposed security zones around vessels transiting to, through, or from United States ports or to conduct security patrols in United States ports;

(2) the number of formal agreements entered into between the Coast Guard and State and local law enforcement entities to engage State and local law enforcement entities in the enforcement of Coast Guard-imposed security zones around vessels transiting to, through, or from United States ports or the conduct of port security patrols in United States ports, the duration of those agreements, and the aid that State and local entities are engaged to provided through these agreements;

(3) the extent to which the Coast Guard has set national standards for training, equipment, and resources to ensure that State and local law enforcement entities engaged in enforcing Coast Guard-imposed security zones around vessels transiting to, through, or from United States ports or in conducting port security patrols in United States ports (or both) can deter to the maximum extent practicable a transportation security incident (as that term is defined in section 70101 of title 46, United States Code);

(4) the extent to which the Coast Guard has assessed the ability of State and local law enforcement entities to carry out the security assignments which they have been engaged to perform, including their ability to meet any national standards for training, equipment, and resources that have been established by the Coast Guard in order to ensure that these entities can deter to the maximum extent practicable a transportation security incident (as that term is defined in section 70101 of title 46, United States Code);

(5) the extent to which State and local law enforcement entities are able to meet national standards for training, equipment, and resources established by the Coast Guard to ensure that those entities can deter to the maximum extent practicable a transportation security incident (as that term is defined in section 70101 of title 46, United States Code);

(6) the differences in law enforcement authority, and particularly boarding authority, between the Coast Guard and State and local law enforcement entities, and the impact that these differences have on the ability of State and local law enforcement entities to provide the same level of security that the Coast Guard provides during the enforcement of Coast Guard-imposed security zones and the conduct of security patrols in United States ports; and

(7) the extent of resource, training, and equipment differences between State and local law enforcement entities and the Coast Guard units engaged in enforcing Coast Guard-imposed security zones around vessels transiting to, through, or from United States ports or conducting security patrols in United States ports.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1126, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me start by thanking Chairman OBERSTAR and Chairman CUMMINGS and Ranking Member LATOURETTE for their leadership and tireless advocacy on behalf of the Coast Guard. I would also like to express my gratitude for the invaluable service provided by our exemplary Coast Guardsmen and women every day.

My amendment would require the Coast Guard to study the extent to which State and local law enforcement augment Coast Guard resources by enforcing Coast Guard-imposed security zones around vessels transiting to and from U.S. ports and conducting port security patrols. The amendment requires the Coast Guard to study and clarify their relationship with local law enforcement, the standards set to ensure that local law enforcement of Coast Guard security zones can deter a security incident. The amendment also seeks to identify the differences in law enforcement authority, particularly boarding authority, between the Coast Guard and local law enforcement. This amendment is necessary given evidence that the Coast Guard is overextended around the country.

A 2007 GAO report states that the assistance the Coast Guard already receives from State and local law enforcement is vital to meet security requirements with limited resources.

Some may point to this as a vindication of local law enforcement's ability to share in the responsibilities of protecting hazardous cargo from potential threats. I would argue that the GAO has shed a light on a more fundamental issue: a lack of adequate Coast Guard resources and a potential new role for local law enforcement that has historically been reserved for the Coast Guard. This issue requires increased scrutiny.

After 9/11 and the absorption of the Coast Guard by the Department of Homeland Security, considerable strain was placed on Coast Guard resources. This shortfall is apparent as dozens of LNG proposals across the country compete for Coast Guard resources to make waterways suitable for hazardous cargo. The Coast Guard on several occasions has expressed its concerns to Congress about the proliferation of LNG proposals that require extensive Coast Guard oversight. The limited public discussion about who should provide these resources has led to unanswered questions. Is this something that should be passed on to the consumer through the price of goods? Is this a local responsibility? Is this a Federal responsibility? This amendment begins the dialogue necessary to clarify what ratio of responsibility is appropriate to protect hazardous cargo.

It is vital to maritime security to determine the role local law enforcement should play in protecting hazardous cargo so that, as policymakers, we can determine exactly what the Coast Guard needs to protect and preserve America's waterways.

Madam Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I want to start by thanking the Chair and the Parliamentarian for clarification of a rule of the House that somehow escaped my understanding, and it was interesting to have that explanation. I apologize to the gentleman from Ohio if we had some missteps even to the advantage of the committee.

Of course, I support the amendment, as I said at the outset. It's a study and report amendment to provide a critical assessment of how much the Coast Guard has done to establish standards for State and local law enforcement units that perform maritime patrols and the extent to which law enforcement can meet those standards. I think it's useful to have that information.

Madam Chairman, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the chairman very much for yielding.

Madam Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment and are pleased to accept it. I want to congratulate Mr. BISHOP, a valued member of the committee and the subcommittee.

This will require the Coast Guard to report on the use and qualification of State and local officials used in a security capacities at LNG facilities.

I would just remark parenthetically that I assume that the chairman was able to close because he is much more revered in the institution than I am, and I accept that and I also agree with that assessment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman. I think we got away with one for a while.

Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished Chair of the subcommittee.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I fully support this amendment by Mr. BISHOP, the Vice Chair of our subcommittee.

This amendment would require the Coast Guard to detail the extent to which State and local law enforcement entities are augmenting Coast Guard resources by conducting port security patrols and by aiding in the enforcement of Coast Guard-imposed security zones around vessels entering our ports.

While I have the utmost respect for State and local law enforcement, the subcommittee is concerned that such entities may be undertaking maritime patrols to augment the Coast Guard's resources without having previously had experience performing law enforcement functions on the water and without fully understanding what it takes to respond to the unique threats that

confront our Nation in the maritime environment.

The study required by Mr. BISHOP's amendment would provide the critical assessment that is needed both of whether the Coast Guard has established adequate training, resource, and equipment standards for State and local law enforcement units performing maritime patrols and the extent to which law enforcement can meet these standards.

I fully support the amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chairman, let me simply close by thanking Chairman OBERSTAR and Chairman CUMMINGS and Mr. LATOURETTE for their support of this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 110–604.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk that has been made in order by the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

Strikes titles X and XI.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1126, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am offering this amendment because I am concerned about the intent and the function of title X and title XI. I would like to seek some clarification from the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, my friend from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), if he would join me in a discussion.

Mr. OBERSTAR, with respect to title X, I'm concerned that if we transfer 80 percent of the funding for the Coast Guard Administrative Law Judge functions to the National Transportation Safety Board, the Coast Guard will not be able to manage the appeals process of any of the truck, rail, and port workers who might be denied the Transportation Worker Identification Credential, or TWIC, card. My concern is that we will create a bottleneck in the appeals process, effectively slowing TWIC appeals and preventing American workers from gainful employment while appeals are adjudicated.

Can you assure us that when this bill emerges from conference that you will make sure that the Coast Guard retains sufficient resources to address the expected TWIC appeal workload resulting from the million workers that are applying?

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Certainly it's our intention to protect the resources of the Coast Guard. We will work to assure that when a bill emerges from conference that there will be sufficient change, that we will not elevate one mission above any other critical Coast Guard mission.

And as further clarification, it was simply a request from NTSB that at least for 1 year we transfer adequate funds to start off. So the legislation limits that transfer of dollars to 1 year, and we will work to assure the strengthening of that language to make sure that that's only for 1 year. And then in the meantime, as I said in an earlier discussion on this matter, we will go to the Appropriations Committee, I hope in a bipartisan effort, to ask them to provide sufficient additional funding for the Coast Guard to continue to carry out its missions.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank you for that assurance. It's certainly a huge issue, as far as I'm concerned, as we deal with Homeland Security and TWIC cards. So I greatly appreciate the chairman's assurance of that, and I'm looking forward to that bipartisan effort. We, unfortunately, don't have enough bipartisanship and bipartisan effort here; so I thank the chairman for that.

Reclaiming my time, Madam Chairman, with respect to title XI, I'm concerned that the current language might give the appearance of elevating the Coast Guard's marine safety mission above its other critical missions, such as search and rescue, national defense, and port security.

Can you confirm for me, Mr. Chairman, that it is not your intent to elevate this one mission above other missions that are critical for the Coast Guard?

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is certainly not our intent to elevate marine safety. Marine safety is one of several functions of the Coast Guard. But as I said in earlier debates, when Mr. YOUNG, then chairman of the committee, and I were at the White House at the earliest stages of creating the Department of Homeland Security, we raised this issue at the White House and said, You're not making clear enough distinction between the homeland security role of the Coast Guard and the other functions, search and rescue, marine safety, aid in navigation, and so on. So we're now providing that clear delineation, assuring there are adequate resources, providing additional personnel to the Coast Guard, the first really substantial increase in Coast Guard personnel since I came to Congress in 1975. And I'm really insistent on this, that we do not elevate above that but that we clearly delineate the marine safety function of the Coast Guard.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Certainly that's important.

And reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his assurances, and I appreciate his willingness to engage in this dialogue to clarify the intent of these two titles and his commitment to work with me in conference to ensure that the Coast Guard has the authorities and resources it needs to secure our homeland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to say that we are very concerned, as you are, and please note that no TWIC applicants have requested an ALJ hearing as of April 13.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia's time has expired.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Chairman, I would like to claim the time in opposition to the amendment even though I am not opposed and would continue to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I want to join with Chairman OBERSTAR in strongly opposing this amendment. But we do plan to work with the gentleman on this.

Title X grants mariners a ''change of venue'' when they appeal the suspension and revocation of their professional credentials from an Administrative Law Judge system controlled by the very same Coast Guard that is seeking to take their credentials to a system located in a neutral agency, the National Transportation Safety Board.

□ 1315

I note that title X would move only Coast Guard suspension and revocation cases to NTSB. All other cases currently heard by the Coast Guard ALJ, including cases from TSA, would be unaffected by title X. I know that the concerns have been raised by the gentleman and that the changes proposed in title X would leave the Coast Guard ALJ program without the resources to handle the TSA, but we certainly question that. However, I note that the cases heard by the Coast Guard's ALJ for TSA and for other agencies, like NOAA, are heard on a cost reimbursement basis. Title X would continue to allow agencies to reimburse the Coast Guard ALJ for the costs associated with adjudication of those cases

Further, I'd note that since TSA was established, that agency has filed 504

civil penalty cases with the Coast Guard ALJ, 60 cases remain pending, a total of 230 cases did not proceed to an adjudication. Orders granting motions for a decision were issued in 156 cases, and dismissal orders were granted in four cases.

Finally, let me say this. No TWIC applicants have requested an ALJ hearing as of April 13, though there have been 230 enrollments, and they started enrolling back in October of 2007. Decisions and orders were issued in only 54 cases, which would be an average of about nine cases per year.

So, again, we have the same concerns, and I hope you understand why this even came about, because we have some very painful testimony from mariners about how they felt that the system was already set up against them before they got into the hearing room. And we had testimony from Administrative Law Judges who were concerned that an atmosphere of unfairness was being pushed upon them by those who may have been above them.

So I think that the ranking member and I and other members of our committee agreed that we needed to do something, and we thought this was the best vehicle. We have the same concerns that you have.

With that, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATOURETTE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. My concern was that the GAO is going to investigate any improprieties within the current Administrative Law Judge System, and that GAO report hasn't been completed. This just seems premature. That is what drew my concern, and I appreciate the chairman's assurances.

With that, I have got one more statement.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Reclaiming my time for a minute, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Georgia is going to ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment, and I want to express my appreciation because the amendment, from my perspective, is problematic. We do concur in the concerns that have been expressed in the colloquy between the chairman and Mr. BROUN, and I want to congratulate Dr. BROUN as another new Member of the House who has really stepped up to the plate and brought important issues before this body.

I would tell the gentleman that we did have some pretty illuminating hearings on the Administrative Law Judge, and the current Acting Chairman and I both served as prosecuting attorneys, she was also a judge, and I would tell you that my experience, and I think she would echo this, is that people can accept when they come into a forum if they lose, as long as they believe that they have lost fairly. The testimony that we received was that there are a number of people that don't have that feeling going in. It was our hope by making this small adjustment that even when they are ruled against, they will say, I got my day in court.

That was the objective. I do appreciate the gentleman's concern. I promise him that we will continue to work on it as it goes to conference.

I would be happy to yield once again to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I submit for the RECORD two letters, a statement from the Commandant of the Coast Guard, as well as the letter from TSA stating their concern on these titles.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD,

Washington, DC, April 23, 2008.

Hon. JAMES L. OBERSTAR,

Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OBERSTAR: On April 18, the Committee filed with the Rules Committee an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2830, that would be retitled the ''Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2008.'' During numerous meetings and staff-level discussions over several months, we have described how a number of provisions that appear in this amendment would compromise organizational efficiency and operational effectiveness, diminish my command and control, and ultimately reduce the Coast Guard's effectiveness in carrying out its safety, security, and stewardship missions. We have expressed these and other concerns in Department of Homeland Security views letters concerning earlier bill language. The amendment also contains provisions neither previously shared nor discussed with the Coast Guard.

One provision requiring that the Coast Guard provide security around liquefied natural gas terminals and tankers is contrary to the existing assistance framework, at odds with accepted risk management practices, and would divert finite Coast Guard assets from other high-priority missions. I recommend a broader discussion of security measures for all extremely hazardous cargoes. In the Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 2830, the Administration has stated that, if the bill is presented to the President with this provision, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Among the others is one that, while similar to the Administration's proposal, fails to authorize the President to appoint officers to positions of importance and responsibility to accommodate organizational change in the future (Admirals and Vice Admirals). Others, primarily involving our important marine safety mission, would statutorily fix the designation and duties of other senior Coast Guard officials and officials at all levels of command, and prescribe inflexible personnel qualification requirements. Still other provisions would diminish the Coast Guard's capacity to adjudicate merchant mariner licensing matters efficiently and effectively and support other vital security adjudications of the Department of Homeland Security (Appeals to National Transportation Safety Board). Still more provisions would prescribe contracting and acquisition practices for the Deepwater program, thereby increasing the cost of, and adding delay to, the Deepwater acquisition process, as well as circumventing the review and approval authority of Coast Guard technical authorities (Coast Guard Integrated Deepwater Program).

Among the new provisions is one that dramatically alters admission procedures for the U.S. Coast Guard Academy. While I have discussed Academy admissions several times with Chairman Cummings and we agree that our process should yield successful cadets and reflect our diverse society, the proposed Congressional nomination process deserves full discussion and deliberate consideration. Other new provisions that affect how we execute our missions deserve similar scrutiny. Conversely, the bill omits the Administration proposal for much needed enhanced authority to prosecute those who would smuggle undocumented aliens into the United States by sea (Maritime Alien Smuggling Law Enforcement Act) and the Administration's proposal to protect seafarers who participate in investigations and adjudication of environmental crimes or who have been abandoned in the United States (Protection of and fair treatment of seafarers).

Over the last year in the course of hearings, personal meetings with you, and regional forums with industry, as well as in my public statements, I have assured you and the public that we share a common objective: a robust marine safety program suited to meet the evolving demands of industry and the marine public. I am already taking aggressive steps to right the balance between our marine safety mission and our other vital responsibilities, and improve the effectiveness, consistency, and responsiveness of our marine safety program, consistent with the framework I presented to you last September. Legislation such as the provisions I describe above was unnecessary to start this process. As I have stated on several occasions, I am the Commandant and am accountable to you to produce the changes needed to improve program performance.

Including these provisions and others in an Authorization Act that would otherwise be welcome compels me to strongly oppose the bill.

Sincerely,

T.W. ALLEN,

Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard Commandant.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Arlington, VA, April 22, 2008.

Hon. PETER T. KING,

Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KING: I am writing to express the Transportation Security Administration's (TSA) strong opposition to Title X—Appeals to National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) of the manager's amendment to H.R. 2830, the ''Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2007.'' Title X would transfer Coast Guard Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) authority for review of merchant mariner documentation and 80 percent of the Coast Guard ALJ budget to the NTSB. This could have an adverse impact upon the adjudication of TSA's civil enforcement cases and anticipated cases dealing with the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) program.

TSA questions whether sufficient legal, administrative, and budget resources will continue to be provided to the Coast Guard to support its remaining ALJ functions, including adjudication of TSA security cases.

For more than 5 years, TSA has been extremely well served by the Coast Guard ALJs as fair, impartial, and responsive adjudicators in security cases involving individuals in the transportation sector. Under an interagency agreement, Coast Guard ALJs play a major role in TSA's enforcement and security credentialing programs. They adjudicate aviation security civil penalty cases,

Hazardous Materials Endorsement (HME) and TWIC denials of requests for waivers and appeals from individuals who have received a Final Determination of Threat Assessment; appeals by air cargo workers who have received a Final Determination of Threat Assessment; and appeals by individuals holding or applying for Federal Aviation Administration certificates, ratings, or authorizations who have received a Final Determination of Threat Assessment.

In the absence of sufficient ALJ legal and administrative resources at the Coast Guard, TSA does not regard NTSB ALJs as a good alternative. Coast Guard ALJs have substantial expertise in fair adjudication of security programs. NTSB ALJs do not have expertise in transportation security matters. As TSA continually expands the implementation of the TWIC program and the Coast Guard enforces it at our Nation's seaports, TSA and TWIC applicants will benefit from the substantial experience Coast Guard ALJs have in the maritime security environment.

In addition, Coast Guard ALJs have been sensitive to the challenges faced by individuals representing themselves in a formal administrative process and have worked with TSA to develop simplified procedures.

TSA and Coast Guard have worked together for years to establish caseload management procedures, agreements, and funding processes to efficiently handle TSA cases. For example, the Coast Guard serves as TSA's Docketing Center for its formal hearing process. Shifting the workload to ALJs of another agency would create a huge setback for TSA enforcement and administration. ALJ coverage, budgeting, processing time, and even geographic availability would have to be reassessed and reestablished, a process that may take several years.

In addition, TSA's HME and TWIC are fee-based programs. TSA developed its fee models based on Coast Guard cost estimates and processing models. If conditions necessitate TSA's seeking ALJ services outside Coast Guard, this could affect program costs, and consequently, fees for applicants.

I would appreciate your consideration of TSA's concerns about the potential adverse impact of Title X on the efficient adjudication of important TSA security cases.

Identical letters have been sent to the Chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee as well as the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Please do not hesitate to contact Ms. Claire Heffernan, Acting Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, at (571) 227–2717 if you have any questions about this matter.

Sincerely yours,

KIP HAWLEY,
Assistant Secretary.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. CUELLAR

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 110–604.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. CUELLAR:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____—ADDITIONAL MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. ____. MISSION REQUIREMENT ANALYSIS FOR NAVIGABLE PORTIONS OF THE RIO GRANDE RIVER, TEXAS, INTERNATIONAL WATER BOUNDARY.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall prepare a mission requirement analysis for the navigable portions of the Rio Grande River, Texas, international water boundary. The analysis shall take into account the Coast Guard's involvement on the Rio Grande River by assessing Coast Guard missions, assets, and personnel assigned along the Rio Grande River. The analysis shall also identify what would be needed for the Coast Guard to increase search and rescue operations, migrant interdiction operations, and drug interdiction operations.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1126, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. Thank you, Madam Chair. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR and also Chairman CUMMINGS and the ranking member from Ohio for the work that they have done on this particular bill, and also, Chairman THOMPSON, from the Committe on Homeland Security, for the work that they did on this bill together.

I also understand, Madam Chair, that this amendment is acceptable both to the majority and the minority, and it's also bipartisan. I believe Congressman MCCAUL will be speaking on this amendment in a few minutes.

Madam Chair, today the U.S. House of Representatives has an opportunity to improve the important and critical mission of the United States Coast Guard. One of the Coast Guard's most important functions is providing safety and security in international waters. I was born in Laredo, Texas. Laredo is located on the international border between the United States and Mexico. Our border is divided by the international waters called the Rio Grande River.

There have been many efforts to improve security along the U.S.-Mexico border. Some of those partnerships between the local and Federal Government law enforcement agencies have proven to be beneficial. The border security responsibilities shared by law enforcement departments are complicated for the first responders from the local communities that are located on the international waters of the Rio Grande. The safety of the international boundary is a national security concern, as the level of violence in Mexico increases and spills across the border. Drugs, cash, and people continue to cross the border into the United States, despite our efforts.

I am consistently asked and contacted by local officials in my district who are asking for more support in their border security effort, specifically for help in patrolling the international waters of the Rio Grande. Unfortunately, the local law enforcement agencies and the border patrol have limited resources for patrolling the international water boundary. As the Rio Grande represents over 1,200 miles of international border, I believe that it is time to address the critical need to provide security on the Rio Grande River and not just along the shores of the Rio Grande River.

My amendment would charge the U.S. Coast Guard to analyze what the current mission is along the international waters, including personnel and assets assessment. My amendment also asks the U.S. Coast Guard to identify what resources will be needed to increase the Coast Guard presence along the international boundary.

Madam Chair, there has been many discussions as to how to best secure the United States border along with Mexico. My amendment would simply allow us to consider the possibility of increasing the Coast Guard's presence in the area of unquestionable, the international waters of the Rio Grande River.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I ask for unanimous consent to claim time, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. I rise in support of this amendment. I want to commend my colleague, Congressman CUELLAR, for bringing this amendment to the floor, and I am honored to support it. He has a great deal of expertise in this area. We have traveled to the border towns together, both on the United States side and in Mexico, and I met with law enforcement on both sides of the aisle and with government officials and we served on the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Group. He understands the importance of security at the border, and particularly in the post 9/11 world.

Currently, there is little Coast Guard presence on international waterways shared with Mexico. This amendment would require the United States Coast Guard to provide an analysis of their mission strength for the navigable portions of the Rio Grande River in Texas. The amendment also asks the U.S. Coast Guard to identify what resources would be needed to increase the Coast Guard's presence along the international boundary of the Rio Grande River.

One of the Coast Guard's most important functions is providing safety and security in international waters, and the safety of the international border is a national security concern as the level of violence in Mexico increases and continues to spill across our border. Contraband and undocumented people continue to pass and cross the

border into the United States, despite our best efforts. This amendment may also pave the way for future studies assessing the need for Coast Guard presence in other areas of the United States where waterways are shared on the border of Mexico and with Canada.

So having said that, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. CUELLAR, for bringing this amendment, and I rise in support.

I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are not opposed to this amendment. We are willing to accept the amendment, which requires the Coast Guard to develop mission needs down on the Rio Grande. I want to congratulate Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. MCCAUL, who looks remarkably like Mr. FORTENBERRY, for bringing this amendment before the House. We accept it.

Mr. CUELLAR. I just want to thank again the Chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR; Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, the ranking member from Ohio, and of course the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

I yield the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. KIRK

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 110–604.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. KIRK:

Page 184, line 22, after ''subparagraph (A)'' insert ''or (B).''

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1126, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. I rise in strong support of the underlying legislation, which provides critical protection for our Nation's waterways. For the first time, this legislation requires ballast water treatment of ships entering the Great Lakes, which claim to have no ballast water on board. These ships were previously not subject to any exchange or treatment requirements, and that created a massive loophole through which invasive species were introduced in our precious Great Lakes. I am very happy that this provision, similar to one I authored with Mr. EMANUEL in H.R. 801, will close this dangerous and expensive loophole that, unfortunately, has so radically changed the Great Lakes environment.

However, there is another loophole which currently exists in the bill which could help spread endemic diseases affecting a myriad of Great Lakes fish. Viral hemorrhagic septicemia, or VHS, is a highly contagious viral disease that caused a significant number of fish deaths in North America since its introduction just in 2005. This virus is only present in four of the five Great Lakes so far, and threatens to cost billions of dollars to the region in lost fishing and tourism revenue.

While the bill currently requires foreign ships to treat their ballast tanks in order to prevent new diseases from entering the Great Lakes, it exempts vessels from treating their ballast tanks when they operate exclusively inside the Great Lakes. This is a loophole which should be closed in the event of an emergency pathogen outbreak. While the Great Lakes ships do not introduce new pathogens into the lakes, they can fully transmit a disease from one lake to another. Currently, Lake Superior is not yet infected with VHS.

My amendment would close the loophole by providing the Secretary of Agriculture with the authority to request that Great Lakes vessels install ballast water treatment systems approved by the Coast Guard, should the Secretary deem it necessary in order to prevent the spread of an infectious disease from one Great Lake to another. The amendment is supported by the Healing Our Waters, Great Lakes Coalition.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking minority member, my colleague from Ohio, for working with me on this very important amendment. It's crucial that we provide the Department of Agriculture with the authority to prevent the spread of VHS to a lake like Lake Superior and to give them the authority to slow down or stop the spread of other infectious pathogens. We must provide officials with all the necessary tools that they need to protect this critical ecosystem, the crown jewel of the Midwest environment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, though I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) for offering this amendment. It does indeed correct a technical mistake and oversight in drafting the bill. There should have been a cross-reference as we inserted one provision in the bill so that the interlake transfer of ballast water would have been covered. Unfortunately, it was an oversight that the legislative counsel did not catch in time, and our committee staff found it after the manager's amendment had been already presented. So through the vigilance of the gentleman from Illinois and his concern for interlake transfer, we certainly accept this provision.

I am very happy to report that not only did we deal with invasive species in the WRDA bill, but also in this Coast Guard bill. It is the first time we have enforcement language on invasive species and interlake transfer. As the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) said earlier today, this is a bad day for invasive species. This is another bad moment for invasive species.

I also want to mention that either next week or the following week I have a meeting, the subject of which I have already discussed with Mr. LATOURETTE, with one of our major interlake shipping companies and other entities to put in place this shipping season a control pilot program for ballast water for lakers. The lakers present a more complicated challenge on ballast water exchange because they have four or five times as many ballast chambers as do the salties coming into the Great Lakes, and dealing with the volume of water and the number of ballast chambers and the treatment technology, it becomes much more complicated for interlake shipping.

We are going to address that this summer. We are going to put in place a pilot program and explore all of the treatment methodologies and equipment and chemicals and how to treat those chemicals before they are again discharged back into the waters of the Great Lakes. And the viral hemorrhagic septicemia issue is chief among those. I think science still doesn't know how to address it. But it and other such assaults upon this one-fifth of all the fresh water upon the face of the Earth is vital. We make an assault upon it in this legislation, and we are determined to follow it through.

I thank the gentleman for his amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, we wholeheartedly support this amendment and congratulate the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) for his catch and for his unwavering diligence and vigilance on Great Lakes water quality issues. Those of us that have the pleasure to represent districts that are near or abut the Great Lakes know the damage that has been done by invasive species, both plants, animals and pathogens. The gentleman's amendment improves upon our bill.

As I said before during general debate, I am so proud of this committee's work on this ballast water exchange program. It really is a shining example of how Members of both parties can come together and do the right thing and the noble thing, and that, of course, all begins at the top with Chairman OBERSTAR's leadership.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman for the amendment. Without a doubt, it makes the bill better. I too am very proud of what we have

been able to accomplish with regard to ballast water. We have a duty to protect our environment, and this goes a long ways towards it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Again, it is not just the Great Lakes, it's the saltwater ports as well. Our colleagues on the west coast for many years, I remember in the seventies and eighties, were saying, what are you worried about invasive species for? Then curious creatures began to appear in the waters of the ports on the west coast from ballast water discharged in those ports from vessels leaving the Pacific Rim, from Japan to Korea to the South China Sea. So this is a unified effort here.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Chairman, just to conclude, the West has the Grand Canyon as its crown jewel of the environment. Florida has the Everglades. But for us in the Midwest, it is the Great Lakes.

We have seen a failure to properly manage shipping in the past introduce a number of alien species. Our environment has suffered from the introduction of the lamprey eel, the rock goby, the fishhook flea, and now viral hemorrhagic septicemia. This legislation is essential to slow down the assault on the Great Lakes with these new species introduced into our critical ecosystem.

I want to thank my colleagues from Minnesota and from Ohio for joining together with this critical legislation, and urge adoption of the amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 110–604.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 110–604.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 14 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

At the end of title VII add the following new section:

SEC. ___. ASSESSMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SECURITY CARD ENROLLMENT SITES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall prepare an assessment of the enrollment sites for transportation security cards issued under section 70105 of title 46, United States Code, including—

(1) the feasibility of keeping those enrollment sites open 24 hours per day, and 7 days per week, in order to better handle the large number of applications for such cards;

(2) the feasibility of keeping those enrollment sites open after September 25, 2008;

(3) the quality of customer service, including the periods of time individuals are kept on hold on the telephone, whether appointments are kept, and processing times for applications.

(b) TIMELINES AND BENCHMARKS.—The Secretary shall develop timelines and benchmarks for implementing the findings of the assessment as the Secretary deems necessary.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1126, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, as I indicated in the general debate, this is an exercise in unity as relates to the safety and security of the Nation and, of course, the reauthorization and the emphasis of the specialness of the Coast Guard. I am delighted to come from the fourth largest city in the Nation and to have a very large port that benefits from the outstanding service of the U.S. Coast Guard.

I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR for not only his eloquence, but his long-standing history and knowledge of what we needed to do in this Congress, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. CUMMINGS, and as well the distinguished, as they all are distinguished, ranking member of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, working on this along with my full committee chair, Mr. THOMPSON. I serve as the Subcommittee Chair on Transportation, Security, and Infrastructure Protection. We have had a number of opportunities to work together. So we are filled with tasks, and those tasks must be addressed.

I rise in support of the legislation. My amendment is a simple but important addition to this vital legislation, which I believe can be supported by every Member of the House.

My amendment calls for the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare an assessment of the enrollment site for the Transportation Worker Identification Credential, TWIC, which we have heard so much about. These cards are issued under section 70105 of Title 46 USC within 30 days of the enactment of this act.

The assessment should at a minimum examine the feasibility of keeping those enrollment sites open 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, in order to better handle the large number of applicants for such cards, the feasibility of keeping those enrollment sites open after September 25, 2008, and the quality of customer service, including the periods of time individuals are kept on hold on the telephone, appointments are kept, and processing times for applications. We are here to help.

In our committee, we have heard over and over again, everyone is trying to meet the deadline. DHS, the Department of Homeland Security, has a deadline. We believe as Members of Congress they should have a deadline to secure America, but we must make sure that the deadline is realistic in light of the resources and the tools that they have to comply.

Madam Chairman, I continue to receive firsthand accounts from my constituents in and around the Nation that deal with the question of transportation workers and operators who are frustrated because of sometimes the unsatisfactory performance of TWIC enrollment sites.

I have spoken with a multitude of people from throughout the country who have shared with me the great difficulty they experience due to administrative obstacles obtaining their TWIC cards. These obstacles include the lack of enrollment sites or the difficulty in getting to the enrollment sites, making appointments at enrollment sites which are not kept, long processing lines for applications, and staying on hold for hours on the telephone. While we have made securing our Nation a priority, we must ensure we do so in the most productive way.

Let me just briefly say what we have seen from the State of Texas and around the Nation. For example, a marine worker at the Houston Port enrolled on December 13, 2007, at the Houston center. To this date, he does not have a card. He remained on hold for 4 hours and 10 minutes and was finally told by the operator that he would have to return to Houston to be fingerprinted again after April. Incidentally, a representative of the Higman Marine Services asked the same question about the employee. That person was told that they should not return until June.

These inconsistencies in service and information are not helping us get our TWIC cards to those individuals, hardworking Americans who need to have a job and a TWIC card to work.

Furthermore, another transportation worker went to the Beaumont center about 3 weeks ago to pick up his TWIC after being notified it was ready. He traveled from a place in Texas. He was told that the card was accidentally shipped to Houston and he could drive 85 miles to pick it up. He presently does not have a card, and therefore he is not able to move forward. The list of incidents go on.

My amendment calls for the Secretary to assess within a month of the enactment these TWIC enrollment sites to determine the feasibility of having them open at times when transportation workers can come and improve the quality of processing procedures. Furthermore, my amendment calls on the Secretary to develop timelines and benchmarks on their assessment. Finally, it calls for them to implement any changes necessary, including keeping it open 24 hours a day, keeping it open 7 days a week, but really at the assessment of the Department of Homeland Security.

Workers are trying to do what they are supposed to do. We have to do what we have to do. I believe this amendment will help do it better, and I believe it is part of the security fabric,

and I hope that we will pass this amendment.

Thank you, Madam Chairman, for affording me this opportunity to address the Members of the House of Representatives and explain my amendment to H.R. 2830, the "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2007." My amendment is a simple but important addition to this important legislation, which I believe can be supported by every Member of this House.

My amendment calls for the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare an assessment of the enrollment sites for Transportation Worker Identification Credential, TWIC, cards issued under section 70105 of title 46, United States Code, within 30 days of the enactment of this Act. This assessment should, at a minimum, examine: the feasibility of keeping those enrollment sites open 24 hours per day, and 7 days per week, in order to better handle the large number of applicants for such cards; the feasibility of keeping those enrollment sites open after September 25, 2008; and the quality of customer service, including the periods of time individuals are kept on hold on the telephone, whether appointments are kept, and processing times for applications.

Madam Chairman, I continue to receive firsthand accounts from my constituents in Houston and from other transportation workers and operators around the country regarding their frustrations and the unsatisfactory performance of TWIC enrollment sites. I have spoken with a multitude of people from throughout the country who have shared with me the great difficulties they experienced due to administrative obstacles in obtaining their TWIC cards. These obstacles include the difficulty of going to enrollment sites, making appointments at enrollment sites which are not kept, long processing times for applications, and staying on hold for hours on the telephone. While we have made securing our Nation a priority, we must ensure that we do so in the most effective and efficient way possible.

I would like to reiterate only few of the obstacles that workers have faced in my State of Texas as well in my district of Houston. For example, a marine worker enrolled at the Houston Port enrolled on December 13, 2007. To this date, he still does not yet have a TWIC card. He remained on hold for 4 hours and 10 minutes and was finally told by the operator that he would have to return to Houston to be fingerprinted again after APR. Incidentally, a representative of Higman Marine Services, Inc., asked the same question about their employee, and she was told that he should not return until June. This blatant inconsistency in service and information is simply unacceptable. Furthermore, another transportation worker went to the Beaumont center about 3 weeks ago to pick up his TWIC after being notified it was ready. He traveled from Hemphill, TX (117 miles) and was told that the card was accidentally shipped to Houston and he could drive there (85 miles) to pick it up. He presently does not have his card. The list of incidences in which workers have to continually overcome structural impediments is too long for me to name. It is from my concern for these workers that I have introduced my amendment.

That is why my amendment calls for the Secretary of Homeland Security to assess, within a month of this Act's enactment, these TWIC enrollment sites to determine the feasibility of having them open at times where transportation workers can come and to improve the quality of their processing procedures. Furthermore, my amendment calls on the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop timelines and benchmarks for implementing the findings of the assessment as the Secretary deems necessary. By identifying the areas in which enrollment sites for homeland security cards are ineffective and inefficient and creating a timeline through which to implement necessary changes and benchmarks to ensure their progress and accountability, we will make this nation a safer place—accessible to labor and operators alike.

In short, Madam Chairman, my amendment can be summed up as follows: for those who have confidence in how these TWIC enrollment sites are administering this program, my amendment offers vindication. For those who are skeptical and have seen firsthand the problems apparent at these enrollment sites, my amendment will provide the information necessary to rectify the causes for their frustrations and a way forward to ensure that the results of this assessment are actually implemented.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to control the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for her thoughtful amendment. We are willing to accept her amendment, which will require the Department of Homeland Security to assess measures that may encourage maritime workers to accelerate application rates for the TWIC card. We all know a deadline is looming.

The only observation I would make so that no one is under a misapprehension, nobody has been prevented from working yet, because the TWIC requirements don't go into effect until September. But we support the gentlewoman's amendment. We think it is a thoughtful amendment.

I would be happy to yield to the chairman of the full committee for his thoughts.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding and the gentlewoman for offering the amendment and her deep concern, which we share on the committee, for those maritime workers.

Madam Chairman, 230,000 applied and 64,000 have actually received their cards. There is a bottleneck at TSA principally in printing out those cards, and the amendment just provides a margin of safety and a time to accomplish the objective.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee for his observations.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have convened two hearings, Madam Chairman, in the Coast Guard Subcommittee on the TWIC card. Our most recent hearing was held in January after the enrollment process had been underway for a few months.

During that hearing, we heard about some of the glitches that individuals attempting to enroll have encountered. Such glitches are unacceptable when workers must pay $132.50 and take time off from work to obtain a card that they are required to have to do their job and to provide for their families.

TWIC is an essential part of our post-security regime and is intended to ensure that those who pose a threat to our maritime infrastructure do not gain access to the secure areas of vessels or port facilities.

□ 1345

However, enrollment must be conducted as seamlessly as possible to cause the least burden to those workers. And I want to thank Ms. JACKSON-LEE for her amendment. It helps to make our bill a better bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATOURETTE. It is my understanding that the gentlelady's time has expired. I learned the hard way today that I don't have the right to close. But I would be happy to yield the balance of our time to the sponsor of the legislation, Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I just want to thank all of you, and I believe that this is the right step. The action item is that they should implement the process of their study to make it work for our various mariners so that they can be part of the security of America. I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 110–604.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 15 offered by Mr. STUPAK:

At the end of title IV add the following new section:

SEC. ___. LAND CONVEYANCE, COAST GUARD PROPERTY IN MARQUETTE COUNTY, MICHIGAN, TO THE CITY OF MARQUETTE, MICHIGAN.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard may convey, without consideration, to the City of Marquette, Michigan (in this section referred to as the "City"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, together with any improvements thereon, located in Marquette County, Michigan, that is under the administrative control of the Coast Guard, consists of approximately 5.5 acres, and is commonly identified as Coast Guard Station Marquette and Lighthouse Point.

(b) RETENTION OF CERTAIN EASEMENTS.—In conveying the property under subsection (a), the Commandant of the Coast Guard may retain such easements over the property as the Commandant considers appropriate for access to aids to navigation.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The property to be conveyed by subsection (a) may not be conveyed under that subsection until—

(1) the Coast Guard has relocated Coast Guard Station Marquette to a newly constructed station;

(2) any environmental remediation required under Federal law with respect to the property has been completed;

(3) the Commandant of the Coast Guard determines that retention of the property by the United States is not required to carry out Coast Guard missions or functions.

(d) CONDITIONS OF TRANSFER.—All conditions placed within the deed of title of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be construed as covenants running with the land.

(e) INAPPLICABILITY OF SCREENING OR OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The conveyance of property authorized by subsection (a) shall be made without regard to the following;

(1) Section 2696 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code.

(3) Any other provision of law relating to the screening, evaluation, or administration of excess or surplus Federal property prior to conveyance by the Administrator of General Services.

(f) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority in subsection (a) shall expire on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Commandant of the Coast Guard. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the United States.

(h) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance authorized by subsection (a) as the Commandant considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1126, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, my amendment will facilitate a simple land transfer between the U.S. Coast Guard and the city of Marquette, Michigan.

The Coast Guard is currently located at the Coast Guard Station Marquette and Lighthouse Point in Marquette County on nine acres of land east of the Marquette Maritime Museum. This facility was originally constructed in 1891, and is the oldest of all U.S. Coast Guard lifesaving facilities in the Nation.

The Coast Guard is in the process of relocating to a new location just south of the Marquette Maritime Museum. This location will bring the Coast Guard closer to where their boats are docked and will help the Coast Guard respond to emergencies more quickly.

The City of Marquette sold this property for the new facility, 1.5 acres on the waterfront, to the Coast Guard for $1. In addition, the City of Marquette has committed $170,000 to reroute bike trails, make roadway improvements and other necessary infrastructure improvements in order to prepare the property for the new Coast Guard facility.

On April 7, 2008, the City of Marquette signed the official documents to turn over the City property to the Coast Guard. Upon moving to this new property, the Coast Guard will vacate their existing location.

My amendment will convey the property of the old Coast Guard facility to the City of Marquette. This is a straightforward amendment. The Coast Guard supports the conveyance of the existing property to the City. The City of Marquette is also in support of the land transfer, which would assist in accomplishing the goals outlined in the City's strategic Harbor Master Plan.

The Coast Guard Station in Marquette plays a vital role in responding to emergencies in the City of Marquette, the surrounding area, and on Lake Superior. This land transfer will facilitate a continued Coast Guard presence within the Marquette area. Without a well-equipped and state-of-the-art Coast Guard Station in Marquette, there would be virtually no presence of the Coast Guard between Sault Ste. Marie and Houghton, Michigan, which represents a stretch of at least 300 miles of shoreline on Lake Superior. This is a win-win for the Coast Guard and the City of Marquette.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this amendment, and I encourage members to vote for final passage of the Coast Guard Authorization Act.

Vote ''yes'' on the Stupak amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition to the amendment, though I do not oppose it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. The amendment is very limited in nature, very specific, to deal with the transfer of property that will not take place until the Coast Guard has relocated the station at facilities that are yet to be built. It will also not take place until environmental cleanup has occurred on the existing site. And that is important. The commandant has determined that retention of property is not required to carry out any other Coast Guard mission. So protection for the Coast Guard, protection for the City and the cleanup provisions, and it is a very beneficial amendment.

I want to address another matter, the concern of the gentleman from Michigan about the transfer of excess property to the Christian Cornerstone Academy, a land transfer that is supported by the Coast Guard, by the Academy, and the community of Sheboygan. We had already filed the manager's amendment at the time that this issue came to the attention of the gentleman from Michigan, and it was not possible to include that in the manager's amendment nor in the amendments considered by the Rules Committee.

But I do want to assure the gentleman that we will work to accomplish the purposes of this land transfer as we get into conference with the other body. Or, should such language be included by the other body in their version of the Coast Guard, which is now working its way to the floor of the other body, that we should expect to meet in conference and recognize the special needs in this matter. The Coast Guard executed a 10-year, no cost lease for the construction of the Cornerstone Christian Academy in Sheboygan. The lease has been renegotiated to fair market value. The Coast Guard has deemed 6 acres of the property as excess, if I have described the matter rightly.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the distinguished chairman.

The gentleman is correct, not only on Marquette but on the Christian Cornerstone Academy. We have been working to transfer this excess land. It would have been a straightforward transfer and supported by the Coast Guard to Christian Cornerstone Academy in the Sheboygan community.

I appreciate the chairman's willingness to work with us to have this inserted either at the Senate level or in conference. And, as always, I appreciate the gentleman's knowledge and wisdom on Coast Guard and Great Lakes issues, and look forward to continuing to work with him on this and thank him for his courtesies on this amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

We are also willing to accept the gentleman from Michigan's amendment, which authorizes the conveyance of property and the light station to Marquette, Michigan. This provision follows the standard language that has been used by the committee in other light station conveyances in previous years.

I would just note, I know the chairman of the full committee represents very hearty folk. When he came to Akron and said that it was 41 below, I think, at International Falls, I also know the gentleman from Michigan, having gone to school in Michigan representing the UP, represents very hearty folk. And so I hope we not only give them what he wants in Marquette, but Sheboygan as well, because they deserve it because it is really cold.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the Chair of the subcommittee, Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I heartily support the amendment of Mr. STUPAK.

The amount of land being conveyed here under this amendment is only 5.5 acres, and I believe it is appropriate that once the Coast Guard leaves this site, the land and the lighthouse be made available to a local municipality that can preserve these resources and utilize them for the public purpose.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his work to craft the Coast Guard Authorization Act, and for recognizing the need for a Coast Guard presence on the Great Lakes.

The Coast Guard Cutter ACACIA was decommissioned on June 7, 2006, after over 60 years of service to this country. The ACACIA has been stationed in Charlevoix, Michigan since 1990.

The ACACIA provided essential navigational and search and rescue services in the northern Great Lakes. This work is important for the safety as well as for businesses and individuals that rely on the Great Lakes. This year's cold winter showcased the need for a cutter presence when Beaver Island once again had to make an emergency call to the Coast Guard to break ice for a shipment of fuel for the island. This, unfortunately, is a common occurrence during the cold winter months, and this winter was exceptionally long and cold.

It is important that this new Coast Guard cutter or similar asset be stationed in Charlevoix. To facilitate this, I worked closely with the chairman to include language in the Coast Guard Authorization Act 2006 to require the Coast Guard Station to sustain icebreaking vessel capabilities in the Great Lakes. Unfortunately, the Coast Guard has ignored congressional intent.

I appreciate the chairman's support in our efforts, and I look forward to working with the chairman and ranking member, and the chair of the Coast Guard subcommittee, to ensure that the Coast Guard honors congressional intent and provides adequate icebreaking services in the Northern Great Lakes.

I yield to the chairman for comment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I share the gentleman's concern for adequate icebreaking capability on the Great Lakes. We have the new icebreaker Mackinaw. The Coast Guard has smaller harbor icebreakers. But they simply are not sufficient to keep channels open. This past shipping season, the Coast Guard failed to send the Mackinaw upstream, up lake, to keep channels open for shipping of iron ore to lower lake steel mills.

I assure the gentleman, I will work diligently with the Coast Guard to keep their attention focused on our needs for icebreaking capability on the Great Lakes. On the Chesapeake Bay, I said to the chairman of the subcommittee, you don't have that problem. It doesn't freeze over.

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman for his words. I thank the work from the chairman on all Coast Guard and Great Lakes issues. I thank Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. LATOURETTE for their help and support.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 110–604 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. POE of Texas.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. MCNERNEY of California.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY POE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 408, noes 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

AYES—408

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns

Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—27

Alexander
Andrews
Blackburn
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Campbell (CA)
Cramer
Diaz-Balart, L.
Doggett
Everett
Faleomavaega
Feeney
Higgins
Hulshof
Kind
LaHood
Lungren, Daniel E.
McCrery
Nadler
Pascrell
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Udall (NM)
Waxman
Weller

□ 1421

Messrs. MILLER of North Carolina and ISSA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 408, noes 0, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 221]

AYES—408

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Alexander
Andrews
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Campbell (CA)
Cramer
Doggett
Everett
Faleomavaega
Feeney
Higgins
Hulshof
LaHood
Loebsack
Marshall
Nadler
Pascrell
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Reynolds
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Udall (NM)
Weller
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Approximately 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1430

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote 221, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO) having assumed the chair, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2830) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1126, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Yes, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Chabot moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2830 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions

to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title IV add the following:

SEC. ___. EXTENSION OF EXEMPTION.

Section 3503(a) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2008'' and inserting ''2018''.

Mr. CHABOT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, this motion is really quite simple. It continues the will of Congress, a will dating as far back as 1968 to allow the *Delta Queen* to operate within the inland waters of the United States. It's an exemption that's been granted by Congress on a number of occasions, eight times to be exact, most recently in 1996. However, unless it is renewed this year, this national treasure will be forced ashore unnecessarily. And unfortunately, an important chapter in our Nation's history will close.

For those who may be unfamiliar with the *Delta Queen*, and this is her right here, and its significance to this Nation, let me give you a brief history of what the Delta Queen is and is not. The *Delta Queen* is a symbol of our Nation's past serving as the last overnight operational steam paddle wheeler. She represents where we started as a Nation and our trials and tribulations and our progress over the years.

The *Delta Queen* is a registered national historic landmark and is a member of the National Maritime Hall of Fame. She is part of the greatest generation, honorably serving our country during World War II, first as a Navy barracks and later transporting servicemen to and from the Navy shipyards docked in the San Francisco harbor.

The *Delta Queen* provides jobs to American families and is a critical source of revenue for local communities, opening up towns and communities located along the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi Rivers such as Ashland, Kentucky; Gallipolis, Ohio; and Clarksville, Indiana, to tourists and allowing mom-and-pop businesses to flourish.

Contrary to what some opponents to this motion would have you believe, the *Delta Queen* is not a safety risk. In fact, the *Delta Queen* is inspected by the United States Coast Guard more than six times a year and has operated since 1968 without significant incident.

Indeed, when Congress first created the inland water exemption from fire retardant regulation, it recognized that vessels such as the *Delta Queen* would never be more than a short distance from shore, circumstances much different than ocean liners and other vessels that traverse the oceans.

House Report 93–289 indicates that an inclusion of this was inadvertent. That's why Congress has granted this exception eight times since 1968. Eight times. Moreover, despite its exemption, the *Delta Queen* has, and continues to operate, in accordance with the safety notification requirements set forth in section 3503(b) of the United States Code and the Coast Guard.

In addition, the *Delta Queen* has gone above and beyond these requirements, installing state-of-the-art fire and smoke detection and sprinkler systems, as well as mandating fire training for its crew, all of which have been approved by the Coast Guard. Every single stateroom on there has sprinklers within it. In fact, just last month, the owners of the *Delta Queen* replaced the vessel's boiler at the request of the Coast Guard. And just last month, the *Delta Queen* was most recently inspected by the Coast Guard and was given a clean bill of health.

Mr. Speaker, I don't understand why continuing the *Delta Queen*'s current exemption for an additional 10 years has generated such opposition. In fact, last session, this body unanimously supported this exemption, passing it by a voice vote. Just last year we did this exact thing that I am asking to be done today. Unfortunately, it was stalled over in the Senate.

I can only conclude that the opposition that we're seeing is not really about the *Delta Queen*. It's really about a labor dispute. If this is true, why should the American people be victims, losing access to this national landmark? Why should American jobs be lost? Why should local businesses be literally ruined all because of a labor dispute? I hope that unions do not have that type of influence here in Washington or here in this Congress.

Let's put all of the politics aside and do the right thing here, and I urge my colleagues to stand up for the *Delta Queen* right here. 1926, no major incidence since that entire time. And there is no reason why we shouldn't save this historic ship here. Keep part of our history alive here by supporting this motion. This really ought to be bipartisan, and I urge you to support this motion to recommit.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I enormously respect the distinguished and amiable gentleman from Ohio, the weight-lifting champ of the House gym. When he walks on the floor, the weights quiver and shake in awe of his appearance.

He has been an advocate for the *Delta Queen* even back to last fall when I was in the Bethesda Naval Hospital for an operation to correct a long-standing injury to my neck. He sent a sheet cake with the *Delta Queen* emblazoned upon it to remind me of his diligence and of his enthusiasm for the *Delta Queen*. I could only eat one slice of it, but I assured him that the staff at the hospital, who had no idea what the *Delta Queen* was all about, appreciated this sheet cake from the very distinguished and caring gentleman from the State of Ohio.

But labor has nothing to do with this issue. I haven't heard from a single person in any labor union about this matter.

The *Delta Queen* was built in 1926 and carried 174 passengers, 88 state rooms. It has extensive wood superstructure. It has extensive wood interior and furniture, and for those reasons, the Coast Guard will not certify this vessel. Opposition is clear. The combustible construction of the vessel presents an unacceptable fire risk that cannot be mitigated by the addition of fire-suppression measures, says the Coast Guard.

As such, the Coast Guard's position remains unchanged. The *Delta Queen* should be prohibited from operating with overnight passengers.

Since May 28, 1936, the United States has required that passenger vessels be constructed essentially of fire retardant material. In the interest of maritime safety, the Coast Guard, continuing their quote, has consistently opposed legislation to prolong the service of the *Delta Queen*. A vessel constructed of wood operating in the overnight passenger trade presents an unacceptable fire risk to its passengers and crew.

It goes on at great length.

The *Delta Queen* can operate in daytime but not at night.

In the operation of the trade on the Mississippi River, the worst disaster in history occurred, fire onboard a paddle wheeler. Yes, in the 19th century, but 1,700 people died 100 yards from shore.

On March 22 of this year, of this year, the *Delta Queen* had a fire in the generating room requiring the use of their fixed $C0_2$ extinguishing system. Fortunately, no one was injured. The generator shorted, caused flames to shoot out the generator end.

Earlier this month, the Queen of the West, this April, a similar paddle wheel operated by the very same company that owns and operates the *Delta Queen* had a fire in the engine room, required evacuation of 177 passengers and crew. Three crew members were treated for smoke inhalation.

□ 1445

Last year, in May, the *Empress of the North*, another excursion vessel operated by the same company owning the *Delta Queen*, ran aground in southeast Alaska, evacuating over 200 passengers and crew; fourth grounding of that vessel in less than 4 years.

Now I can understand those who live along the Mississippi River, which starts nearly in my district all the way down to the Gulf, but friends, we would never stand for limiting safety on a 747 aircraft. And over a decade ago, a foreign airline was trying to remove over-

wing exits from a 747. Congressman Bill Clinger, Pennsylvania's ranking Republican on the Committee on Aviation with me, we stopped them from doing that. We stopped the FAA from allowing that risk to safety. We should stop this risk to safety here. Fire at night is terrifying. Oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 208, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 222]

AYES—195

Aderholt
Akin
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Loebsack
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—208

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—28

Alexander
Andrews
Biggert
Blackburn
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Campbell (CA)
Costello
Cramer
Doggett
Everett
Feeney
Higgins
Hulshof
LaHood
McNulty
Nadler
Pascrell
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Slaughter
Udall (NM)
Weller
Wynn
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1504

Messrs. BISHOP of Georgia, LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, PERLMUTTER, and ENGLISH of Pennsylvania changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 395, noes 7, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

AYES—395

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller

Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—7

Coble
Duncan
Flake
Nunes
Paul
Rogers (KY)
Tancredo

NOT VOTING—29

Alexander
Andrews
Blackburn
Boyd (FL)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Costello
Cramer
Doggett
Everett
Feeney
Higgins
Hulshof
LaHood
McNulty
Miller, George
Nadler
Pascrell
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Udall (NM)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Yarmuth

□ 1513

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2830, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2830, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section and title numbering, cross-referencing, conforming amendments to the table of contents and short titles, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1515

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for information about the schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Republican whip.

On Monday, the House is not in session. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, no votes are expected.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The final list of suspension bills, as usual, will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. We will consider H.R. 493, the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act, and H.R. 5522, the Combustible Dust Explosion and Fire Prevention Act.

Finally, Members should note that on Wednesday, the Prime Minister of Ireland, The Honorable Bertie Ahern, will address a joint meeting of the House and Senate.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that information.

Will the Combustible Dust Explosion and Fire Prevention Act, will that act be under a rule?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. BLUNT. And the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act will be as well?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that. I notice the schedule doesn't include anything yet on the supplemental. I continue to see reports suggesting that the supplemental may come directly to the floor and not through committee. I wonder if the gentleman has any indication of what might be the schedule at this time on the supplemental.

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

As you have read, we are discussing how to process the supplemental. As I indicated to you, it is my intention that we will pass the supplemental prior to Memorial Day. By that, I mean in sufficient time so the Senate can do so as well so we can pass it finally.

That is my hope and my intention. We are still working on the components of the supplemental, and very frankly, it has not yet been finally decided as to how that might be processed. Obviously, at times in the past it has been added to other legislation. In other times, it has been passed as a free-standing bill. Committee consideration, obviously, is part of the regular order, if we go that way, but there are other ways to go. We want to facilitate the passage of it as quickly as possible.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate the need to get this war supplemental done. Of course we have been talking about it during this entire work period for the last 4 weeks now. Since 1989, the Congress has passed 36 supplementals. All but seven of them went through the committee process. On those seven occasions—it was the supplemental right after 9/11, the supplemental right after Katrina. I would just say to the gentleman that I know our members of the Appropriations Committee today have expressed great concern if the committee doesn't have the opportunity to mark this up in regular order, and I don't know that that has anything other than informational value to you, it may very well go through the committee. If it doesn't, I have heard a lot of concern expressed about why, with the amount of time we have had here, we would do what is a relatively extraordinary thing.

I would be glad to yield.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Our intent obviously, as I said, is to pass this bill. Obviously we are considering the best way to do so, giving every Member an opportunity to vote as they see fit on various component parts of the supplemental, and we are considering how best to do that.

I understand, certainly, the committee's concern, having served on that committee for about 24 years, and having considered a number of supplementals. As a member of that committee, I understand that concern. But I will tell the gentleman that we are trying to proceed in a way that will facilitate the passage of this bill to the Senate and hopefully transmittal to the President prior to the Memorial Day break.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I thank the gentleman for that. I do think the time does matter here because of the potential for furlough notices and other things for troops if we let this bill go much beyond the work period we are in right now between now and Memorial Day.

One of the items that I keep seeing reports that could be in this bill would be enhanced GI benefits. The cost estimates I have seen from a Senate cost