

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 4505.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on H.R. 4771, H.R. 4786, and H.R. 4505, the bills just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1992

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 482 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 482

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5055) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered by title rather than by section. Each title shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and clause 8 of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the

committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McEWEN], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded shall be for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 482 provides an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 5055, the Coast Guard authorization bill for fiscal year 1993.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

The rule also waives section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act and clause 8 of rule 21 against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill.

The waiver of section 302(f) of the Budget Act is necessary because of a provision in the bill which exempts vessels used in training at the State maritime academies from a Coast Guard inspection fee.

This is a noncontroversial provision which was met with no objection in the committee. The waiver of clause 8 of rule 21 is needed because a CBO cost estimate was not available and therefore not printed in the bill as introduced or as reported by the committee.

However, the required CBO cost estimate is now printed in the bill to be considered following the adoption of this resolution.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5055, the Coast Guard reauthorization bill is important legislation which authorizes \$3.6 billion for fiscal year 1993. Since 1915 the U.S. Coast Guard has performed many important duties on the high seas for the United States.

Its primary functions are to promote safety at sea, to enforce maritime laws, and to provide for the safety and security of vessels in U.S. ports and waterways.

Beyond these tasks the mission of the Coast Guard has grown substantially.

Coast Guard personnel now play an important role in naval readiness both in war time and in peace and they have taken a high profile role in the war against drugs by stepping up efforts in airborne and waterborne interdiction.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5055 authorizes funding for these important tasks and many others.

Funding is authorized to update and maintain the vessels of the Coast

Guard's aging air and sea fleet and for the establishment of two marine oil-spill management simulators.

These simulators will be located in Galveston, TX, and at the Massachusetts Center for Marine Environmental Protection at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

These facilities will improve methods to contain and prevent oilspills which can be devastating to our precious marine environment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this resolution was adopted in the Rules Committee with bipartisan support by a voice vote. I urge its adoption and adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for the consideration of H.R. 5055, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1992. House Resolution 482 is a good rule, an open rule, a fair rule.

I would like to thank the chairman of the Rules Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, for bringing this open rule to the floor. I would also like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZN], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation, and also my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], the ranking member of the subcommittee, for requesting this open rule.

The chairman of the Rules Committee has thoroughly explained this rule. It establishes an hour of general debate for H.R. 5055, and then allows amendments to be considered under the five minute rule.

As always, it is a great pleasure to be able to rise and join with the chairman of the Rules Committee in calling for support for an open rule. Open rules make for an open, and successful legislative process. They allow the peoples representatives to work their will.

H.R. 5055 authorizes \$3.6 billion for Coast Guard programs in fiscal year 1993, which is equal to the President's request. As we know, the Coast Guard uses these funds to perform a number of important roles, including the enforcement of customs laws, the provision of navigation and safety assistance to boaters, the regulation of vessel traffic, and the inspection of foreign tankers.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has a number of concerns with H.R. 5055 as reported by the committee. I would like to insert the Statement of Administration Policy on the bill at this point, which details their reasons for opposing the bill. This open rule certainly offers the House the best opportunity to address those concerns.

The statement referred to is as follows:

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, June 11, 1992.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY  
(H.R. 5055—Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1992—Tauzin of Louisiana and Five Others)

The Administration strongly opposes enactment of H.R. 5055 unless it is amended to delete:

A committee amendment to divert \$80 million during FYs 1993-1997 from the high priority Sports Fish Restoration program to expand the Coast Guard's existing Boat Safety program. The Sports Fish Restoration program enables States to improve fishing habitats and access on rivers and lakes. The Administration is on record as opposing any diversion of funds from the Sports Fish Restoration program.

Section 109, which would arbitrarily limit competition in the procurement of buoy chain by the Coast Guard. This provision could both increase costs to the Coast Guard and invite retaliation by America's trading partners.

The exemption for State Maritime Academy vessels from certain vessel inspection fees without an offset from the resulting reduction in receipts (Section 301).

Provisions described in the Attachment that micromanage the Coast Guard in a manner that will unjustifiably increase costs.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORING

At least one provision of H.R. 5055 would also reduce receipts. Therefore, H.R. 5055 is subject to the pay-as-you-go requirement of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA) of 1990. No offsets to the revenue loss resulting from this provision is provided in the bill.

A budget point of order applies in both the House and Senate against any bill that is not fully offset under CBO scoring. If, contrary to the Administration's recommendation, the House waives any such point of order that applies against H.R. 5055, the effects of enactment of this legislation would be included in a look back pay-as-you-go sequester report at the end of the Congressional session.

OMB's preliminary scoring estimates of this bill are presented in the table below. Final scoring of this legislation may deviate from these estimates. If H.R. 5055 were enacted, final OMB scoring estimates would be published within five days of enactment, as required by OBRA. The cumulative effects of all enacted legislation on direct spending will be issued in monthly reports transmitted to the Congress.

ESTIMATES FOR PAY-AS-YOU-GO

[In millions of dollars]

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1992-97
Receipts .....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

<sup>1</sup> Less than \$500,000.

OTHER OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS OF H.R. 5055

The Administration also strongly opposes the following provisions of H.R. 5055:

Section 304, which requires the Coast Guard to enter into an agreement with the Department of Commerce to require fisheries enforcement practices and procedures. This is inappropriate because the Coast Guard exercises no responsibility or control over these practices and procedures.

A Committee amendment that would require the Secretary of Transportation to intervene in the resolution of a contract dispute between a contractor and subcontractors.

The dispute should be resolved in a judicial forum. H.R. 5055 creates the potential for a second payment by the Federal Government under a contract for which payment has already been made as legally required.

Several provisions that would unnecessarily restrict the Coast Guard's ability to expend funds in the most cost effective manner. These include sections 104 (Shore Facilities Improvements at Group Cape Hatteras) 105 (Prepositioned Oil Spill Cleanup Equipment), 106 (Training Simulators), 204 (Federal, State, and Local Coordination Demonstration Projects), and 303 (Study of the Application of Tiltrotor Aircraft Technology to Coast Guard missions). They also include committee amendments requiring: (1) a study of the usefulness of night vision technology, and (2) installation of Radar Navigation Aid at Eekholms Island Coast Guard Installation near Sitka, Alaska.

Sections 107 and 108, which would prematurely designate certain structures as obstructions to navigation, making them eligible for certain Federal assistance. Instead, procedures already prescribed by law to evaluate the extent to which they are in fact obstacles to navigation should be completed.

Section 202, which would mandate, at the Federal level, boater education requirements that are more appropriately the concern of States.

Section 203, which would unnecessarily require the Coast Guard to study ways to study ways enlarge the mission of the Coast Guard Auxiliary. A balance in the roles of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Auxiliary has already been achieved as a result of the 1988 Report on the Coast Guard Auxiliary.

I would like to take a moment to refer to a concern expressed by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee regarding the procedure leading to the granting of this rule. In a letter to the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, a copy of which was sent to both the chairman and ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Illinois expresses concern with the fact that the Rules Committee granted a rule for H.R. 5055 before the Merchant Marine Committee had filed its report on the bill.

There are apparently some jurisdictional concerns which Ways and Means has with the bill. The Rules Committee's consideration of the rule before the report was printed, according to the letter of the chairman of Ways and Means, "left the Committee on Ways and Means without the opportunity to review the bill before the rule was granted; if we had such an opportunity, we would have been aware of the jurisdictional issues sooner."

Now, there are often times when members of the minority come to the floor expressing grave concerns with waivers of House rules regarding lay-over periods. This is the period of time granted under House rules to read bills and reports before measures are considered on the floor.

In this case, we have the respected chairman of the Ways and Means Committee expressing a similar concern. I bring attention to this fact, not to

criticize the Rules Committee, or the honorable chairman from Massachusetts, but only to note that concerns with timeliness, and overly hasty consideration of legislation, is not a partisan issue. Giving committees and members time to read bills and reports is a necessary part of the system. It protects the rights of every member to constructively take part in the process.

Mr. Speaker, returning to the important matter at hand, I would like to thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for his fine work bringing this open rule to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support this rule so that we can get to work on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I had one request for time from the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] who wanted to speak for 1 minute, but, in his absence, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Pursuant to House Resolution 482 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5055.

The Chair designates the gentleman for Georgia [Mr. DARDEN] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1422

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House dissolved itself in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5055) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes, with Mr. PANETTA, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman. when I first entered Congress, the Coast Guard was a small, specialized agency with an annual budget of \$473 million. Its principal responsibilities were search and rescue,

ship inspection, and the maintenance of lighthouses and other navigational aids.

In many ways, the Coast Guard is the same service it has always been. However, in other ways, it is very different from the Coast Guard of 1966—its responsibilities have multiplied and some of its priorities have changed.

Now, over 23 percent of the Coast Guard's operating budget is used in the war against drug smugglers;

Over \$250 million a year is expended on marine environmental protection; and

Hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent each day on enforcing fisheries laws and intercepting illegal aliens.

Unfortunately, this mountain of new responsibility has not been matched by a mountain of money. While struggling with a steady stream of new jobs, the Coast Guard has received only gradual funding increases. This year is no different.

Our bill calls for an appropriation of a little over \$3.6 billion in fiscal year 1993. This closely tracks the amount recommended by the President, and represents an approximate 6-percent increase over last year. Virtually all these additional funds are for operating expenses and most of that increase is due to built-in changes, such as cost-of-living adjustments.

In other areas, there is clearly not enough money to fully fund the Coast Guard. This bill authorizes a small increase over last year's budget for acquisition, construction, and improvements; bridge alternations; and environmental compliance. Nevertheless, the increases are modest. Make no mistake, this is a lean authorization. It provides the minimum necessary to carry out the Coast Guard's missions.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1992.

Mr. Chairman, before turning to the bill, I would like to express my personal, deep, and sincere appreciation to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for his outstanding leadership for so many years. This will be the last Coast Guard authorization bill that Chairman JONES will preside over, and on my behalf and on behalf of all the Members, I think I can speak on behalf of all of them today, on both the majority side and the minority side, we want to indicate that we will sorely miss his knowledge, his experience, and his quick wit, and the way he has guided our committee for so many years and has helped the Coast Guard in this and so many other bills that have come before the Congress to ensure its efficient and effective operation.

WALTER, this Congress will miss you, but our committee will especially miss you and your great service here.

I would also like to thank the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS]. He has led the minority in a cooperative and bipartisan manner, and has been a true friend of the Coast Guard. We will of course miss BOB DAVIS' excellent service to our committee and to the needs of the Coast Guard.

Finally, I would like to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] and I have developed H.R. 5055 as we have developed all Coast Guard legislation in a bipartisan manner that fully authorizes the administration's budget request for the Coast Guard.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] and his staff have been extraordinary good and helpful agents for our committee, in working with the majority and myself personally, in ensuring that our work is done in a truly bipartisan manner.

JACK, I want to thank you publicly again both for your help personally and your staff.

The Coast Guard is unique. No other agency of the Federal Government does as much with so little as the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard's jurisdiction is extraordinarily broad. Its resources are stretched to the limit to meet its operational demands.

Its various missions include such things as search and rescue, where Coast Guard's men and women every day save American lives; boating safety, where again, through efforts made in cooperation with the States, lives and vessels are saved because of the educational efforts that go into planning and for safety on the water; fisheries enforcement; aids to navigation; commercial and recreational vessel inspections; marine casualty investigations; documentation of vessels; drug interdiction; licensing of mariners; oil spill response; regulation of hazardous materials, transportation by water; ocean dumping, prevention and enforcement; military readiness; icebreaking; and, believe me, I have only named a few of its many and varied missions.

The Coast Guard does this with a force of men and women that is smaller than the New York City police force, believe it or not.

Congress has charged the Coast Guard with implementing and enforcing some of the most complex and important environmental laws enacted in the last decade.

The Commandant, Adm. Bill Kime, has done an outstanding job of bringing efficient, modern management techniques to the Coast Guard. He has emphasized that the Coast Guard cannot carry out its duties without a committed and enthusiastic body of people. To that end, he has worked to ensure that

Coast Guard men and women receive adequate pay, decent housing, dependable medical care, and comprehensive training. His emphasis on the people in the Coast Guard has been the hallmark of his stewardship as Commandant. His efforts are paying off now with a better qualified, educated, and a more professional organization.

Congress loves to praise the Coast Guard. It is easy to praise the Coast Guard. And it is relatively easy to pass an authorization bill where we authorize funding for the Coast Guard. The tough part comes when it comes time for Congress to actually appropriate the funds for the Coast Guard among the many priorities that Congress must face.

We have been informed today that other committees of the House will propose drastic cuts in Coast Guard funding, as much as \$87 million in operational budgets, and about \$20 million in its OC&I budget.

These cuts will adversely affect your and my constituents and this Nation. If the cuts are deep, they will be deeply felt in vital services that affect constituents' lives, property, and the economic well-being of the maritime industries.

If cuts are going to be mandated, it is imperative that Congress work closely with the Commandant to ensure that any cut in the Coast Guard's budget will not cut into the heart and soul of Coast Guard operations.

I just got off the phone with the Commandant. Let me give you the bad news. If those cuts are the final product of this Congress, those cuts will mean dramatic cuts in the level of operation of the Coast Guard.

The current budget we recommended is a mere 1-percent increase over last year that is mainly required because of cost-of-living adjustments to the personnel of the Coast Guard. You take \$87 million out of the Coast Guard's operating budget and you will see decommissioning of ships, you will see closure of search and rescue stations and air stations. You will see closure and consolidation of marine safety offices. And you will see major delays in the implementation of the repositioning of equipment and supplies to combat oil spills, an issue which occupied this Congress so heavily in recent years.

Now, those cuts, if we cannot avoid them, will have those effects. And if we in the Congress choose other priorities, whatever they may be, whatever transportation projects we think are more important than operating a search and rescue station, then it will be on our heads when these search and rescue stations and other vital Coast Guard operations are in fact shut down.

When the President introduced his budget earlier this year, the Coast Guard's budget had already been severely trimmed. The OC&I request, which the Coast Guard uses to buy new

ships, planes, and buildings, is now \$9 million less than it was last year, before recommends cuts again.

We cannot continue to ignore the fact that the Coast Guard is operating 50-year-old ships and 75-year-old shore facilities. This bill authorizes the minimum investment the Coast Guard needs to carry out its third century of service.

I would like to point out that this bill, as I said, provides less than a 1-percent increase in authorizing funds. Much of that increase is due to cost of living requirements for Coast Guard personnel.

The Coast Guard simply cannot absorb major cuts without major reductions in services and in programs.

This is the first time that either the Reagan or Bush administrations have requested an increase in funds from the Department of Defense to the Coast Guard.

At the direction of Congress, such a transfer has in fact occurred every year for almost a decade. The administration has finally recognized that the Coast Guard has in fact a military readiness mission, and has in fact recognized that mission with the request for a \$203 million transfer from the Department of Defense. Congress must now ensure that that transfer takes place.

One additional final item. I have brought to the attention of the Committee on Rules the fact that in last year's appropriation, we transferred five aerostat vessels. Those are the vessels used to do drug enforcement surveillance, primarily in the Gulf of Mexico.

We transferred those five vessels to the Department of Defense, and the Department of Army in particular.

Since we transferred those vessels, with instructions to put them to work to assist the Coast Guard in drug interdiction, the Department of Army has parked those vessels, has had them parked, and has refused to operate them since January.

Recently the Department of the Army in fact issued an order mothballing three of those vessels, despite the clear congressional intent and letters from Appropriations Committee members, that those vessels were to be operated, despite a memo from the Commandant that describes choice points where drugs flow into the Gulf of Mexico and to the shores of America are left wide open without the operation of these aerostats, the Department of Army has stubbornly parked these vessels and has refused to operate them.

I am pleased to tell the House today that it is my understanding that the Department of Defense appropriations bill that is currently in a subcommittee, will include language mandating that the Department of the Army use \$25 million in fact to operate those five

aerostats and to close those choke points.

But let me stress again, if we do not follow through on that mandate, so far the Department of the Army has stubbornly resisted the efforts to put those vessels into operation, and in fact, according to the Commandant, has left those choke points wide open for 6 months now. That means the welcome mat is out to those druggies who want to bring drugs into America, the wide open choke points have been open since January, and it is time for Congress to close them.

I hope this House will assist us in ensuring that the defense appropriations bill does in fact contain language mandating that those vessels be operated.

□ 1435

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues, as they have in the past, to support the Coast Guard, to approve this authorization bill and to join us when the appropriations bill comes to the floor insisting that the Coast Guard have necessary funds to operate as it has done so adequately and efficiently in the years gone by.

Mr. HAYES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUZIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HAYES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I came down here for the purpose of supporting the gentleman's amendments, which I anticipate are so overwhelmingly supported that there will not be a vote.

Nevertheless, I want to be on record. Second, I came down because I was watching C-SPAN and heard the words "Coast Guard" and thought that the gentleman had a distress signal around his neck. So I came to assist.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, this is not a distress signal. This is worn in honor of the men and women who serve the U.S. Coast Guard. I hope that all Members of the House have the same deep respect and admiration for those men and women, as I have. I hope we show that deep respect when we approve not only this authorization bill but the appropriations that must come and must follow.

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

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H.R. 5055, I rise in strong support of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1992.

And, like subcommittee Chairman TAUZIN, I, too, want to pay special recognition to Chairman WALTER JONES. I have served with Chairman JONES for 12 years. He has always been fair—always cared about his committee on both sides—been truly bipartisan and for that we are appreciative.

I would also like to compliment my distinguished subcommittee chairman, Congressman BILLY TAUZIN, for his outstanding leadership and for moving this bill in such an expeditious fashion.

This essential funding measure for the Coast Guard has been drafted in a truly bipartisan manner and I appreciate all of the courtesies extended to this side of the aisle.

While the administration may have some concerns about the legislation, it was unanimously reported by the full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee just 2 weeks ago.

It is the product of many months of careful deliberation and it is fiscally responsible in that it authorizes only \$25.6 million more than last year's figure. While frankly I would have supported a higher funding level, the Commandant of the Coast Guard has stated that this authorization bill will provide sufficient financial resources to meet their operational needs.

Nevertheless, we must all recognize that the Coast Guard and its personnel are being stretched to their absolute limits. Instead of eliminating certain missions, Congress continues to mandate new and additional responsibilities.

With this bill, the Coast Guard will be able to continue to replace their seagoing and coastal buoy tenders; to pre-position certain oil spill cleanup equipment at coastal locations throughout the country; to renovate the Coast Guard icebreaker *Mackinaw*; to upgrade our Nation's vessel traffic service system and to arrest those persons bringing illegal drugs into the United States.

Furthermore, the Coast Guard is currently involved in a massive effort to promulgate the various regulations mandated by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990.

Mr. Chairman, there are few, if any, Federal agencies that more responsibly spend our taxpayer's money and it is essential that the Coast Guard receive the full \$3.8 billion authorized by this legislation.

While there are a number of important provisions contained within H.R. 5055, I would like to highlight several which are of particular interest to me.

First, H.R. 5055 authorizes the repositioning of certain Coast Guard oil spill cleanup equipment for the Houston Ship Channel.

As a representative of the Port of Houston, I am committed to ensuring that, if we have any future oil spills, they will be cleaned up quickly and effectively. By having this Coast Guard equipment repositioned in the Houston Ship Channel, we are much more likely to minimize any environmental impacts.

Furthermore, there are few, if any, regions of our country that have larger concentrations of petroleum products than the Port of Houston and no location which more fully satisfies the repositioning criteria stipulated in the Oil Pollution Act.

Under this provision, the Port of Houston will receive two vessel of op-

portunity skimmers, 2,500 feet of oil containment boom, and two portable floating bladders. This equipment will supplement that to be provided by the Marine Spill Response Corporation, which is a privately funded organization.

Second, H.R. 5055 provides \$1.25 million so that the Texas Center for Marine Training and Safety at Galveston, TX, can purchase a marine oil spill management simulator.

This state-of-the-art technology will provide individuals with computer simulations of actual oil spills. By so doing, it will allow hundreds of students, including maritime cadets, Coast Guard personnel, and professional mariners to learn firsthand how to deal with an oil spill under a number of different scenarios.

Using a simulator allows valuable training to take place quickly, cheaply and repeatedly without risking lives or an environmental catastrophe. Because of this training, an individual will be much more likely to respond correctly when confronted with an actual oil spill.

Mr. Chairman, Texas A&M University has been in the forefront of efforts to educate those involved in the domestic oil and transportation industry. In 1977, the university established the National Spill Control School, which offers a variety of courses on such subjects as oil spill prevention, emergency response training, and safe handling of dangerous cargos. Since its opening the school has trained 12,500 persons.

I am convinced that the \$1.25 million authorized in this bill is a proper investment of oil spill liability trust funds and, with this simulator, Texas A&M University will be able to do even a better job of educating thousands of Americans on how to protect our Nation's coastline from oil spills.

Third, I am pleased that incorporated within section 301 of H.R. 5055 is my language to prohibit the collection of any fees for the inspection of our Nation's five State Maritime Academy training ships.

The Texas *Clipper*, which is the training ship for the Texas Maritime Academy, and the other sailing vessels are owned by the Federal Government and are chartered to the State Maritime Academies under long-term operating agreements. Since Congress appropriates money each year to the State academies, frankly, it makes no sense to now demand that they pay \$7,200 for each Coast Guard inspection. While I would prefer that the Coast Guard simply exempt these vessels from their proposed regulations, it appears that a legislative solution will be necessary.

Fourth, this legislation addresses the issue of Coast Guard enforcement of certain regulations to protect sea turtles. While this bill does not propose to alter or suspend the use of the turtle excluder devices [TED's], a number of

individuals who have been accused of violating these regulations have been denied due process of law. Under the Endangered Species Act, all citizens are guaranteed a hearing on their case before any penalties can be assessed.

Regrettably, requests for hearings have been routinely denied and shrimpers in the Gulf of Mexico have not been given their day in court.

This situation must be corrected and H.R. 5055 requires that a memorandum of agreement be signed by the Coast Guard and the National Marine Fisheries Service allowing those accused of a violation to appear for a hearing if a timely request is made.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of whether a Member is for or against the TED enforcement regulations, we must ensure that our citizens' constitutional rights are protected.

Finally, this bill will improve safety for the 4 million Americans who travel on a foreign-flag cruise ship each year. Section 302 will allow the Coast Guard to prevent the departure of any passenger vessel which does not fully comply with the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea [SOLAS]. Under SOLAS, to which the United States is a party, inspection authority is unlimited. Therefore, H.R. 5055 amends current U.S. law to allow the Coast Guard to withhold port clearance when they have concerns about the safety or the seaworthiness of a certain cruise ship. It is a long overdue change that will improve safety for the traveling public.

Mr. Chairman, for all of these reasons, I strongly support the enactment of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1992. While H.R. 5055 is not a perfect bill, it will allow the Coast Guard to continue to wage its battle against illegal drugs, to protect our coastline from future oil spills, and to assist thousands of Americans throughout this country.

Mr. Chairman, again, I urge support for H.R. 5055 and compliment Chairman TAUZIN for his superb leadership in moving this vital Coast Guard funding bill.

Like the gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman TAUZIN, I was just informed by the Commandant of some drastic reductions from another committee, and I wanted to ask the gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman TAUZIN, I know it is early and it is difficult to say what those reductions would mean.

As I understand, there is an \$87 million cut that has been proposed in another committee.

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

Mr. FIELDS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. The \$87 million reduction is being proposed by the subcommittee in Appropriations, and it is \$87 million in operations, \$20 million

additional on AC&I. That is the acquisitions budget.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, if I could ask the gentleman, he and I have both been very active in trying to deal with the threat of oil spills in our coastal waters. It appears to me that one of the things that would be impacted initially would be the ability to preposition this oil spill clean-up equipment.

□ 1444

Mr. TAUZIN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, there are 21 proposed sites on the coastline of America all around this country, sites that are designed to be places where equipment, supplies, the kinds of things that the Coast Guard is going to need to respond to an oil spill which would be pre-positioned, ready to go into action if and when a spill occurs. The Commandant today on the phone told me that implementing those 21 sites would be dramatically delayed as a result of cuts recommended by the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. FIELDS. The Commandant said basically the same thing to me. He also talked about some facilities that might be closed. Does the chairman have any idea what type of facilities we are talking about?

Mr. TAUZIN. If the gentleman will yield, I asked the Commandant to specify that for me as accurately as he could. He and his staff are hastily trying to accomplish a list that has more specificity than he could give me this morning. However, I can tell you this: He clearly said there would be shutting down of some search and rescue stations and air stations.

Does the gentleman recall when the Congress had to face that several years ago, and how this body literally came together in a great cry not to shut those stations down? These cuts would shut down search and rescue stations, imperiling lives immediately.

Second, it would clearly mean decommissioning of some Coast Guard vessels. If we do not have the money to operate, we simply cannot operate the vessels the Coast Guard needs to do all the other work, fisheries enforcement, rescue, what have you.

It would also clearly mean that there would be some reductions in the amount of money available to do such things as pre-positioning equipment and supplies for oilspills and a delay in the whole implementation schedule of OFA 1990, the oilspill act that Congress passed with such fanfare a few years ago.

Mr. FIELDS. I don't know if the chairman heard the same thing that I heard, but I also heard that was not something that he would be able to wait on, the Commandant, up until the last minute; that he would be able to make personnel reductions now and that these people would not necessarily be hired back.

Mr. TAUZIN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I am not sure everyone in the House is aware of how important the Marine Safety Office is to a community that has a marine industry. A Marine Safety Office is a critical component of not only safety for the recreation of the public but for the marine industries that are critical to this Nation and its economy.

The Commandant said he would have to begin immediately consolidating and shutting down Marine Safety Offices. He would have no choice if in fact these kinds of cuts were mandated, and he could not wait to do it in the middle of the year. He would have to start shutting down search and rescue stations. He would have to start decommissioning vessels and shutting down safety offices. That is how serious these cuts could be to the Nation and to the economics and to the health and safety of the boating public.

Mr. FIELDS. One of the most important missions of the Coast Guard is drug interdiction, and the chairman has been very active in that particular area. Is there any insight as to what this particular reduction would do in that drug interdiction area?

Mr. TAUZIN. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman knows we have included language from time to time in our authorization bill to make sure that drug interdiction money were not used in lieu of operating search and rescue stations, but what a choice, what a choice, if this Congress is forced to look at an \$87 million reduction in the operation of the Coast Guard, if we have to choose between a necessary drug enforcement effort to stop drugs from coming in to kill the lifeblood of the future generations of our country, or to save somebody who is drowning in the recreational waters of our country. What an awful choice. But we are going to be faced with those kinds of choices if in fact these cuts come down.

Mr. FIELDS. Of course, I know no one is going to accuse the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] of not being a fiscal conservative, nor me of being a fiscal conservative.

However, I think it is very important for the House, the entire House, to recognize that the Coast Guard is already at their bare-bones level, and that this \$87 million is extremely important.

I would just like to commit to the chairman to work with him in a bipartisan fashion to make sure that all Members of the House recognize how important this particular money is.

Mr. TAUZIN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, unlike a number of budgets we are going to look at before this year is through, the Coast Guard's budget is not increasing rapidly. It is set at less than 1 percent increase this year, and that is due mainly to the cost-of-living adjustments to its personnel.

If we take \$87 million out of it, there is no place for it to come but out of the

hide of operations critical to the safety, health, marine traffic, and all the other good things the Coast Guard does, and the drug enforcement and what have you. The gentleman is absolutely right, we have not been greedy, we have not been excessive in our appropriations to the Coast Guard. We have given them the bare minimum to do their incredible job, and they give us more for the dollars we send them than I think any other Federal agency that we ever appropriate for. I hope that Congress clearly understands that when it comes down to looking at what these cuts are going to mean to the Nation and the state of readiness of the Coast Guard.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me highlight a provision of special concern to me. Section 104 addresses serious shoreside problems at Group Hatteras, which is located in my district. At stations within this group, Coast Guard men and women live in 20-year-old trailers and homes that were last renovated in the 1950's. The Coast Guard doesn't even have the money to replace the wooden fire escapes on aging buildings. H.R. 5055 will remedy this situation by directing the Secretary to spend up to \$5.5 million over 5 years to fix up these facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES. I rise in support of H.R. 4055, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1993.

The Coast Guard is an agency charged with many diverse missions including search and rescue, marine safety, aids to navigation, marine environmental protection, defense readiness, drug interdiction, and law enforcement.

Despite this broad range of tasks, the Coast Guard continues to function effectively and efficiently. Indeed, I believe the Coast Guard is the finest and most well-run branch of the armed services, and I am very proud that the country's only Coast Guard Training Center is in my district, in Cape May, NJ.

H.R. 5055 authorizes an appropriation of \$3.6 billion for Coast Guard programs in fiscal year 1993, a modest increase of 6 percent over last year's appropriation. I believe this budget reflects the Coast Guard's commitment to all its missions, including the Commandant's personal goal of increasing the quality of life for the Coast Guard's enlisted men and women.

I am particularly pleased to see an increase in the authorization of funds for marine environmental protection, vessel traffic service systems, pre-positioned equipment, and strike teams, in

addition to an expansion of the national oilspill response system.

The recent *Santa Clara I* incident, in which hazardous cargo was lost overboard during the vessel's transit along the east coast, demonstrates the real and growing need to maintain a readiness to respond to pollution and environmental disasters at all times, particularly as international commerce in hazardous substances increases.

Another crucial objective of the Coast Guard is to improve boating safety and to foster greater development, use, and enjoyment of all U.S. waters. Accordingly, the increase in the Wallup-Breaux trust fund to be used for State grants for recreational boating safety activities will aid the Coast Guard in accomplishing this goal. Further, the Coast Guard's plan to develop a boating safety education program geared to our young boaters is an effective means of improving boating safety, and I support it wholeheartedly.

This bill also increases authorization levels for research and development, environmental compliance, acquisition, construction and improvement, and operating expenses.

Overall, this is a sound, cost-effective bill, and I urge my colleagues' support for its passage.

□ 1450

Let me say before I sit down that it is disheartening to learn of the Appropriations Subcommittee's reduction of the Coast Guard activities, \$133 million total, \$87 million in operations. I guess when you forget about history you are bound to repeat it, and that is what we are doing again.

I remember just a few years ago, and I am sure my colleagues from Louisiana and Texas remember as well when we had those kinds of cuts in the operating budget, and we had about 40 percent of our fleet idle. We did not have enough fuel at that time basically to man our cutters to be able to do our job in the Caribbean against the drug traffickers.

At a time when substance abuse is on the increase they are proposing a \$87 billion reduction in the Coast Guard. At a time when our fleet is falling apart because we have not committed enough resources to maintaining our cutters, when we are not building new cutters to replace the aging cutters in our fleet, why we are cutting about \$29 billion in maintenance. It just does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Coast Guard authorization committee in seeing that this particular authorization is not only passed into law, but we see an appropriation of a level amount.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The story of the Coast Guard consists of many tales of courageous individuals—

The search and rescue teams that brave hurricanes and gales to rescue individuals lost at sea;

The young men and women who confront armed drug smugglers;

The teams that handle hazardous chemical spills knowing that a mistake may cause pain or death.

This year, a Coast Guard hero, Comdr. Bruce Melnick, was one of the astronauts of the space shuttle *Endavour*. This crew defied the odds and successfully captured and repaired an unwieldy 4½-ton satellite. Who can forget those thrilling live television shots of this space rescue?

Commander Melnick's triumph exemplifies the innovation, talent, and deep commitment to public service that the Coast Guard brings to its many demanding missions.

Commander Melnick is a model and inspiration for our young people. He is also an excellent representative of the men and women of the U.S. Coast Guard—heroes all.

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

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

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

I want to thank the members of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, especially Chairman JONES, Mr. DAVIS, Chairman TAUZIN, and Mr. FIELDS for their unanimous support of my legislation which is included in this year's Coast Guard reauthorization bill. I would also like to thank Congressman GILCHREST for offering my legislation as an amendment during the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard's consideration of H.R. 5055.

As you know, the Coast Guard is part of the Department of Transportation and therefore is not bound by the same procurement policies as is the Department of Defense. Buoy chain procurements are currently covered by the Buy American Act and the Federal acquisition regulation which are intended to level the playing field between U.S. domestic bidders and foreign bidders. However, there are only two U.S. manufacturers that regularly bid buoy chain solicitations because many American companies find they cannot compete with foreign companies who are subsidized by their governments.

According to the recent figures obtained from the Coast Guard, in fiscal year 1990 the Coast Guard procured 69.1 percent of its buoy chain from China, 15.4 percent from Yugoslavia, and only 15.5 percent from the United States.

Moreover, if bid selections are approved for fiscal year 1992, only 6 percent of the buoy chain purchased would be from domestic sources and 94 percent would be from foreign manufacturers.

H.R. 5055 would require the Coast Guard to be subject to the same pro-

urement policies as the Department of Defense, therefore restricting the Coast Guard from procuring buoy chain that is not manufactured in the United States. In addition, all of the components of the buoy chain must be produced or manufactured in the United States.

Although the Coast Guard estimates this change will increase their costs for buoy chain, buy America is a good policy from a national security, strategic defense, and economic standpoint. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this reauthorization bill.

□ 1500

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE].

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, echo the sentiments of others who have spoken.

As a conservative in Congress, and I would match my credentials with any other conservative in Congress, I want to support the funding of the Coast Guard. You know, there is a lot of talk nowadays about defense cuts, about what we are going to have to do in our Nation's defense.

Quite frankly, I think we have cut too far in many areas, but there is a major distinction that many people are not aware of when they deal with the Coast Guard. A defense system is one that practices and prepares in the event of a war or a conflict. In the Coast Guard, the war is going on every day. The Coast Guard deals with search and rescue, with drug interdiction, with oil spills. These are very real things that are going on.

During the subcommittee meeting, we were able to put an amendment on the Coast Guard bill to determine what use we could make of a vehicle that is particularly adept for use for the Coast Guard. It is the tilt-rotor concept of the V-22. This is something that was developed several decades ago. It was used in the original prototype, which was the XV-15.

I have to be very candid and say the fuselages were made in the Rockwell plant in Tulsa, OK, so perhaps I do come from somewhat of a prejudiced perspective, but in the area of aeronautics myself, I can show and demonstrate to people that if there was ever a vehicle that could be used for the Coast Guard, it would be this particular vehicle which has the capability of a 300-knot speed and hovering capability by the rotation of the motors.

Admiral Yost, prior to his leaving the Coast Guard, said that the tilt-rotor concept is the answer to a Coast Guard commander's prayers.

In the area of search and rescue, I do not think anyone can look at this and not see that this has the advantage of

getting there and then hovering once it is there, that there is not another vehicle that would do anything like this.

On an average day, the search-and-rescue operations save 13 lives and some 339 people are assisted. I happened to be one of those individuals who was assisted just a few years ago. So I am very familiar with that. In the area of drug interdiction, I do serve on the drug committee as the gentleman from California does. We were talking right before this that those of us like the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] and myself who are pilots and who have a background in aviation, when you say that something will go 300 knots and hover, you have told the whole story.

Certainly drug interdiction is an area where it can be used.

In oilspills, we are all anguished over the problems that happened in Prince William Sound when we had the *Ezzon Valdez* incident, and certainly that would be an area where there would be an excellent application.

The gentleman from California and I did a 2-hour special order after I flew a small plane around the world not too long ago, last summer, and I stopped at the various Coast Guard stations. One of them was under the leadership of Adm. David Ciancaglini in Juneau, AK. When we went out and analyzed the vehicles being used up there, he agreed that every mission the Coast Guard had could be enhanced by the use of this particular vehicle.

So I am very pleased that this is going to be something that is included in this bill, and I think that the Coast Guard, by determining how this is going to be used, is going to be in a position to offer a lot to civilian aviation also.

We know in this day and age of shorter runways, of airports being closed, of noise problems that exist, certainly this has a great civilian application.

Lastly, I would say that if you look at our balance of trade, developing this technology in America will preclude others from developing it and before we are able to do it. It is our information that the Japanese are already working on this technology. If we can get there first, obviously it is going to be to America's advantage and to everyone in America.

So I am very pleased this is going to be part of this bill, and I am very supportive of the bill, as I have told the chairmen.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INHOFE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to support everything the gentleman has said about this V-22 Osprey. I truly consider it a national asset for all the services, not only for the Marine Corps amphibious mission, which has grown absolutely

obsolete given beach fortification firepower; you have to envelop them by insertion probably at night deep behind the enemy lines. The same would apply to the Army units, all Special Forces units.

Let me speak briefly to this rescue mission. I do not want to bore my colleagues with a peacetime war story, but I was ferrying an Air Force jet fighter from an Air National Guard field in Van Nuys, obviously an intensely populated area, to the boneyard in Davis-Monthan in Tucson to be out up. This was the hangar queen. I had not flown in 73 days. The plane had not flown in 4 months. It flamed out over a dense area. So I took it out trying to get an air start, and then I took it out over the water to punch off the tanks.

I finally realized I was going to have to get out of this aircraft. I had delusions of bailing out, and with the sea and prevailing winds, my parachute drifting into the beach. By the time I got out of it, I was 6 miles out, with no Mae West, no life raft.

A helicopter came out to get me. This is ancient, because this is 30 years ago this coming February 23. That helicopter had been assigned rescue duty that first day, that very hour, and it is still there, derivatives of the helicopter 30 years later.

The pilot of the helicopter told me, after I had warmed up, because it was the coldest day of the year off the California coast, 46 degrees water temperature, which is hypothermia time. He told me that probably 10-15 more seconds, I would not have lived.

Now, if he had had this aircraft, the V-22, he would have been out there in minutes, not the 15 or 20 minutes it took them to get 6 miles out in an old HUP helicopter. This helicopter is the ultimate rescue weapon for the Coast Guard since the rowboat. We simply must build it.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I certainly do not want the gentleman from California to think, by my support of this for the Coast Guard, it diminishes my interest for the Defense Department, because he and I were both over the Persian Gulf during the war. If you stop and think about the mission over there and how it could have applied, that is great, but since it looked like it was not meeting with a favorable reception in Defense, this is a logical place for it to start. We have got to keep this alive. We have got to keep this the country that produces and the advanced technology of tilt-rotor, and this is a good place to start.

Mr. DORNAN of California. If the gentleman will yield further, if we buy it, every Coast Guard in the world will buy it.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], for their good and sound work again on the Coast Guard.

They have brought out some very interesting points.

I have been on the committee for 20 years now, and we have increased the funding for the Coast Guard to some degree over what it was when we first came, but we are still not up to speed. We believe that we need more, because the Coast Guard just is not for coastal areas or rescuing people in jet planes. It is also for the Nation when it comes to drug interdiction, oil-spill cleanup opportunities, not only on the oceans but in the rivers.

It was, also, the immigration problems. The Coast Guard has been charged with numerous responsibilities by this Congress.

I will say that Congress has, under the leadership of this committee, tried to fund them adequately, and I believe that we have to bring it home to this administration and to other Members of this Congress that we should be increasing the spending to a greater degree.

Mr. Chairman, I also believe that I cannot stand here and speak about the Coast Guard without reminding people of their role in activities with the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill. The Coast Guard was the lead agency after finally getting things straightened out, and we learned something and passed legislation through the oil-spill legislation to give the Coast Guard the authority to do the job.

□ 1510

Now, we have given the authority. Hopefully, we are going to give them the equipment and we will have the direction in place so that if we ever have another oil spill that we will have the ability to clean it up.

It may be for nought, if I may remind the Members, because we are producing so little oil. This last month we imported 7.5 million barrels a day and only produced 6.2 million barrels a day, so there may not be any need for this so-called oil spill legislation cleanup activity, if we do not start producing some oil.

I am going to remind this Congress that the Coast Guard can be funded if we are making products and producing products in this country. So it is time we start thinking also where we are in the fossil fuel production in this country. There are 630 wells being drilled today, rigs being used, versus 4,000. There were 4,000 wells in 1980.

We have run our business overseas. It is in China. It is in Russia. It is in Ven-

ezuela and Colombia. It is in Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Iraq, but it is not here at home.

So as much as I support this bill, and I do support it very strongly, it plays a major role in my State with the large coastlines we have, with the search and rescue that takes place, with the fine personnel that we have, and we must fund them adequately.

But this Congress has to wake up to where we are as far as production of energy for this Nation. If not, we are doing this all in vain.

Again, I thank the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] for their activity on the Coast Guard. Let us pass this legislation overwhelmingly.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5055, a bill to authorize appropriations for the U.S. Coast Guard, and urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard is an important line of our national defense, especially in coastal States, such as my own State of Alaska. The Coast Guard has done an excellent job in keeping the peace, enforcing laws and treaties, performing search and rescue missions, and protecting our environment. They should not only be commended for their fine work, but also should be given the level of funds necessary to carry out their job.

Now that I have said all these good things about the Coast Guard, I want to point to one section in this bill that corrects a mistake made by this fine agency. Section 306 of this bill authorizes the Coast Guard to pay certain subcontractors who have been the victims of bureaucracy and outright fraud. The story is simple: In 1987, the Coast Guard contracted for work to be performed in Ketchikan, AK. The contractor subcontracted with a number of local firms. The Coast Guard paid the contractor, but the contractor never paid the subcontractors. In trying to collect their payment, the subcontractors discovered that the contractor had gone bankrupt, and the bond posted by the contractor was completely worthless. The subcontractors have tried every legal avenue they could to receive their payment. To date, they have received nothing, and they will never get anything in the future unless Congress authorizes a payment.

There is some question as to whether the Coast Guard has a legal liability in this issue. After all, the Coast Guard was supposedly operating under the contracting rules in force at the time. However, it appears to me, and the Committee has agreed, that the Coast Guard may not have done all it should have to make sure that the subcontractors were protected.

This section authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to investigate this issue within a set time frame and, if certain findings are made, to pay the subcontractors what they are owed. We think this is the only fair way to see that American workers and small businesses are protected.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a good bill and I urge its passage.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas only has 3½ minutes to yield.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, for trying to put a Texas spin on that 3½ minutes very much.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to pay my respects to the chairman of the committee. I felt it was an honor and a privilege to serve with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] since I have been in Congress. I think I have learned a lot, and we will certainly miss the gentleman, and I want to extend my congratulations to the gentleman for the good work he has done on this through the many years that he has done it, and I join with my other colleagues who have made those statements.

I also want to commend the chairman, and of course, our ranking member, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] for getting this authorization bill forward.

Mr. Chairman, these are very challenging times for the U.S. Coast Guard, and the trend, I fear, is that Congress is heaping more and more on the Coast Guard's plate without regard for priorities or affordability.

On any given day, the Coast Guard must be prepared to patrol for smugglers, conduct search and rescue missions, protect life and property at sea, protect the marine environment including oil spill matters, maintain aids to maritime navigation, assist in icebreaking activities, promote boating safety, and last but not least, the Coast Guard must always be prepared to serve as a branch of the Navy in times of war. Quite a tall order to fill, but somehow the Coast Guard always comes through.

The problem for the Coast Guard, not to mention the taxpayers, is that each year the list of Coast Guard duties continues to grow as resources continue to dwindle. In the last 20 years, the legal responsibilities of the Coast Guard have expanded enormously as a result of the adoption of 19 new maritime laws. The Coast Guard simply does not have the manpower or the budget to absorb new mandates at this rate.

With the adoption of the recreational boat user fee, the Congress has successfully, if unwisely, transformed the Coast Guard into an arm of the IRS. And with the latest mandate passed down—requiring the Coast Guard to commit major resources to the windward passage—the Coast Guard has been asked to assume the role of immigration support officer. It is extra missions such as these that force the Coast Guard to dip into resources provided for basic Coast Guard needs and services. This is unfair not only to the

Coast Guard, but also to the taxpayers at large who depend on basic services.

Up until now, the Coast Guard has successfully lived up to its numerous responsibilities. But we may have reached a point where the Coast Guard and the taxpayers have to say "no" to additional missions.

Mr. Chairman, no matter how much we challenge the ability of the Coast Guard to manage on a shoestring budget, we have a responsibility to prioritize the duties of the Coast Guard with an eye toward affordability. I certainly am not advocating micromanagement by Congress—I am urging a better system of oversight that allows us to know when we are robbing Peter to pay Paul. There may be valid reasons to do so—as we have recently seen in the windward passage—but I believe we all need to know the true cost in dollars and forgone missions in support of other goals. I support this authorizing legislation, today, but I note my concern.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is up to us to pursue policies to assure a world where shipping is safer, the oceans are purer, the coasts are cleaner, and fisheries resources are richer. Today, we have a chance to act to achieve these goals. Let us give the men and women of the Coast Guard the resources and equipment necessary to meet these challenges and fulfill their other responsibilities. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Coast Guard by passing this extremely important bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of our side's time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, the House in committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5055) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes:

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5055, Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1992. The bill authorizes \$3.6 billion for the Coast Guard in fiscal year 1993—including \$2.6 billion for operating expenses, \$419 million for acquisition and construction, \$30.5 million for environmental compliance, and \$520 million for retirement benefits. The total authorized is \$198 million—6 percent more than appropriated for those Coast Guard activities in fiscal year 1992, and \$6.5 million more than requested by the Bush administration. Mr. Chairman the Congressional Budget Office estimates that if Congress appropriates the full amount authorized in the bill, outlays would be \$2.1 billion in fiscal year 1993, \$427 million in fiscal year 1994, \$344 million in fiscal year 1995, \$81 million in fiscal year 1996, and \$33 million in fiscal year 1997.

Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard is a multi-mission agency. Organizationally, the Coast Guard is part of the Department of Transportation in peace time, but in war time, it is a part of the Navy, and as such is part of the

Department of Defense. The Coast Guard's mission includes such diverse duties as search and rescue, marine safety, aids to navigation, marine environmental protection, defense readiness, drug interdiction, enforcement of laws and treaties and ice operations.

For several years, the Coast Guard has been expected to do more, with less resources. The Coast Guard's budget is the bare minimum necessary to accomplish its many missions. Coast Guard surveillance is a vital part of our Nation's drug interdiction strategy. Coast Guard intelligence also allows civilian and military law enforcement agencies to respond more expeditiously when a suspected drug smuggling boat or airplane is spotted. In addition, boarding suspected drug smuggling vessels is a dangerous task that requires, specialized training, bravery and tact.

In addition to annual authorizations the Coast Guard is permanently authorized under existing law to spend funds for reserve training—expected to be about \$75 million in fiscal year 1993, of which \$43 million would be transferred from the Defense Department.

Mr. Chairman, a provision in the bill would increase from \$1,000 to \$5,000 the maximum civil fine for second, and any subsequent, violations of operating a boat under the influence of drugs or alcohol. This change in the law is appropriate because operating a boat while intoxicated is just as dangerous, if not more so, than operating a motor vehicle under the influence on shore.

The bill also requires the Coast Guard to report to Congress on the possible applications of V-22 Osprey tiltrotor aircraft technology to Coast Guard missions, particularly search and rescue, law enforcement, and oil spill response.

Mr. Chairman, the Bush administration opposes passages of H.R. 5055 for several reasons. The administration does not approve of the provision that exempts training vessels operated by State maritime academies from a proposed Coast Guard user fee for vessel inspections; that require the Coast Guard and the Commerce Department to agree on procedures involved in enforcing U.S. fisheries laws and regulations. It also opposes provisions that direct the Coast Guard to undertake specific actions; that declare certain bridges and obstructions to navigation, and thereby eligible for Federal assistance to remove or alter them.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that when H.R. 5055 reaches his desk President Bush will sign it, because it is inconsistent to talk about how serious the Nation's drug problem is, acknowledge what an important role the Coast Guard plays in the war against drugs, and then deny them the funding necessary to do an adequate job of drug interdiction.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5055, legislation authorizing funding for the U.S. Coast Guard for fiscal year 1993.

Residents of southeastern Massachusetts know better than just about anyone, how important a healthy and well equipped Coast Guard is to their community. Whether it's protecting our beaches from oil spills, rescuing our fishermen at sea or keeping our channels well marked, the Coast Guard's activities are a big part of our lives.

The funding authorized in this bill represents about a 6 percent increase over last year's appropriations. While the hearing record created by Subcommittee Chairman TAUZIN clearly shows that the Coast Guard needs more than that, we will have a difficult time getting the 6 percent increase. Last week the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation marked up a bill which essentially freezes the Coast Guard at last year's levels. I urge all of my colleagues to join with our committee in seeking an increase for the Coast Guard 1993 appropriation.

Just 2 weeks ago, I had the privilege of taking part in a ceremony dedicating a monument to fishermen in the Port of Chatham, on Cape Cod. Chatham is an old fishing port which opens to the Atlantic through one of the most treacherous channels on the east coast. For centuries, the Coast Guard and its predecessors—the Lighthouse Service and the Life-saving Service—have had a presence in Chatham.

During that ceremony over 1,000 people stood to pay tribute to Senior Chief Jack Downey, who is in charge of the local search and rescue station. Chief Downey—the best damn chief in the Coast Guard—represents the finest of the Coast Guard's proud tradition.

The funding and military strength and training levels authorized in this bill will provide the Coast Guard—and people like Chief Downey—with the resources it requires to continue to be the Nation's finest. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5055, the Coast Guard authorization bill.

This bill authorizes \$3.6 billion for the Coast Guard in fiscal year 1993, of which \$2.6 billion covers Coast Guard operating expenses. It should be noted that this \$2.6 billion is equal to the amount requested by the administration and 5 percent more than appropriated in fiscal year 1992 for Coast Guard operating expenses.

Coast Guard operations include carrying out search and rescue missions, interdicting the transport of illegal drugs, aiding navigation, protecting the marine environment, and enforcing treaties and laws. The Coast Guard's role in ensuring the public safety cannot be minimized, especially in an island State like Hawaii.

The waters around the State of Hawaii are utilized for every conceivable water-based recreational and commercial activity and include some of the richest fishing grounds in the mid-Pacific. The waters northwest of Kauai, the westernmost of the State's eight principal islands, support more than a fair share of these rich fishing grounds. As such, these waters attract a considerable amount of recreational and commercial fishing activity.

The above activity and the Coast Guard's plans to essentially relocate its Kauai station to the island of Oahu, 100 miles further to the East, has prompted a number of my constituents to question the appropriateness of the Coast Guard's plans.

I join my constituents in urging the Coast Guard to reconsider its plan to ensure that search and rescue missions in the waters around and to the northwest of Kauai are carried out in a timely manner.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired for general debate.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and each title is considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate title I.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text by the rule be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 5055

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

**TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS**

**SECTION 101. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1992".

**SEC. 102. AUTHORIZATION.**

Funds are authorized to be appropriated for necessary expenses of the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1993, as follows:

(a) For the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, \$2,603,000,000, of which—

(1) \$142,100,000 shall be transferred from the Department of Defense;

(2) \$31,876,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund; and

(3) \$35,000,000 shall be expended from the Boat Safety Account.

(b) For the acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids-to-navigation, shore and offshore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, \$419,030,000 to remain available until expended, of which—

(1) \$18,000,000 shall be transferred from the Department of Defense; and

(2) \$37,852,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

(c) For research, development, test, and evaluation, \$29,900,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$4,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

(d) For retired pay (including the payment of obligations otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose), payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefit Plans, and payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, \$519,700,000, to remain available until expended.

(e) For alteration or removal of bridges over navigable waters of the United States constituting obstructions to navigation, and for personnel and administrative costs associated with the Bridge Administration Program, \$12,600,000, to remain available until expended.

(f) For environmental compliance and restoration at Coast Guard facilities, \$30,500,000, to remain available until expended.

**SEC. 103. AUTHORIZED LEVELS OF MILITARY STRENGTH AND MILITARY TRAINING.**

(a) As of September 30, 1993, the Coast Guard is authorized an end-of-year strength for active

duty personnel of 39,732. The authorized strength does not include members of the Ready Reserve called to active duty under section 712 of title 14, United States Code.

(b) For fiscal year 1993, the Coast Guard is authorized average military training student loads as follows:

(1) For recruit and special training, 2,653 student years.

(2) For flight training, 110 student years.

(3) For professional training in military and civilian institution, 362 student years.

(4) For officer acquisition, 878 student years.

**SEC. 104. SHORE FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS AT GROUP CAPE HATTERAS.**

The Secretary of Transportation shall expend not more than \$5,500,000 of amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Coast Guard in Fiscal Years 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997, for shore facilities improvements within Group Cape Hatteras, North Carolina.

**SEC. 105. PREPOSITIONED OIL SPILL CLEANUP EQUIPMENT.**

Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement that are derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund in fiscal year 1993, the Secretary of Transportation shall expend \$1,780,000 to acquire and preposition oil spill response equipment at Traverse City, Michigan and Houston, Texas.

**SEC. 106. OIL SPILL TRAINING SIMULATORS.**

Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement that are derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund in Fiscal Year 1993, the Secretary of Transportation shall make available—

(1) \$1,250,000 to the Texas Center for Marine Training and Safety at Galveston, Texas, for the purchase of a marine oil spill management simulator; and

(2) \$1,250,000 to the Massachusetts Center for Marine Environmental Protection, located at Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts, for the purchase of a marine oil spill management simulator.

**SEC. 107. DESIGNATION OF THE FLORIDA AVENUE BRIDGE AS AN UNREASONABLE OBSTRUCTION TO NAVIGATION.**

Notwithstanding another law, the Florida Avenue Bridge, which is located 1.63 miles east of the Mississippi River on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in Orleans Parish, Louisiana, is deemed to be an unreasonable obstruction to navigation.

**SEC. 108. DESIGNATION OF THE CHELSEA STREET BRIDGE AS AN UNREASONABLE OBSTRUCTION TO NAVIGATION.**

Notwithstanding another law, the Chelsea Street Bridge, which is located at mile 1.2 on the Chelsea River (Creek), in Chelsea, Massachusetts, is deemed to be an unreasonable obstruction to navigation.

**SEC. 109. PROCUREMENT OF BUOY CHAIN.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**"§96. Procurement of buoy chain**

"(a) The Coast Guard may not procure buoy chain unless—

"(1) it is manufactured in the United States; or

"(2) substantially all of its components are produced or manufactured in the United States.

"(b) For purposes of subsection (a)(2), substantially all of the components of a buoy chain are deemed to be produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components that are produced or manufactured in the United States is greater than the aggregate cost of the components that are produced or manufactured outside the United States.

"(c) In this section—

"(1) 'buoy chain' means any chain, cable, or other device that is—

"(A) used to hold in place, by attachment to the bottom of a body of water, a floating aid to navigation; and

"(B) not more than four inches in diameter; and

"(2) 'manufacture' includes cutting, heat treating, quality control, welding (including the forging and shot blasting process), and testing."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§6. Procurement of buoy chain."

**SEC. 110. TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS FOR STATE BOATING SAFETY PROGRAMS.**

Section 4 of the Act of August 9, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 777; popularly known as the "Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act"), is amended—

(1) by inserting "distribution, and transfer" in the third sentence after "deduction,"; and

(2) by inserting after the second sentence the following: "Of annual appropriations allocated under section 3, \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1993, \$15,000,000 for fiscal years 1994 and 1995, and \$20,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter, shall be expended for State recreational boating safety programs under section 13106(a)(1) of title 46, United States Code."

**TITLE II—BOATING SAFETY**

**SEC. 201. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR OPERATING A VESSEL WHILE INTOXICATED.**

Section 2302(c)(1) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking "\$1,000;" and inserting "\$1,000 for a first violation and not more than \$5,000 for a subsequent violation;"

**SEC. 202. FUTURE BOATERS EDUCATION PROGRAM.**

Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives a plan to increase the availability of voluntary safe boating education to individuals sixteen years of age or younger. In developing the plan, the Secretary shall consider using the resources of the Coast Guard Auxiliary to provide boating education to the greatest extent possible.

**SEC. 203. COAST GUARD AUXILIARY MISSION REPORT.**

Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives a report on ways to enlarge the mission of the Coast Guard Auxiliary and to increase Auxiliary participation in Coast Guard programs and activities.

**SEC. 204. LAW ENFORCEMENT COORDINATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.**

Not later than two months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a demonstration project in the Ninth Coast Guard District in conjunction with other appropriate officials of Federal, State, and local government agencies, to increase coordination of enforcement of boating laws and regulations.

**TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS**

**SEC. 301. STATE MARITIME ACADEMY VESSEL INSPECTION FEE RELIEF.**

Section 2110 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the following:

"(j) Effective October 1, 1992, the Secretary may not establish or collect a fee or charge for the inspection under part B of this subtitle for

training ships operated by State maritime academies."

**SEC. 302. AUTHORITY FOR THE COAST GUARD TO INSPECT AND WITHHOLD THE DOCUMENTS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN PASSENGER VESSELS.**

(a) Section 3303(a) title 46, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence by—

(1) striking "only"; and

(2) striking "the condition of the vessel's propulsion and lifesaving equipment are" and inserting "the condition of the vessel is".

(b) Section 3505 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking "or domestic vessel of more than 100 gross tons having berth or stateroom accommodations for at least 50 passengers" and inserting "vessel".

**SEC. 303. STUDY OF THE APPLICATION OF TILTROTOR AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY TO COAST GUARD MISSIONS.**

(a) Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit a study to congress on the application of the V-22 Osprey tiltrotor technology to Coast Guard missions.

(b) In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the application of tiltrotor technology to Coast Guard missions including—

(A) search and rescue at sea; and

(B) the enforcement of laws of the United States especially with respect to drug interdiction;

(2) determine whether use of the technology in the Coast Guard marine environmental protection program would minimize the damage caused by oil or hazardous substances spills in the waters of the United States; and

(3) determine what effect the technology would have on Coast Guard manpower and operating costs, compared to those costs associated with technology currently used by the Coast Guard.

**SEC. 304. ENFORCEMENT AGREEMENTS.**

The Coast Guard and the Department of Commerce shall enter into a Memorandum of Agreement regarding fisheries enforcement practices and procedures that provide at a minimum for the opportunity, if timely requested, to appear in person to respond to charges of violation of law or regulation when the opportunity for a hearing is granted by statute. The Memorandum of Agreement shall also provide that all enforcement procedures shall be fair and consistently applied.

**SEC. 305. RADAR BEACON AID-TO-NAVIGATION FOR THE ECKHOLMS ISLANDS.**

Not later than ninety days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall install a radar beacon aid-to-navigation at the Eckholms Islands, near Sitka, Alaska.

**SEC. 306. AUTHORIZING PAYMENT TO CERTAIN SUBCONTRACTORS.**

(a) Not later than sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall determine whether the Coast Guard failed to investigate the adequacy, availability, and financial soundness of the security for payment to subcontractors under Coast Guard contract DTCSG50-87-C-00096, notwithstanding any law or regulation in effect at the time the contract was made.

(b) If the Secretary determines that the Coast Guard failed to investigate as provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) not later than one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, determine the amounts that MZF, Incorporated owes to all subcontractors that performed work or supplied materials under the contract; and

(2) not later than sixty days after making that determination, the Secretary shall pay the subcontractors out of amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act.

(c) The Secretary shall conduct investigations and interviews under this section in Ketchikan, Alaska.

**SEC. 307. STUDY OF THE APPLICATION OF NIGHT VISION AND THERMAL IMAGING TECHNOLOGY TO COAST GUARD MISSIONS.**

(a) Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit a study to Congress on the application of the Driver's Thermal Viewer (DTV) to Coast Guard missions.

(b) In conducting the study required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the applications of the Driver's Thermal Viewer to Coast Guard missions on Coast Guard utility boats and motor lifeboats including—

(A) search and rescue at sea;

(B) the enforcement of laws of the United States, especially with respect to drug interdiction; and

(C) marine environmental protection; and

(2) determine what effect implementing the technology would have on Coast Guard operating costs and manpower.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAUZIN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAUZIN: At the end of the bill add the following new section:

**SEC. . COAST GUARD BAND DIRECTOR.**

Section 336 of title 14, United States Code, is amended in subsection (d) by striking "lieutenant".

Mr. TAUZIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment simply allows the Coast Guard the flexibility it needs to promote the Coast Guard band director from the rank of lieutenant commander to the rank of commander.

The Coast Guard has requested that I offer this amendment for three reasons. First, the statute currently limits the rank to lieutenant commander.

Second, the Coast Guard director has the years and service required otherwise to make him eligible for promotion to commander.

Third, the other services do allow and currently permit the promotion of their directors to the rank of captain or colonel.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment. It is non-controversial in nature, technical in real nature, and offered at the request of the U.S. Coast Guard, and I would move adoption of the amendment.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment offered by my distinguished subcommittee chairman, BILLY TAUZIN, to increase the service rank for the Coast Guard's band director.

While this may seem like a trivial matter, in recent years, the Coast

Guard's band has gained international recognition for its superb performance. In fact, the band has recently received an invitation to perform at the Lincoln Center in New York City.

Under current law, the director of the Coast Guard band is the lieutenant commander, which is a rank considerably less than any of the other branches of the U.S. military service.

This law has not been changed since its inception in 1965, despite the fact that the roles and responsibilities of the Coast Guard band have greatly increased. What was once a small command band that performed at local functions has now evolved into a band that routinely tours throughout the country. It is also a band that has been recognized as one of our finest.

Mr. Chairman, this law should be changed and the Coast Guard's band director should be able to attain the rank of commander. By so doing, it will make the director's rank comparable to that of their counterparts in the other armed services' bands and it will provide this position with the recognition which it deserves.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1520

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAUZIN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAUZIN: At the end of the bill add the following new section:

**SEC. . COASTWISE LAWS.—**

**(a) DREDGES.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Act of May 28, 1906 (46 App. U.S.C. 292) is amended to read as follows:

**SECTION 1. VESSELS THAT MAY ENGAGE IN DREDGING**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a vessel may engage in dredging in the navigable waters of the United States or the Exclusive Economic Zone only if—

“(1) for a vessel that is at least 5 net tons—

“(A) the vessel is documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, with a coastwise endorsement; and

“(B) if chartered, the charterer of the vessel is a citizen of the United States under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 802) for purpose of engaging in the coastwise trade; or

“(2) for a vessel that is less than 5 net tons—

“(A) the vessel was built in the United States; and

“(B) the owner and, if chartered, the charterer of the vessel is a citizen of the United States under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 802) for purpose of engaging in the coastwise trade.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—A documented vessel with a registry endorsement may engage in the dredging of gold in Alaska.

“(c) PENALTY.—When a vessel is operated in knowing violation of this section, that

vessel and its equipment are liable to seizure by and forfeiture to the United States Government.”.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) does not apply to—

(A)(i) the vessel STUYVESANT, official number 648540;

(ii) any other hopper dredging vessel documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code before the effective date of this Act and chartered to Stuyvesant Dredging Company or to an entity in which it has an ownership interest; however, this exception expires on December 3, 2022 or when the vessel STUYVESANT ceases to be documented under chapter 121, whichever first occurs; and

(iii) any other non-hopper dredging vessel documented under chapter 121 and chartered to Stuyvesant Dredging Company or to an entity in which it has an ownership interest, as is necessary (a) to fulfill dredging obligations under a specific contract, including any extension periods; or (b) as temporary replacement capacity for a vessel which has become disabled but only for so long as the disability shall last and until the vessel is in a position to fully resume dredging operations; however, this exception expires on December 8, 2022 or when the vessel STUYVESANT ceases to be documented under chapter 121, whichever first occurs;

(B) the vessel COLUMBUS, official number 590658, except that the vessel's certificate of documentation shall be endorsed to prohibit the vessel from engaging in the transportation of merchandise (except valueless material), including dredge material of value, between places within the navigable waters of the United States; or

(C) a vessel that is engaged in dredged material excavation if that excavation is not more than a minority of the total cost of the construction contract in which the excavation is a single, integral part, and the vessel is—

(i) built in the United States;

(ii) a non-self-propelled mechanical clamshell dredging vessel; and

(iii) owned or chartered by a corporation that had on file with the Secretary of Transportation, on August 1, 1989, the certificate specified in section 27A of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883-1).

(b) GOVERNMENT MERCHANDISE.—Section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883) is amended by striking “merchandise” in the first sentence and inserting “merchandise, including merchandise owned by the United States Government, a State (as defined in section 2101 of title 46, United States Code), or a subdivision of a State.”.

(c) GRANDFATHER PROVISION.—Public Law 100-329 does not apply to a vessel—

(1) engaged in the transportation of valueless material or valueless dredged material; and

(2) owned or chartered by a corporation that had on file with the Secretary of Transportation on August 1, 1989, the certificate specified in section 27A of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883-1).

Mr. TAUZIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard regulated and documented dredges are not subject to the same re-

quirement as other aspects of the maritime industry.

Today I am offering an amendment which will secure safety for domestic hopper dredges by requiring that any future entrants into the industry be domestically built and U.S. citizen owned.

This amendment will make all domestically operated dredges subject to the same documentation and ownership requirements as other vessels under the coastwise trade laws.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would close loopholes in the Federal law. It has been written in cooperation with the U.S. dredging operators and grandfathers existing foreign-owned fleets.

Dredges are a major part of the safety of our maritime industry. Its continued existence under the U.S. flag is very important.

All new entrants under this amendment into the market will be required to be U.S. built, U.S. crewed, and U.S. owned, thus guaranteeing the continued safety in our Nation's waterways of those operations.

I present for the record a position paper issued by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for the support of the amendment at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, as I indicated, is technical, closes loopholes, and I urge my colleagues' support and move its adoption.

**DREDGES AND COASTWISE TRADE**

Section 1 of the Act of May 28, 1906 (46 App. U.S.C. 292), commonly referred to as the Foreign Dredge Act, states:

A foreign-built dredge shall not, under penalty of forfeiture, engage in dredging in the United States unless documented as a vessel of the United States.

An opinion issued by the Attorney General on August 7, 1963 (42 Op. A.G. 189) that was based on the Foreign Dredge Act stated:

Dredging performed by or from vessels on navigable waters is maritime trade, and is coasting or coastwise trade when performed in domestic navigable waters.

This opinion by the Attorney General has largely been ignored when determining the application of the coastwise trade laws to dredging activities. However, section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883), commonly referred to as the Jones Act, requires vessels that transport merchandise, including dredged material, in the coastwise trade to be built in the United States, owned by a corporation in which 75 percent of stockholders are U.S. citizens, and documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code with a coastwise endorsement.

Many vessels engaged in dredging are also engaged in the transportation of dredged material; therefore, they must meet the Jones Act requirements. However, some dredges—such as hydraulic pipeline and clamshell—may be under

foreign ownership or control since they do not transport dredged material.

This amendment to the Foreign Dredge Act requires all dredges to meet the same requirements as those engaged in the coastwise trade and to bring the statute into conformance with the Attorney General's 1963 decision. In addition, if the dredge is chartered under a time voyage or demise charter, the charterer of the vessel also must meet the citizenship requirements under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916—46 App. U.S.C. 802—which means that 75 percent of stockholders must be U.S. citizens. The purpose of this restriction is to ensure that these vessels are always under the control of U.S. citizens.

New subsection (b) of the Foreign Dredge Act allows vessels only have a certificate of documentation with a registry endorsement to engage in dredging for gold in waters of the State of Alaska. Under this exception, the vessel may be foreign built and does not have to meet the ownership requirements of section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916.

The amendment also includes a grandfather clause to protect existing dredging operations that are affected by the change in law.

As previously discussed, the Jones Act requires vessels transporting merchandise between two points in the United States—the coastwise trade—to be built in the United States, owned by U.S. citizens, and documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code with a coastwise endorsement.

However, the Customs Service has ruled that the Jones Act does not apply to the transportation of Government-owned merchandise since the penalty under the Jones Act is forfeiture of the merchandise. Since Government property cannot be forfeited, Customs believes that the Act does not apply to Government-owned merchandise. The committee strongly disagrees with this statutory interpretation. To use a penalty provision as a basis for interpreting the substantive requirements of the law is backward reasoning.

This amendment also clarifies the intent of Congress that the Jones Act applies to the transportation of merchandise owned by the U.S. Government, a State, or a subdivision of a State. Mr. Robert H. Moore, the Director for Transportation Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Production and Logistics—testified before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine on April 23, 1991 that:

We need an adequate and reliable U.S.-flag merchant marine to move the majority of our material sustainment requirements. . . . We need trained and readily available civilian mariners to fill the short-fused emerging requirements for U.S.-flag and RRF manning.

General Hansford T. Johnson, USAF, the Commander-in-Chief of the United

States Transportation Command, stated that "The solution to our future sealift capability as a nation, however, must also include efforts to improve the U.S. merchant marine."

The committee believes that the Government should support the U.S. merchant marine through the Jones Act in the same manner as the private sector is required to use this law when transporting property in the coastwise trade.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed the amendment offered by my distinguished subcommittee chairman and I support its adoption.

The purpose of this amendment is twofold. First, it closes a loophole in our cabotage laws which allows foreign-owned barges to participate in our coastwise trade as long as they do not transport dredge materials.

And, second, it overturns a ruling by the U.S. Customs Service which stipulates that property of the U.S. Government is not merchandise for purposes of the Merchant Marine Act. As a result of this ruling, foreign-owned vessels are transporting Government-owned dredge materials from one U.S. port to another.

Mr. Chairman, clearly these two practices are violations of the letter and spirit of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. This statute, which is better known as the Jones Act, is the foundation of our maritime law and it clearly states that cargo in the domestic or coastwise commerce of the United States is reserved to vessels built in and documented under the laws of the United States and owned by U.S. citizens.

This amendment, which is the product of careful negotiations among all interested parties, will help to restore the fundamental purpose of the Jones Act and it will ensure that these onerous interpretations are eliminated.

Finally, this amendment is strongly supported by the American Waterways Operators Association and by our Nation's maritime labor unions.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOSS: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . . ACCEPTANCE OF EVIDENCE OF PAYMENT OF COAST GUARD FEES.

The Secretary of Transportation may not issue a citation for failure to pay a fee or charge established under section 2110 of title 46, United States Code, to an owner or operator of a recreational vessel who provides reasonable evidence of prior payment of the fee or charge to a Coast Guard boarding officer.

Mr. GOSS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, what we have got here is a somewhat minor problem somewhat corrected, but we have not completely corrected it. We want to provide relief to America's boaters who are being subjected to this very onerous problem of having to buy this decal fee to put on their recreational boats. Even though we have a better solution for the decal fee problem in the mill, we have got an administrative problem here. This amendment simply seeks to suggest that anybody who can provide reasonable evidence of a prior payment through a Coast Guard boarding officer should be excused from any citation for not showing a decal on his or her vessel. It is that simple. I do not believe there is anything contentious or controversial about it. It should be user friendly. It should make certainly the Coast Guard happy. It certainly should make the consumer happy. Perhaps there will be court officers or administrative officers who will have less to do, and I think that, frankly, will make them happy also.

The long and the short of it is that when we get through, if we adopt this amendment, we will allow common sense to prevail. If somebody has taken the proper steps to get this decal and can prove that, they will be excused from the onerous proceedings of an administrative hearing, having to prove their innocence and being excused from the liability of up to \$5,000 fine.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like nothing better for this amendment to read as something different. I would like nothing better than this amendment to say that those so-called Coast Guard user fees, those so-called fees that this Congress has, in essence, assessed against the recreational boaters of America for the simple purpose of raising money for the general treasury, would be repealed today. I would love to have such an amendment made in order.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, because of the rules of the House, the budget agreement that we are operating under, if an amendment to repeal those fees was offered today, it would be subject to a point of order. The chairman of the Committee on Budget would be obliged to make that point of order. The Chair would be obliged to rule that such an amendment would be out of order.

We do not have that opportunity today, but I wish we could.

I think the great majority of the Members of this House wish we could also.

Before this process is through, before the process of this bill going to a conference committee and the conference committee meeting with the Senate and us having a chance to maybe cure those budget agreement problems, those technical and procedural problems, we may yet have a chance to present to this floor a vote on whether or not you want to repeal this so-called user fee, which is nothing more than a nuisance tax.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the comments made by the gentleman from Louisiana. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], and others on this committee for the leadership they have shown in trying to get this issue before the Congress to a vote so that we can in fact repeal a tax which is a general tax, not a user fee as the gentleman so well points out, which has proven so onerous and to have had such an adverse impact.

I am hopeful, with the gentleman's leadership, and the assistance of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS], and others, that we will see that tax repealed, certainly within the near future. I assure the subcommittee chairman that I am going to be a strong ally of his when we try to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the rule to which the gentleman refers. It is a very important rule that we have. The committee cares deeply about its jurisdiction. I understand that.

But this is something that we ought to move forward on. The chairman is absolutely right.

Mr. TAUZIN. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I join him and so many others in the House, particularly the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] on the Republican side, who has been so instrumental in trying to bring this issue to a vote on the House floor.

That day is coming. Some day, somehow, despite our procedural barrier, we will have a vote on it. In the meantime, the gentleman's amendment—I understand Mr. DAVIS had a lot to do in drafting it and working with the gentleman from Florida. It is essential that we pass it.

What this amendment does is simply say to the boating public, who has paid this fee, this tax that has been assessed against him, and has not yet gotten a decal to prove to the Coast Guard that they have paid the tax and they will be given a chance to submit other evidence that they are in fact complying with the law, before they get cited and hauled off to jail for not paying his decal fee.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I neglected to say something very important in my opening remarks. And that is that I am poaching on Mr. DAVIS' amendment here. We all know this is Mr. DAVIS' amendment. He could not be here to do it. In my enthusiasm to get it before the House, to get it moved forward, I failed to say that. The gentleman from Louisiana has brought it to my attention. Mr. DAVIS indeed deserves the credit.

Mr. TAUZIN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Let me say that this has been a nightmare for the Coast Guard.

Mr. Chairman, we held hearings on this so-called user-fee tax sometime ago at the subcommittee level, and what we learned was that the cost of collecting it is going to be more than the money we raise for the U.S. Treasury as a result of imposing this fee on the American boating public.

Let me say it again: The cost of collecting it, with all of the aggravation, with all the time and attention and the cost of operating U.S. Coast Guard equipment, the time of personnel, the contracts that have been let to outside agencies to educate the public on what is required of them, the entire cost of this operation will far exceed the revenues to the Federal treasury. That alone ought to be enough to convince people of the commonsense mind that we ought to repeal the doggone thing.

If we are not going to realize any net revenue to the Government and all we are doing is aggravating the dickens out of the boating public of America and costing the Coast Guard, costing the Coast Guard in valuable resources that it ought to be using for search and rescue, drug interdiction, and all the other good things that it does, we ought to repeal that thing. The faster we can get to that, the happier I will be, and the happier most Members of this Congress will be.

In the meantime, this amendment is critical to insure that people who have complied with this dastardly law have a chance to prove it to the Coast Guard before they are hauled off to jail because somebody has not mailed them the decal. I think we had better adopt this amendment right now.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Goss amendment to H.R. 5055. The gentleman worked diligently with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS].

During the past 2 years, we have all received correspondence from a number of our constituents complaining about

the enforcement of the recreational boat fee.

Currently, in order to obtain a decal, a boater calls a toll-free number in Des Moines, IA, pays the appropriate fee, and then waits for the decal to arrive.

What is happening is that boaters, who have paid the fee but have yet to receive their decal, are being cited by the Coast Guard for failure to comply with the recreational boat fee law.

Mr. Chairman, it is my firm belief that if a taxpayer pays this onerous fee, they should not be subjected to a civil penalty of up to \$5,000.

The purpose of the Goss amendment is to direct the Coast Guard not to cite or fine those boaters who can provide reasonable evidence that they have already paid their recreational boat fees. It seems to me that this could be easily accomplished by having the Coast Guard's subcontractor in Iowa, a company known as Neodata, simply provide the boater with an identification number. Upon being stopped, the boater could provide the Coast Guard with that identification number and, therefore, avoid any further prosecution.

Mr. Chairman, while this is a good amendment and a step in the right direction, the ultimate solution is to remove this burden on 4.1 million Americans by repealing the recreational boat fee. You can be assured that I remain committed to achieving that goal this year.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, again I applaud the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS, for this amendment, and I also want to state that he worked very closely with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] in drafting this amendment.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Goss amendment. This amendment ensures that previous policy stays in effect, and that simple courtesy is extended to the boating public.

We all know what a fiasco the boat user fee has been, and how inefficient the distribution system has been. My office has received dozens upon dozens of complaints, ranging from 45-minute waits to purchase a decal, to unresponsive Coast Guard officials.

I have had constituents who have actually purchased the decal, but had to wait 3 to 4 weeks before putting their boat in the water because the decal had not arrived. Furthermore, one constituent who was checking up on his order was told that there was no way for the Coast Guard to determine the status of that order. He just had to wait.

While I was happy to see the user fee repealed earlier this year—and I commend the sponsor of this amendment for all his work in helping to get the fee repealed—we still face another boating season where our constituents are going to have to pay another tax for the right to operate their boats.

This amendment will help avoid the worst of the aforementioned problems, and, most importantly, will avoid adding insult to injury.

When the fee was first enacted, the Coast Guard's informal policy was to allow boaters

an opportunity to prove that they had purchased the decal. This amendment simply formalizes this policy. If one has purchased the decal, but has not received it, he or she should not be penalized for the inefficiency of the distribution system. This is common courtesy, nothing more.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOYER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOYER:

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

SEC. . SCHEDULE FOR OPERATION OF DRAWBRIDGE OF WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL BRIDGE.

(a) COMMERCIAL VESSELS.—

(1) RESTRICTIONS ON HOURS OF OPERATION.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating (in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall not operate the drawbridge of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge in the following periods for the passage of a commercial vessel:

(A) Monday through Friday (except Federal holidays), 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

(B) Saturday, Sunday, and Federal holidays, 2:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

(2) NOTICE REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall not operate the drawbridge of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge for the passage of a commercial vessel unless—

(A) the owner or operator of the vessel notifies the Secretary of the time that the vessel will pass the bridge, by not later than 24 hours before that time; and

(B) the vessel passes the bridge in the 2-hour period beginning 1 hour before that time.

(b) RECREATIONAL VESSELS.—

(1) RESTRICTIONS ON HOURS OF OPERATION.—The Secretary shall not operate the drawbridge of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge in the following periods for the passage of a recreational vessel:

(A) Monday through Friday (except Federal holidays), 5:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight.

(B) Saturday, Sunday, and Federal holidays, 7:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight, except as provided in paragraph (2).

(2) SPECIAL OPERATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary may operate the drawbridge of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge beginning at 10:00 p.m. on Saturday, Sunday, or a Federal holiday for the passage of a recreational vessel, if the owner or operator of the vessel notifies the Secretary of the time of that passage by not later than 12 hours before that time.

(3) PASSAGE DURING OTHER OPENINGS NOT PROHIBITED.—This subsection shall not be considered to prohibit a recreational vessel from passing the Wilson Memorial Bridge at any time at which the drawbridge is being operated for the passage of a commercial vessel.

Mr. HOYER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of a brief colloquy I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE].

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], and I appreciate his accommodating me because I have to leave the floor very shortly. I just want to get this question in prior to the gentleman explaining his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just want the gentleman to assure us that he will work with me and others in conference to be sure that the provision regarding advanced notice, the advanced notice requirement of commercial vessels, is practical and reasonable.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE], my good friend, that we intend to work between now and conference and in conference to accomplish the objectives that, in fact, the provisions provided are practical and can be implemented.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], and the full committee chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], for their assistance on this issue. I also want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] who has worked with us, not necessarily in support of the amendment, but has been very open on this amendment, and I appreciate that. He is a fine Member of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCREST], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCMILLEN], and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Mr. Chairman, as many Members of this House know well, the Woodrow Wilson Bridge is a terrible chokepoint not only for the Washington area's beltway, but for the main north-south highway in the east, I-95. Worsening this chokepoint is the fact that this bridge is a drawbridge—and when it is up, traffic on this major interstate comes to a complete standstill.

When the bridge is raised during rush hour, traffic backs up over 2.5 miles, and when it is finally lowered, usually after 10 minutes, it takes over 3 hours for traffic flows to return to normal. In 1990, however, the bridge was stuck upon in June and July for over an hour after it was raised for one sailboat, and traffic backed up for over 10 miles in either direction—bringing the entire Washington region and thousands of very overheated drivers, into absolute gridlock.

The problem is, of course, very complicated. But the bottom line is that the bridge was designed to carry 75,000 vehicles per day and it now carries over 165,000 vehicles every day. And by the year 2,000 this traffic will grow to over 244,000 vehicles per day, well over three times the rated capacity of this bridge.

It is critical, therefore, that some action be taken to minimize disruption to this traffic flow while still preserving both commercial and recreational uses of the Potomac River.

In an effort to strike a fair balance among all involved parties, offices from Maryland, Virginia, and the District have been working with the Coast Guard, the business community, and representatives of the traveling and boating public. We have developed a schedule that Members of both parties from every jurisdiction around the region have agreed upon. And Mr. Chairman, if the true test of a good deal is that no one is absolutely happy, nor very unhappy, then this amendment truly meets that test. The bottom line is that this amendment strikes a fair balance that attempts to meet everyone's concerns.

This amendment continues to allow midday openings for commercial vehicles but restricts those openings during the most heavily traveled hours. It would require recreational boats to pass through the bridge at nighttime on weekdays, unless the bridge is opened for a commercial vessel. And it would require 24-hour notice so adequate notice could be given to both motorists and boaters of scheduled openings.

Mr. Chairman, this schedule has been endorsed by the Transportation Planning Board of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, the Greater Washington Board of Trade, AAA, State and local transportation departments, and many, many others.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is necessary because the Coast Guard in the region has been unable to agree. We believe the Coast Guard has not properly recognized the absolute disaster that raising this bridge can create for this area's economy. The costs and inconvenience caused to motorists are totally out of proportion to the benefit of allowing one recreational boat to raise the bridge during the day. The position of this gentleman, and from the officials of this region, is that it is simply an unacceptable position to continue this practice.

Mr. Chairman, let me close on a very serious note. We are not only talking economic loss by delays to traffic and commerce and frustration to thousands of motorists. Six months ago a woman sat in her car waiting for the bridge to be lowered so that she might continue on her way. As a truck came around the corner on the Virginia side of the Beltway, not expecting traffic at a dead stop on a major interstate, it

crashed into this woman's car, taking her life and creating havoc on the bridge. Accident, after accident, after accident occurs on this span, and they and their threat to human life is not necessary. This amendment proves that. I urge its adoption by this House and thank the chairman for his advice and counsel.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as I said earlier, for this consideration with respect to this amendment and his support of this amendment.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment from the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. Chairman, I commend the delegation from the State of Maryland and those from Virginia who have joined together in support of the draft of this legislation. The opposition, where there is any, comes from one group of mariners, those recreational mariners who would like the bridge to open during the daylight hours so they might move their recreational vehicles.

Let us keep in mind we are not talking about little fishing boats. We are talking about what we call in Cajun country "yachies." They are big yachts, those big yachts that are operated by folks who can, in fact, check with the notice to mariners, can in fact look at the notices put out by the Coast Guard when the 24-hour notice is given by the commercial operators, and they can tag along with the commercial operators when the bridge is open with advanced notice behind the commercial vessel.

So, Mr. Chairman, for the most part the objections of the few large yacht owners who want to traverse that checkpoint during the daylight hours, I think the amendment is drafted in such a way that, if they want to take advantage of the information provided under the 24-hour notice, those yacht owners can proceed during those openings permitted for commercial operators by tagging along behind those commercial operators.

I would suggest that perhaps between now and the full conference we can clarify those provisions, as the gentleman earlier pointed out, so that we can make sure that that is clear to those yacht owners that they are not in any way disenfranchised of their rights to move through the channel, but nevertheless have that right protected as they might tail along a commercial operator.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the gentleman raise an extraordinarily serious concern. I, like many of my colleagues who serve in the Congress, have been caught in those traffic jams, and my colleagues know what they mean in terms of personal frustration. But there are also

the personal tragedies for people who might need to move across the bridge for emergency medical assistance, the accidents, the damage that is caused by these, the environmental problems of these vessels, 2½-mile long lines of vessel or cars running, rather their engines idling, polluting the atmosphere of this region as they wait to cross the bridge.

□ 1540

The problems, as I pointed out, with this conflict between the vehicular traffic and the mariners ought to end and we ought to have a resolution that is acceptable to both sides. I believe this amendment goes along with finding it.

Mr. Chairman, I give my commendations to those Members who represent the two affected States and the regions. On behalf of the subcommittee, although the Coast Guard still has some objection, I rise in support of the amendment, and hope between now and then we can work out those final objections and assure all parties their rights are going to be respected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I join in a bipartisan effort to bring safety and common sense to the debate on the openings of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge drawspan. The frequent opening of the bridge is a regional problem, which many in this Chamber have also experienced since all Members and staff are Washington area residents pro tempore.

The bridge was opened in 1961 and carried 19,000 vehicles daily. Today the bridge carries 165,000 vehicles a day—its capacity is 75,000. In 20 years, the number is projected to be 244,000 vehicles a day. If the drawspan never opened, this bridge would still have serious traffic congestion problems. It is one of the most heavily traveled links on the Interstate Highway System along the eastern seaboard.

Since the summer of 1990, the Coast Guard, State highway officials, members of the area congressional delegation, AAA Potomac, and representatives of the commercial and recreational boating community have been proposing various drawbridge opening schedules. We have worked to create a workable schedule for openings. Commercial vessels have a total of 13 hours a day to request a drawbridge opening on weekdays. On weekends and holidays, the number of hours jumps to 19. The recreational boater has less time, but any boat can go through the drawspan with commercial vessels, which have given a 24-hour notice.

The hours of midnight to 5 a.m. on weekdays and midnight to 7 a.m. on weekends can be inconvenient hours for recreational boaters. But common sense demands that one sailboat be pre-

vented from causing the terrific congestion of June and July 1990 when on two occasions the drawspan stuck in an open position for more than an hour on each day and traffic piled up in both directions on Interstate 95 and on the approaches to I-95 in both Maryland and Virginia. An inventory of all marinas north of the bridge revealed that there are 68 sailboats which warrant the opening of the existing drawspan. There were 260 sailboat openings between July 1989 and June 1990, which accounted for two-thirds of the drawspan openings. The vast number of pleasure boats get under the bridge without requiring an opening.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues will argue that this is a safety issue. And I agree. It is a matter of traffic safety for the estimated 58 million vehicles which pass over the bridge annually. I would support additional lighting or other safety measures to assist recreational boaters sailing under the drawspan at night. The Maryland and Virginia Departments of Transportation state:

The only time of day that bridge openings do not have a major disruptive impact is during the middle of the night.

Mr. Chairman, the schedule that this amendment presents has been endorsed by the transportation planning board of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, the Greater Washington Board of Trade, AAA-Potomac, and State and local transportation departments. I urge the House's support for this critical proposal.

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

Mr. Chairman, today marks the culmination of over 20 years of effort on the part of the congressional delegations, State officials, Federal officials, and people directly affected by the Woodrow Wilson Bridge.

This bridge was built in the early 1960's to handle 75,000 vehicles. Today it is handling more than twice that number. By the end of the decade it will be handling more than three times that number.

Mr. Chairman, it was never intended to go through the District of Columbia. Those plans were changed after the Wilson Bridge was built. So now all of that interstate traffic is diverted across the Wilson Bridge.

You have eight lanes on the Capitol Beltway having to merge into six lanes on the Wilson Bridge. That is why I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], as well as the congressional delegations from Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Virginia, for their bipartisan support of this legislation, and particularly our chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES], and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], for their support of it.

I was mayor of Alexandria, VA, for 5 years, and I can tell you from firsthand experience that this is an abysmal, intolerable situation we have. The Virginia side is in Alexandria, and the Maryland side is in Prince Georges County. I know that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has had similar reaction from his constituents.

This is a very serious safety hazard. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has mentioned the loss of life that has occurred directly as a result of this drawbridge opening. It defies the imagination why we would have a drawbridge on an interstate highway, but the fact is we do. The fact is that it is owned by the Federal Government, it is operated by the District of Columbia, and Virginia and Maryland share various responsibilities for its upkeep. That in itself is a very difficult situation.

But we have an amendment today that has the full bipartisan interstate support of everyone that has been involved in this issue. We even have the support of the AAA, who represents the motorists, thousands of motorists whose time is lost and whose frustration goes past the boiling point when the bridge is open, as well as I believe at least the tacit support of Boats, U.S., who have gotten part of the things they wanted to be included in the bill, in other words, the ability to go through the opening in the bridge when it opens for commercial vessels.

We also have an extra opening after 10 p.m. so that recreational vehicles can avail themselves of that with 1 day's notice.

So I think we have accommodated everyone. The Coast Guard has their own interests to maintain, but I think if you asked Coast Guard personnel that are directly familiar with the situation, they would recognize that this is about the best solution that we could come up with.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Members for their consideration and the opportunity for us to lay the situation at the table and to support this very commonsense solution.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for granting me the opportunity to sort of butt in to this love-in. It seems that I might be the only one in the entire Chamber that is not necessarily in favor of this amendment. Certainly I am one that gives a great deal of support to local situations, and I recognize the traffic problems that this causes for those of us who represent people in this area.

But at the same time it is my understanding that this will be the only bridge in the entire country that has such mandated restrictions by law, and I think that we should give the Coast Guard their ability to negotiate whatever is workable with the local community.

Mr. Chairman, you do have people that are going to be impacted by this. You do have some danger factors that are going to be involved, because you simply cannot stop a ship as heavy as some of the commercial ships that are coming up the river might be, in a matter of 15 feet, nor can they stop with the currents that you have on these rivers here as safely as you might think.

□ 1550

It is not just simply an indication where we can turn off the engine and sit there and wait until a more appropriate time.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman aware of any other drawbridge on an interstate highway owned by the Federal Government?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, no, I am not.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think this is a unique situation.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard is in charge of all navigable streams. Just because it is on an interstate does not make any difference. We have U.S. highways that are involved. We have State highways that are involved. We have railroad traffic that is involved.

While I am not going to ask for a vote on this, I do think that we should permit the Coast Guard to adopt these regulations because, if we come in here today for Virginia, we come in here for Maryland today, and we say, we are going to facilitate the needs of whatever the popular mission is of this particular issue, then tomorrow we are going to be talking with people in Missouri. And we are going to be talking about the Mississippi River and Alabama and other rivers.

I do think that this is something that should be negotiated, that should be worked out with local officials in Maryland and in Virginia, with the U.S. Coast Guard. And they ought to work it out for a situation there rather than mandated by law.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I also appreciate his position.

The fact that he has reservations but is not going to ask for a vote on this, I might have respond, currently the Coast Guard does have restrictions as to hours of use. From the Coast Guard's perspective, they are not as restricted as perhaps those incorporated in the amendment.

So the practical problem, which I think is a wise one to raise in terms of

being able to stop and being able to schedule, is one that now exists under current restrictions. This may be a smaller window of opportunity to utilize the bridge, but it is not unique in the sense that there already is a window that exists.

I want to assure the gentleman, I do not know whether he was on the floor when I responded to the gentleman from North Carolina, but obviously, I want to say parenthetically, I am a very strong supporter of the Coast Guard. I think they do outstanding work.

I will hopefully be representing a district that will have a vast amount of waterways. I now represent the Harbor of Bladensburg, of course, but I will have a slightly bigger seaway of water way next time around.

The fact is, I believe that the Coast Guard is responsible, wants to do the right thing. We want to do the right thing. We are looking forward to make sure that it can be practically implemented.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I might just comment to the gentleman that I am one of those Members who lives in the gentleman's district, and I am one of the few who drives on that waterway.

I want to be quick to tell the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that my vote is not impacted by this. I can get under that bridge any time day or night. But there are some people who cannot get under it and especially commercial traffic, I think that we are really infringing upon the right of waterway commerce.

I certainly respect the position of the gentleman.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, let me first recognize and acknowledge the gentleman's major concern that this not be a precedent for this committee and our own subcommittee and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries hearing constantly requests from Members to come forward with Federal legislation governing the opening and closing of draw bridges on State and local highways.

The gentleman from Virginia is correct, this is a very special case involving a Federal interstate highway. It is special in that it is located here, the Nation's Capital. It is special because of the extraordinary amounts of traffic on this bridge.

I hope the gentleman's admonition is correct, that we not make this a precedent, however, for a constant stream of amendments coming on this bill in the future, asking for this Congress to make local decisions about bridge openings.

Let me also tell the gentleman that the Coast Guard is engaged even now in

these negotiations regarding the final version these regulations are going to take codified in law, as I expect it will be in the final bill that comes out of conference.

The Coast Guard will stay in those negotiations till we have completed a final version.

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

I rise today in support of the amendment offered by Mr. HOYER, on behalf of the Maryland delegation, to restrict the opening schedule for the Woodrow Wilson Drawbridge. This amendment intends to provide a permanent solution to the longstanding problems caused by frequent opening of the drawspan.

For some time now, the Maryland delegation has been urging the Coast Guard to restrict openings of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge in order to alleviate the severe traffic congestion and frequent accidents that currently plague the bridge. The Woodrow Wilson Bridge is a vital link to the Capital Beltway. The Coast Guard has been experimenting with different opening schedules, but all are too lenient, allowing for far too many openings to accommodate recreational boaters. Today, nearly two-thirds of the openings are for recreational boats, at the expense of 150,000 vehicles.

I joined with Senator SARBANES in introducing legislation last year that would have limited openings of the drawspan to between the hours of 12 a.m. through 4 a.m. Since then, the affected parties in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia have worked out a compromise opening schedule and warning system. While I support a more restrictive schedule, I accepted this schedule as a balanced approach that addressed our main goals of alleviating traffic congestion and safety hazards.

Unfortunately, the Coast Guard has chosen not to implement this schedule and therefore we are here today to take legislative action.

The compromise schedule restricts openings of the drawspan during peak commuter travel periods during the week and weekend. It also requires 24-hour notification of an opening. These restrictions will prevent bottlenecks caused by opening of the span, and the notification will give commuters fair warning to adjust their travel times as well as prevent accidents.

This amendment strikes a fair balance between the interests of boaters and the motoring public. I am pleased that all the Members of the delegation have come to recognize the problems with the Woodrow Wilson Drawbridge and have come together to take this necessary action. I want to give special thanks to Congressman JIM MORAN, who I have worked on this project with since the beginning. I ask my col-

leagues to support this measure as means to solving a major traffic problem for commuters in Maryland, Virginia, and the District.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Hoyer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, virtually everyone who lives in the Greater Washington area is aware of the bottleneck posed by the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. Even without the problem of the drawbridge opening, there is a substantial traffic problem along I-95 during rush hour; the occasional opening of the bridge only exacerbates this, with back ups often ranging several miles. Aside from the inconvenience to commuters, these stoppages have an economic cost in terms of work-time lost, slower deliveries, and other costs related to the delays. And is often dangerous to drivers.

The Hoyer amendment seeks to balance the competing interests of commuters, State and local governments, commercial boaters, and recreational boaters. Under this amendment, the bridge would only open between 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. for commercial river traffic. Recreational sailboats would have the option of accompanying a commercial boat through, or else passing through at night. On weekends, the bridge would be prohibited from opening between 2 p.m. and 7 p.m.

I am aware of the objections to this proposal which have been voiced by the Coast Guard, and I understand their dedication to boater safety and convenience. However, today, we must take into account the safety and convenience of everyone concerned, on the road as well as the river. I believe that we can reach an acceptable compromise with Coast Guard before conference.

Mr. Chairman, there is no arrangement which would completely please everyone involved. Boaters would obviously prefer to be able to pass under at will, and motorists would obviously prefer that the bridge never open. However, I believe the Hoyer amendment, or some modified version of it, can produce an acceptable compromise among the various parties. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and speak to the Hoyer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hoyer amendment, which is a splendid example of regional cooperation to deal with a problem that is difficult, one that affects both safety and the regional economy. When I say "regional economy," I want to make clear that that spills over into the entire economy of the east coast, and therefore the economy of the United States of America. Anybody who has seen the

traffic buildups when the drawspan is up understands exactly what I mean.

This bridge is operated by District of Columbia personnel, so we have a perfect example of the region working together and experiencing regional frustrations. As the only Member from the region on the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, this is an issue that has been of great concern to me.

The amendment, of course, both would alleviate a demonstrably dangerous situation that has been described to this body, a truck crash which resulted in a death, and it is a wonder that there have not been more problems of this kind, but it is nothing more, nothing less than a common-sense amendment. It does not make any sense to open a drawbridge at peak traffic times. It is too bad that the Coast Guard was not able to figure this out, but the congressional delegation had no obligation to do so at this point.

I appreciate that this amendment is being considered at this time. It is the product of a negotiated compromise involving the entire regional delegation in a bipartisan fashion, and it has the concurrence of every organization which has the necessary expertise. It accommodates the needs of recreational boaters, commercial shippers, motorists, commercial trucking, and that has been difficult to do.

The District of Columbia has a special interest as well, because we find that traffic problems caused by the Wilson Bridge cause traffic to be diverted from the bridge to the 14th Street Bridge and to the Southeast-Southwest Freeway, and sometimes even the Key Bridge, showing the serial effects of this one span.

The Wilson Bridge is the only bridge left on the Interstate System, and we are the only body that can correct this situation. Residents, businesses from Maine to Florida who use Interstate Routes 95, 395, and 495 will be grateful if this amendment is passed this afternoon. It is a vital east coast throughway link, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I ask her to yield only for the purpose of pointing out that in truth and in fact there is only a small area of disagreement between the Coast Guard and the delegations from the District and the two respective States. The areas of disagreement have only been how big a notice for commercial vessels, and whether or not there would be a small window for recreational vessels during daylight hours. The Coast Guard has been very diligent in trying to resolve this. It is not, frankly, their fault that it has not come to complete

resolution, but they are engaged in the negotiations now, and hopefully before conference we will work out any final disagreements. To their credit, they have tried to work very hard to solve this.

I want to commend the gentlewoman, and again the representatives from the respective States, for their great efforts. I think we are going to resolve it before the conference committee.

Ms. NORTON. I accept the gentleman's commendation of the Coast Guard.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say, both to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], with whom I work so closely, who is going to be speaking in just a few minutes, and to my colleagues in the Washington metropolitan area, we have worked very, very closely together, not only on this matter but on a lot of matters, most of which we agree on, and some of which we do not.

I want to congratulate the gentlewoman. She has no opposition, so this is not political in any way, but I want to say what a positive addition she has been to the Washington metropolitan area delegation. She does outstanding work, and I want to say in particular her work on the Committee on Public Works and Transportation is of benefit to the entire region.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for those comments.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I will be very brief, Mr. Chairman. All of the arguments have been made. I rise in strong support of the Hoyer amendment. It is balanced, it is fair, and lest anyone think it leaves the Coast Guard out, the Coast Guard has been very much involved in this.

In their regulations they were proposing a prohibition from 5 a.m. to 9 a.m. What the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is doing is merely adding 1 hour to 10 a.m., and anyone who knows the Washington metropolitan area rush hour, the morning rush hour does not end until about 10 a.m., so it is a very moderate approach. What the gentleman from Maryland is doing is very appropriate.

Second, in the evening the Coast Guard wanted to ban it from 2 p.m. to 7 p.m. Rush hour does not end until 8 p.m. The gentleman from Maryland merely adds that additional hour.

Last, I have heard people concentrate on the region. It is important to the region, but it is equally important, I think, to the entire country, because the east-west traffic coming from Maine and New York and Connecticut

or coming up from Florida and places like that, these people get caught in this traffic.

The last thing why the Hoyer amendment is so important, no one knows the hour that they cannot raise the bridge any more. It has been tested. The Coast Guard has three or four different times, 8 o'clock, 9 o'clock, 8:30, 7:30. No one knows, and if there were a quiz, everyone would probably fail it. What the Hoyer amendment does is it codifies it.

I appreciate the support of the chairman, once and for all, so people from Maine to Louisiana to Florida and whatever, and Alexandria, Maryland, Fairfax, and all will know what the hours are. I commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for taking the leadership, and thank the committee for adopting this, because I think everyone will know, and it really will not hurt anyone. It brings this thing to a final conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT  
Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: At the end of the bill add the following new section:

**SEC. . BUY-AMERICAN REQUIREMENT.**

(a) DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.—If the Secretary, with the concurrence of the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of Commerce, determines that the public interest so requires, the Coast Guard may award to a domestic firm a contract that, under the use of competitive procedures, would be awarded to a foreign firm, if—

(1) the final product of the domestic firm will be completely assembled in the United States;

(2) when completely assembled, not less than 51 percent of the final product of the domestic firm will be domestically produced;

(3) the difference between the bids submitted by the foreign and domestic firms is not more than 10 percent; and

(4) the foreign firm's bid is subsidized by the foreign government under whose laws the foreign firm is domiciled or operating.

In determining under this subsection whether the public interest so requires, the Secretary shall take into account United States international obligations and trade relations.

(b) LIMITATION.—This section shall not apply to the extent to which—

(1) such applicability would not be in the public interest;

(2) compelling national security considerations require otherwise; or

(3) the United States Trade Representative determines that such an award would be in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or an international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies only to contracts for which solicitations are issued by the Department of Transportation after the date of the enactment of this Act and which are entered into during fiscal year 1993.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the implementation of this section. Such report shall include a description of each of the following:

(1) The contracts covered by this section that met the requirements of subsection (a) and were awarded to domestic firms.

(2) The contracts covered by this section that met the requirements of subsection (a) but which were determined by the United States Trade Representative to be in violation of the General Agreement or an international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(3) The contracts covered by this section that were awarded to foreign entities.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) DOMESTIC FIRM.—The term "domestic firm" means a business entity that is incorporated in the United States and that conducts business operations in the United States.

(2) FOREIGN FIRM.—The term "foreign firm" means a business entity that is not a domestic firm.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment says when they open up the drawbridge, the boats that go underneath it are to be made in America, and if they are made in America they have a wide span and a good long time to get under there. If they are not made in America, the Coast Guard has to refuse the opportunity to let these boats go underneath this drawbridge; not quite totally true.

Mr. Chairman, this is a buy American amendment. I have already discussed it with the committee. I think it makes good sense, and I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for his amendment dealing with certain items that should be made in America as well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. The House has included the Traficant amendment in the Coast Guard authorization bill for some years now. We have had difficulty keeping it in the conference. I not only support his amendment, but it is in line with the statement this House made recently on the issue of trade, with reference to foreign subsidies. It is in line with the notion that we ought to be buying American wherever we can, particularly where the bids are lost to foreign competition because of foreign subsidies, and it is something I hope, frankly, we can hold in the conference committee this year.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] for offering it, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of the amendment and say that we have reviewed it on this side of the aisle, and we have no objection to it. This is, in essence, the same amendment that was adopted last year on a voice vote, and I urge its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill is an example of why Congress needs the balanced budget amendment. It is an example of why Congress cannot balance the budget without an amendment. This year just under \$3.6 billion was appropriated for the Coast Guard. This bill asks for just over \$3 billion.

□ 1610

The truth is, for 1993 we have to spend less. Why? Because we are running a \$400 billion deficit. The amount of money we are spending is too high, and we have to cut it.

What would we do differently if we had a balanced budget amendment? What would we do differently if we absolutely had to bring the Coast Guard spending in below this year's level?

One thing is, we would not give a raise to the leader of the Coast Guard Band. I know that seems petty, but businesses in desperate financial trouble cut wherever they can. We are in desperate financial trouble and we need to cut here.

What else would we do differently? We would not be increasing grants to State governments for recreational boating safety activities. We do not have the money to grant it.

What else? We would not legislatively designate obstructions to navigation making them eligible for Federal aid.

What else? Well I do not know what else. I am not an expert on the Coast Guard. But I know we could bring this bill in below the 1992 appropriation if we had to. Because we think we do not have to, we are not.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to vote against the Coast Guard. I do not want to vote against boating safety. I do want to vote against drug interdiction.

Incidentally, this was not mentioned on the floor, but the Coast Guard has relieved itself of the responsibility of surveillance. They have transferred their entire aircraft surveillance responsibility for the whole United States, it is my understanding, to the Navy, saving millions of dollars. That was not mentioned here, so it is much

more than just a minor increase in the present budget.

But we just simply cannot afford this bill. I am voting "no," and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

We not are spending and will have a \$400 billion deficit. Members have heard that number mentioned many times. That is 60 percent of all of the income taxes we collect. We are spending \$294 billion on just interest, and in a few more years this Government will do nothing more than to have deficit spending for the purposes of everything this Government does, and the balance of the revenues we take in will be simply for interest. That is unbelievable. That means that not one real dollar will be spent on the true budget of these United States. We will simply be deficit spending for everything we need, and the balance of what we collect basically will be nothing more than collecting interest, and it will go geometrically from there.

I encourage a "no" vote on this bill. Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Florida. There are many in this House who are concerned about the deficit. In fact, we missed by about nine vote I think it was, putting a balanced budget amendment before the U.S. populace, and I wish we had passed it.

But in regard to how we achieve a balanced budget, it will require this Congress to set priorities, what is important, what is necessary in the life of our country.

Let me point out that if every agency of the Federal Government operated in the last 10 years the way the Coast Guard operated, if every agency of the Federal Government came before this Congress this year with a request as this authorization does for less than a 1 percent increase in authorizing funds when we are living in a 5.5 percent inflationary time, we would not have a deficit. We would not have anything to worry about.

What we are talking about basically is some pretty basic services, search and rescue, safety boating programs.

Let me point out the gentleman from Florida raised a question of whether or not we ought to be increasing the funds to States for boating safety. That is a dedicated fund. That money comes from the boaters of America and is dedicated in Breaux-Wallop to the States for that purpose. It is not a question of increasing or decreasing it. It is a dedicated fund by law, raised from the boaters for the purpose of boating safety. Those the kinds of elements in the budget.

I want to point out again that if every single agency operated the way the Coast Guard operated we would not have a debate on a balanced budget. We would not have this deficit to deal with. Let me say it again. If the Appro-

priations Committee would appropriate every dollar that we authorized, it would be less than 1 percent of last year's authorized funds. We are actually recommending in this authorization \$9 million less in acquisition budget than what was approved last year.

The Coast Guard, and the Coast Guard authorization committee, I would point out, is doing its job. It is trying to hold down spending and yet maintaining essential elements of service like safety on the waters for recreational boaters.

Let me point out also that we raised literally over \$1 billion in oilspill money dedicated to do something about the danger of oilspills. If we do not somehow give the Coast Guard, as we try to in this budget, some ability to preposition equipment and supplies, the effect of that bill will be nil, and we will be no better protected than we were before OPA 90 before we got together in this Congress and passed those kinds of statutes.

So its one thing for us to stand in the House and continue to give these new authorities, these new mandates to the Coast Guard, and then to come and say that we are not going to give them the money to carry out their duties. It is one thing to say we ought to balance the budget. It is another to say that this agency of Government, operating like most agencies should be operating, ought to be accorded the minimum to carry out the health and safety and navigational requirements for the Nation.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, my point is, if this is one of the best budgets, even this budget clearly has areas, for example, the increase in the rank of the band leader, for example, and designating bridges, for example, and the reductions, and therefore the increase of expenditures in other areas of responsibility, like drug surveillance for the entire United States, if this is the best, if this is the leanest of all of the bills, it only emphasizes how much serious trouble we are in with all bills.

So I would expect a "no" vote, and then I would think on many other bills that are at least as fat as this bill to vote "no". I feel quite comfortable to vote against this bill until a couple hundred million are trimmed, and I thank the gentleman for allowing me the time for these comments.

Mr. TAUZIN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would urge on the contrary that an agency that operates properly, that gives the U.S. Government a bang for its buck, that gives the people back services for the dollars we spend the way the Coast Guard does ought to be rewarded for what it does. And when the Appropriations Committee rec-

ommends a budget so clearly in line with the needs of balancing the budget of the United States of America, so clearly in line and below the rate of inflation, it ought to be rewarded with a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I too urge an "aye" vote on this. We have been down line by line in this particular budget, and the Coast Guard does more for the money than any other Federal agency.

I would just ask my colleagues to review this, and then vote aye when it comes to final passage.

Mr. TAUZIN. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in order to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], the manager of the bill.

I understand the Federal Government makes funds available to States to assist with boating safety. And these funds are available through the Wallop-Breaux boating safety fund, is that correct?

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. The gentleman certainly is correct, yes.

Mr. PALLONE. I would like to take a moment and explore how these funds made available to New Jersey may be used. I am aware of a marine police station in Monmouth Beach that is in desperate need of repair. This marine police station serves a large portion of the coast, enforcing boating laws and ensuring boating safety. The marine police's continued existence in this area of jurisdiction is vital to ensure the safety of the boating community.

Governor Florio and I are committed to maintaining a marine police presence in the area serviced by the Monmouth Beach Station, and the State has recognized the need for a well-maintained, modern marine police force, and would like to see these funds used in a way that could maximize public safety.

I would like to ask the gentleman if the funds made available to New Jersey through the Wallop-Breaux fund could be used to make much needed repairs to the marine police station, or in the alternative to construct a new facility.

Mr. TAUZIN. As the gentleman knows, the Wallop-Breaux funds are allocated to the States on a formula basis. The State of New Jersey may spend the money it receives through the Wallop-Breaux fund on programs to increase boating safety in general.

I have discussed this matter with my colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM

HUGHES, who serves on the committee with the gentleman, and he has agreed with me that the State in fact could use the Wallop-Breaux funds in the most efficient manner in order to increase boating safety throughout all of New Jersey, and in doing so the funds could be spent to renovate the facility the gentleman is concerned about, or even to build a new station.

Wallop-Breaux safety funds, because they are dedicated to boating safety, could certainly be used for such a project.

□ 1620

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for clarifying that. I appreciate it. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

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

Mr. Chairman, I join with the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Texas in response to the innuendoes from the gentleman from Florida about the U.S. Coast Guard as to whether or not America is getting the greatest bang for its buck.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that the Coast Guard is one of those agencies that deserves every penny we give to them. As a matter of fact, I think we are about \$300 or \$400 million short and probably will have to come back and request that amount.

But I want to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Texas and to the staff for putting together a budget that will preserve this very valuable asset to our shorelines and to compliment the men and women who represent the U.S. Coast Guard.

I urge a favorable vote.

Mr. Chairman, in just a few minutes, this body will be voting on the Coast Guard authorization for fiscal year 1993. While I do not intend to restate all the pros and cons of the bill, I would like to take just a minute to tell you that this Member is one who truly appreciates the U.S. Coast Guard.

Quite possibly, the Coast Guard is one of the least recognized and most misunderstood branches of our national defense. In fact, because the Coast Guard is normally under the direction of the Secretary of Transportation instead of the Secretary of Defense, it is not always thought of as being an integral part of our national defense.

But Mr. Chairman, let me assure you that as a Congressman whose district borders the Gulf of Mexico, I view the Coast Guard a little like having a big life insurance policy on a loved one. You hope you never need it but you are mighty glad you do when the time comes.

In south Alabama alone, the Coast Guard employs over 800 people in 4 different locations with an annual payroll well into the millions and an economic impact estimated at over \$500 million.

In this day and age of belt tightening and cutting back, some might question if we, the

American people, are getting our money's worth from groups like the Coast Guard. Let me assure you the answer to that question is a resounding "Yes."

In addition to search and rescue missions and the deployment of buoys, America's Coast Guard is also at the forefront of providing expertise on the containment of oil, chemical and hazardous waste spills in a 36-State area. Additionally, the men and women who make up our Coast Guard in south Alabama have the distinction of recording the largest single confiscation of cocaine on the high seas. Yes; America's Coast Guard is on the front lines of our war against drugs and I am especially proud to know that our folks in Alabama are leading the way in this important battle.

Mobile is also the home to the Coast Guard Aviation Training Facility at Bate's Field, which is the largest facility of its type in the world. Coast Guard pilots from around the country learn to fly their specific helicopters and planes used in routine, day-to-day operations.

Soliders, patriots, rescuers, navigators—the Coast Guard is made up of the finest America has to offer and I, for one, am proud of all of these men and women who serve their country.

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of an authorization of \$1 million per year for 5 years to renovate buildings at the Hatteras Group Coast Guard Station, a station that has been allowed to deteriorate to a deplorable state. It is shameful that we would ask men who risk their lives regularly on dangerous search and rescue missions and in law enforcement to live under these conditions. It is outrageous that we should expect families to live in this housing. This is worse than any service housing I have ever seen.

The general condition is rundown, shabby and depressing to servicemen stationed in a remote region where not many of the modern amenities and recreational facilities are available to brighten up their lives.

The floors in the ramshackle housing units are so slanted that a bottle placed on the floor begins rolling immediately and crashes into the wall. I am not exaggerating when I say that the floors have to be constantly jacked up and down to keep furniture, children and even adults from literally falling out of their houses.

Because of the low water table, a septic tank has been placed on what amounts to a hill, and the seepage has no other path than through the housing area. The pilings have sunk so low that water regularly laps up under the units and soaks the rugs and floors.

The housing units have tiles of asbestos, a material we are removing from our own facilities because it presents a danger to us. How long must the families of brave men and women live at risk from something we won't tolerate in our own environment?

I have been shocked and angered at the kind of family housing we find on some military bases, but the housing at Hatteras makes that housing seem luxurious.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for coming to the floor to make that statement and

to just cite a couple of cites for this House. On an average day in 1991, the U.S. Coast Guard saved 13 lives. That is on an average day, 13 American lives. It assisted 339 other people who were in trouble on the water every day. It saved \$2 million in property. It conducted 232 search-and-rescue sorties every day on the average day. It responded to 33 oil or hazardous chemical spills. It conducted 87 port safety security operations, and it inspected 82 commercial vessels, investigated 18 reported marine accidents, served 119 aids to navigation, and it seized 84 pounds of marijuana and 92 pounds of cocaine every day on the average day. That is what the agency is doing for America, and that is why I think it is one of the best run and most efficient agencies of the U.S. Government.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I have to tell you that a great deal of this activity takes place in my congressional district on the Gulf of Mexico in south Alabama. We are proud to have both an aviation facility and an operational facility there, and I will assure you that none of us ever hope we have to use the Coast Guard, but it is comforting for me to know that they are there for search and rescue when we need them. It is rewarding for me to sit on this committee and to see the activities that take place when you see the largest drug bust in the history of America take place right in the Gulf of Mexico by a Coast Guard commander; let me tell you, it makes you feel proud, and at the same time, it makes you fully aware that they are one of the most conservative with respect to spending American dollars, taxpayer dollars, of any agency in this country.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. DARDEN, 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. 5055) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 482, 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 committee amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the suspension, if called, be a 5-minute vote.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 304, nays 22, not voting 108, as follows:

(Roll No. 207)

YEAS—304

Abercrombie	Darden	Hobson
Andrews (ME)	de la Garza	Holloway
Andrews (NJ)	DeLauro	Hopkins
Andrews (TX)	Dellums	Horn
Annunzio	Dickinson	Horton
Applegate	Dicks	Hoyer
Atkins	Dingell	Hubbard
AuCoin	Dixon	Huckaby
Baker	Dooley	Hughes
Balenger	Doilittle	Hunter
Barnard	Dorman (CA)	Hutto
Barrett	Downey	Hyde
Bellenson	Dresler	Inhofe
Bennett	Durbin	Ireland
Bentley	Dwyer	Jacobs
Beruter	Early	Jefferson
Berman	Eckart	Jenkins
Bevill	Edwards (CA)	Johnson (SD)
Bilbray	Edwards (TX)	Jones (NC)
Bilbrakis	Emerson	Jontz
Blackwell	Engel	Kanjorski
Billey	English	Kaptur
Boehert	Evans	Kasich
Boehner	Ewing	Kildee
Brewster	Fascell	Kleecka
Brooks	Fazio	Kolbe
Broomfield	Fields	Kolter
Browder	Fish	Kyl
Bruce	Flake	LaFalce
Bunning	Ford (MI)	Lagomarsino
Bustamante	Ford (TN)	Lancaster
Byron	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Callahan	Franks (CT)	LaRocco
Camp	Frost	Laughlin
Campbell (CA)	Gejdenson	Leach
Cardin	Gephardt	Lehman (FL)
Carr	Geren	Levin (MI)
Chandler	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Chapman	Gilman	Lewis (FL)
Clay	Glickman	Lewis (GA)
Clement	Gonzalez	Lightfoot
Clinger	Goodling	Liptanski
Coble	Gordon	Long
Coleman (MO)	Goss	Lowey (NY)
Collins (IL)	Gradison	Luken
Collins (MI)	Green	Machtley
Condit	Guarini	Markey
Conyers	Hall (OH)	Martinez
Cooper	Hall (TX)	Mazzoli
Costello	Hamilton	McCandless
Coughlin	Hammerschmidt	McCloskey
Cox (CA)	Hayes (IL)	McCrery
Cox (IL)	Hayes (LA)	McCurdy
Coyne	Hefley	McDermott
Cramer	Hertel	McEwen
Cunningham	Hoagland	McHugh

McMillen (MD)	Porter	Solarz
McNulty	Poshard	Spence
Mfume	Pursell	Spratt
Miller (CA)	Quillen	Staggers
Miller (OH)	Rangel	Stearns
Miller (WA)	Ravenel	Stenholm
Mineta	Reed	Stokes
Mink	Regula	Studds
Moakley	Richardson	Sundquist
Mollinari	Ridge	Sweet
Montgomery	Rinaldo	Swift
Moody	Roe	Tauzin
Moorhead	Roemer	Taylor (MS)
Moran	Rohrabacher	Taylor (NC)
Morela	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas (CA)
Mrazek	Rose	Thomas (GA)
Murphy	Roybal	Thornton
Murtha	Russo	Torricelli
Myers	Sabo	Towns
Nagle	Sanders	Trafilant
Natcher	Sangmeister	Unsold
Neal (MA)	Santorum	Upton
Nowak	Sarpaluss	Valentine
Oakar	Sawyer	Vander Jagt
Oberstar	Saxton	Vento
Obey	Schaefer	Visclosky
Oliz	Scheuer	Volkmer
Olver	Schiff	Vucanovich
Ortiz	Schroeder	Walsh
Orton	Schulze	Waters
Owens (UT)	Serrano	Warman
Oxley	Sharp	Weber
Packard	Shaw	Whet
Pallone	Shays	Whitten
Panetta	Shuster	Williams
Parker	Sikorski	Wilson
Pastor	Siskyski	Wolf
Patterson	Skaggs	Wolpe
Paxon	Skeen	Wyllie
Payne (VA)	Slattery	Yates
Pelosi	Slaughter	Yatron
Penny	Smith (IA)	Young (AK)
Petersen (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Zelluff
Petersen (MN)	Smith (OR)	Zimmer
Pickett	Smith (TX)	
Pickle	Snowe	

NAYS—22

Allard	Fawell	Petri
Allen	Grandy	Ramstad
Burton	Hancock	Sensenbrenner
Combest	Henry	Solomon
Crane	James	Stump
Dannemeyer	Johnson (TX)	Thomas (WY)
Dorgan (ND)	Meyers	
Duncan	Nussie	

NOT VOTING—108

Ackerman	Gingrich	Neal (NC)
Alexander	Gunderson	Nichols
Anderson	Hansen	Owens (NY)
Anthony	Harris	Payne (NJ)
Archer	Hastert	Pease
Armey	Hatcher	Perkins
Aspin	Hefner	Price
Bacchus	Herger	Rahall
Barton	Hochbrueckner	Ray
Bateman	Houghton	Rhodes
Bonior	Johnson (CT)	Riggs
Borski	Johnston	Ritter
Boucher	Jones (GA)	Roberts
Boxer	Kennedy	Rogers
Brown	Kennelly	Rostenkowski
Bryant	Klug	Roth
Campbell (CO)	Kopetski	Roukema
Casper	Kostmayer	Rowland
Coleman (TX)	Lehman (CA)	Savage
Davis	Lent	Schumer
DeFazio	Levine (CA)	Skelton
DeLay	Livingston	Smith (FL)
Derrick	Lloyd	Stallings
Donnelly	Lowery (CA)	Stark
Dymally	Manton	Synar
Edwards (OK)	Marlenee	Tallon
Erdreich	Martin	Tanner
Espy	Matsui	Torres
Feighan	Mavroules	Traxler
Foglietta	McCollum	Walker
Gallely	McDade	Washington
Gallo	McGrath	Weiss
Gaydos	McMillan (NC)	Weldon
Gekas	Michel	Wise
Gibbons	Mollohan	Wyden
Gillmor	Morrison	Young (FL)

□ 1646

Mr. GRANDY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. ZELIFF changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5055, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5055

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 5055, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering, and cross-referencing.

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

There was no objection.

#### ESTABLISHING A WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1624, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1624, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to establish a memorial, in the District of Columbia or its environs, to honor members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II and to commemorate the participation of the United States in that war."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of ap-

proving the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 100, not voting 105, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

AYES—229

Abercrombie	Green	Parker
Andrews (ME)	Guarini	Pastor
Andrews (NJ)	Gunderson	Patterson
Andrews (TX)	Hall (OH)	Payne (VA)
Annunzio	Hall (TX)	Pelosi
Applegate	Hamilton	Penny
Archer	Hammerschmidt	Peterson (FL)
Atkins	Hayes (IL)	Peterson (MN)
AuCoin	Hayes (LA)	Petri
Barnard	Hertel	Ewing
Bellenson	Hoagland	Pickle
Bennett	Horn	Poshard
Berman	Horton	Pursell
Bevill	Hoyer	Rangel
Billbray	Hubbard	Ravenel
Blackwell	Hughes	Reed
Boucher	Hutto	Richardson
Brewster	Hyde	Ridge
Brooks	Jefferson	Rinaldo
Browder	Jenkins	Ritter
Bruce	Johnson (SD)	Roe
Bustamante	Jones (NC)	Roemer
Byron	Jontz	Rose
Callahan	Kanjorski	Roybal
Cardin	Kaptur	Russo
Chapman	Kasich	Sabo
Clay	Kildee	Sanders
Clement	Kiecicka	Sangmeister
Clinger	Kolter	Sargallus
Coleman (MO)	LaFalce	Sawyer
Collins (IL)	Lancaster	Scheuer
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Schiff
Combest	LaRocco	Schroeder
Condit	Laughlin	Schulze
Conyers	Lehman (FL)	Serrano
Cooper	Levin (MI)	Sharp
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Shaw
Cox (IL)	Lipinski	Sisisky
Coyne	Long	Skaggs
Cramer	Lowey (NY)	Skeen
Darden	Luken	Slattery
de la Garza	Machtley	Slaughter
DeLauro	Markey	Smith (IA)
Dellums	Martinez	Smith (NJ)
Dicks	Mazzoli	Snowe
Dingell	McCloskey	Solarz
Dixon	McCurdy	Spratt
Dooley	McDermott	Staggers
Dorgan (ND)	McHugh	Stenholm
Downey	McMillen (MD)	Stokes
Dreier	McNulty	Studds
Duncan	Mfume	Sweet
Durbin	Miller (CA)	Swift
Dwyer	Mineta	Tauzin
Early	Mink	Taylor (MS)
Eckart	Moakley	Thomas (GA)
Edwards (CA)	Molinari	Thornton
Edwards (TX)	Montgomery	Torrice
Engel	Moran	Towns
English	Mrazek	Trafficant
Evans	Murtha	Unsoeld
Fascell	Myers	Valentine
Fazio	Nagle	Vander Jagt
Fish	Natcher	Vento
Flake	Neal (MA)	Vislosky
Ford (MI)	Nowak	Volkmer
Ford (TN)	Oakar	Waters
Frank (MA)	Oberstar	Waxman
Frost	Obey	Wheat
Gejdenson	Olin	Williams
Geren	Oliver	Wilson
Gilman	Ortiz	Wolpe
Glickman	Orton	Wylie
Gonzalez	Owens (UT)	Yates
Gordon	Packard	Yatron
Gradison	Pallone	
	Panetta	

NOES—100

Allard	Hancock	Porter
Allen	Hefley	Quillen
Baker	Henry	Ramstad
Bailenger	Hobson	Regula
Barrett	Holloway	Rohrabacher
Bentley	Hopkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Bersuter	Huckaby	Santorum
Billrakis	Hunter	Saxton
Bliley	Inhofe	Schaefer
Boehert	Ireland	Sensenbrenner
Boehner	Jacobs	Shays
Bunning	James	Shuster
Burton	Johnson (TX)	Sikorski
Camp	Kolbe	Smith (OR)
Campbell (CA)	Kyl	Smith (TX)
Chandler	Lagomarsino	Solomon
Coble	Leach	Spence
Coughlin	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Cox (CA)	Lewis (FL)	Stump
Crane	Lightfoot	Sundquist
Cunningham	McCandless	Taylor (NC)
Dannemeyer	McCrary	Thomas (CA)
Dickinson	McEwen	Thomas (WY)
Doolittle	McMillan (NC)	Upton
Doran (CA)	Meyers	Vucanovich
Emerson	Michel	Walker
Ewing	Miller (OH)	Walsh
Fawell	Miller (WA)	Weber
Fields	Moorhead	Wolf
Franks (CT)	Morella	Young (AK)
Gilchrest	Murphy	Zeliff
Goodling	Nussle	Zimmer
Reed	Oxley	
Richardson	Faxon	

#### NOT VOTING—105

Ackerman	Gillmor	Neal (NC)
Alexander	Gingrich	Nichols
Anderson	Hansen	Owens (NY)
Anthony	Harris	Payne (NJ)
Armedy	Hastert	Pease
Aspin	Hatcher	Perkins
Bacchus	Hefner	Price
Barton	Herger	Rahall
Bateman	Hochbrueckner	Ray
Bonior	Houghton	Rhodes
Borski	Johnson (CT)	Riggs
Boxer	Johnston	Roberts
Broomfield	Jones (GA)	Rogers
Brown	Kennedy	Rostenkowski
Bryant	Kennelly	Roth
Campbell (CO)	Klug	Roukema
Carper	Kopetaki	Rowland
Coleman (TX)	Kostmayer	Savage
Davis	Lehman (CA)	Schumer
DeFazio	Lent	Skelton
DeLay	Levine (CA)	Smith (FL)
Derrick	Livingston	Stallings
Donnelly	Lloyd	Stark
Dymally	Lowery (CA)	Synar
Edwards (OK)	Manton	Tallon
Erdreich	Martenee	Tanner
Espy	Martin	Torres
Feighan	Matsui	Traxler
Foglietta	Mavroules	Washington
Gallea	McCollum	Weiss
Gallo	McDade	Weidon
Gaydos	McGrath	Whitten
Gekas	Mollohan	Wise
Cephardt	Moody	Wyden
Gibbons	Morrison	Young (FL)

□ 1713

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on official business in my district for the votes on rollcall Nos. 207 and 208. If I had been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 207 and "aye" on rollcall No. 208.