

Don Edwards Center for Environmental Education.

This is a fitting tribute to a man who throughout his distinguished tenure in public service has committed himself to protecting the environment. Indeed, he is responsible for the creation and expansion of the 40,000 acre San Francisco Bay Federal Wildlife Refuge and I look forward to the day when the entire refuge will be named in his honor.

Bay area residents and visitors will benefit for decades to come from Mr. EDWARDS' tireless efforts on behalf of the refuge.

The visitor's center will not only stand as a reminder of his efforts on behalf of the refuge, but his efforts on behalf of the environment as a whole.

I have had the pleasure of knowing DON EDWARDS for years and serving with him in the 103d Congress. He has served in this body and represented his San Jose district since 1962.

Although he has stood firmly behind the principles he supports, he has always been a fair and honest legislator. He has not only been a gentleman but he has also been a gentle man.

To me, he has also been a friend and I will sorely miss him.

I am pleased that we can pay tribute to DON EDWARDS with the Don Edwards Center for Environmental Education and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REQUEST FOR DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON, AND IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF, H. R. 4852, OCEANS ACT OF 1994

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4852) to provide congressional approval of a governing international fishery agreement, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for an explanation of this bill.

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

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, on dozens of occasions this Congress, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has brought to this House carefully crafted, bipartisan legislation and

asked for your support. JACK FIELDS and I are extraordinarily proud of the fact that we have never been turned down.

Today, we bring before you—in one package—many of these same bills. As is our practice, the contents of this package have been worked out with Members on both sides of the aisle, and in consultation with our sister committee in the Senate.

Suffice it to say that re-passing this legislation is, at this late date, the only way these bills will ever be considered by the Senate and the only way they will ever be enacted into law.

So, while the title of this bill—officially—is providing for congressional approval of a Governing International Fishery Agreement with Lithuania, it contains more. Much, much, more.

At the end of my statement, I will include for the RECORD a list of the bills incorporated into this package and their accompanying reports.

The first six titles deal with fisheries issues. Title I implements an international treaty to require fishing vessels on the high seas to comply with conservation and management measures. Title II authorizes U.S. participation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization. Title III is the stated purpose of this bill, approval of a fishing agreement with Lithuania. Title IV takes care of our Atlantic bluefin tuna stocks by amending the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act and directing the U.S. to seek greater international cooperation in conserving bluefin. Title V amends the Fishermen's Protective Act to allow American fishermen to be compensated for an illegal transit fee charged earlier this year by Canada. Title VI is dear to the heart of my friend from Alaska in that it implements a treaty for managing fisheries in the Sea of Okhotsk—otherwise known as the Peanut Hole.

Titles VII through XV embody provisions of the fiscal year 1995 authorization for the U.S. Coast Guard which passed the House on September 22. These include strong recreational boating safety requirements with specific new protections for children, the elimination of burdensome and duplicative Coast Guard regulations, incentives to jump-start a U.S.-flag passenger cruise ship industry and help U.S. shipyards, a stable source of funding for the Coast Guard's state boating safety grant program, and a significant improvement in the safety of our towing industry—including requirements for more rigorous crew licensing and the carriage of navigational equipment.

In addition, we have added in Title XVI provisions sponsored by Mr. TAUZIN which define offshore supply vessel.

Title XVII grants authority to convey ownership of a number of Coast Guard properties.

Title XVIII incorporates a House-passed bill offered by Mr. LIPINSKI to

help keep critters like zebra mussels out of our waters.

Title XIX is the fiscal year 1995 authorization for the "wet" programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Title XX includes a variety of miscellaneous Coast Guard provisions ranging from the treatment of vegetable oil spills to a study of how to keep ships from hitting endangered right whales.

Title XXI is House-passed legislation to stimulate the promising field of marine biotechnology research. Title XXII would provide a flag and burial benefits for World War II merchant marine veterans.

And last but not least, title XXIII includes a number of coastwise trade endorsements for vessels.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing that much of this package has in common is the shared jurisdiction of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. It is diverse, it represents good, sound, public policy, and it deserves the support of this House.

#### LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF H. R. 4852

Title I—H.R. 4760, High Seas Fisheries Licensing Act.

Title II—H.R. 3058, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention Act, passed House as part of H.R. 3188, November 2, 1993, House Report 103-316.

Title III—H.R. 4852, Governing International Fishery Agreement with Lithuania.

Title IV—H.R. 779, Amendments to the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act; H. Con. Res. 295, Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Resolution, passed House October 5, 1994.

Title V—H.R. 3817, Amendments to the Fishermen's Protective Act, House Report 103-585, passed House July 12, 1994.

Title VI—H.R. 3188, Fisheries Enforcement in the Sea of Okhotsk, House Report 103-316, passed House November 2, 1993.

Title VII—X—H.R. 4422, Coast Guard Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995, House Report 103-706, passed House September 22, 1994. See Congressional Record that date for legislative history of floor amendments beginning at page H9504.

Title XI—H.R. 3786, Recreational Boating Safety Improvement Act, House Report 103-445, passed House March 21, 1994; also incorporated into H.R. 4422.

Title XII—H.R. 4959, Coast Guard Regulatory Reform Act, passed House as part of H.R. 4422.

Title XIII—H.R. 3821, United States Passenger Vessel Development Act, passed House as part of H.R. 4422.

Title XIV—H.R. 4477, Boating Improvement Act, passed House as part of H.R. 4422.

Title XV—H.R. 3282, Towing Vessel Navigational Safety Act, passed House as part of H.R. 4422.

Title XVI—H.R. 5136, Offshore Supply Vessel Construction and Development Act.

Title XVII—Miscellaneous Coast Guard property transfers most of which were included in H.R. 4422.

Title XVIII—H.R. 3360, Ballast Water Control Act, House Report 103-440, passed House March 21, 1994.

Title XIX—H.R. 4008, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization

Act, House Report 103-583, passed House September 26, 1994; also included in H.R. 4008: H.R. 3807, Convey the National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory to Gloucester, MA; H.R. 3886, to amend the boundaries of the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary; and, H.R. 4236, National Undersea Research Program Act.

Title XX—Miscellaneous Coast Guard provisions most of which were included in H.R. 4422.

Title XXI—H.R. 1916, Marine Biotechnology Investment Act, House Report 103-170, passed House July 13, 1993.

Title XXII—H.R. 44, Merchant Mariner Benefits, passed House as part of H.R. 4422 and as part of H.R. 2150 on July 30, 1993.

Title XXIII—Miscellaneous waivers of the Jones Act, virtually all of which were included in H.R. 4422.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I rise in support of the H.R. 4852, the Oceans Act of 1994, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this is bipartisan legislation developed by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. It includes several important international fisheries provisions, which will allow the United States to remain a leader in conservation and management.

We have included in this legislation provisions to: implement the recommendations of the United Nations' Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization to establish a licensing and reporting system for U.S. fishing vessels which engage in fishing operations on the high seas; implement the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries and allow the United States to participate in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization; approve the governing international fishery agreement between the United States and the Republic of Lithuania; require a report to Congress on the status of monitoring and research programs to support the conservation and management of Atlantic bluefin tuna and other highly migratory species; reauthorize and expand the ability of the Fishermen's Protective Act to reimburse fishermen for the loss of their vessels and catch if seized illegally by a foreign government or to reimburse them if they are forced to pay an illegal transit fee by a foreign government; and require that the U.S. fishermen comply with international fishery agreements that govern fisheries management in the Central Sea of Okhotsk.

Title VII of this bill authorizes funds for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1995 at the level requested by the President, plus \$13 million to fund the bridge administration program, and an additional \$21 million for drug interdiction activities. Title VIII through X contain important provisions to improve vessel and navigation safety and improve Coast Guard personnel management.

Title XI of this bill contains the text of H.R. 3786, the Recreational Boating Safety Improvement Act of 1994. This bill is one of my highest priorities, and

I am pleased that the most important requirements of my bill, H.R. 2812, are incorporated into the bill. This legislation will save lives and reduce the number of injuries that occur on America's waterways each year.

Title XII, the Coast Guard Regulatory Reform Act of 1993, is intended to simplify U.S. construction requirements to reduce the regulatory burden on the U.S. maritime industry without compromising safety. These provisions were developed by the Coast Guard, industry representatives, and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. They will streamline shipbuilding requirements for all the U.S. maritime industry and allow it to become more competitive internationally.

Title XIII, the United States Passenger Vessel Development Act, is designed to promote the construction and operation of domestic passenger ships that will operate out of U.S. ports and cater to Americans.

Title XIV contains the provisions of the Boating Improvement Act of 1994, to establish a reasonable, stable funding method for the State boating safety program. The Boating Improvement Act is supported by all the affected groups, including the National Association of Boating Law Administrators, the American League of Anglers and Boaters, and the Boat Owners Association of the United States.

I also support the remaining titles of this bill, which will improve towing vessel safety and offshore supply vessel shipbuilding opportunities, and address various miscellaneous problems. I am pleased that title XX of this bill contains my amendments to maintain the President's proposed level of Coast Guard drug interdiction and to require a complete cost accounting of Coast Guard expenses related to Haiti.

Title XIX of this bill contains an authorization for the ocean and coastal programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] for fiscal years 1995 and 1996. In addition to NOAA's national ocean service programs, ocean and Great Lakes research, selected fisheries programs, and general administrative support, the title also improves the Saltonstall-Kennedy Program; encourages dual use of military oceanographic assets; amends the boundary of the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary; improves congressional oversight of NOAA's fleet modernization activities; and authorizes the National Undersea Research Program.

These programs contribute to America's understanding and wise use of the greatest resource of the Earth—our oceans. I note that through the outstanding leadership of Oceanography Subcommittee Chairman SOLOMON ORTIZ that the Gulf of Mexico finally receives its due in this bill. The authorization of a National Undersea Research Program Center for the Gulf, a

study using satellites to help pinpoint sea turtles, and the consideration of an offshore platform as a research facility in the only Gulf national marine sanctuary are all a result of his tireless work. Chairman ORTIZ has also been extremely responsive to the views of all members of the Merchant Marine Committee, on NOAA matters.

I also want to commend Oceanography Subcommittee Ranking Republican Member CURT WELDON for his efforts on behalf of NOAA, especially his work on the use of military resources for civilian oceanographic research. This is a new but potentially fruitful avenue for the committee. Finally, Committee Chairman STUDDS has helped steer our course to the floor to ensure NOAA's future.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee had completed action in a fair, bipartisan manner, on matters that are extremely important to our maritime industry and to the safety of our citizens. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly enact H.R. 4852 and express my highest compliments to our distinguished chairman, GERRY STUDDS, for his outstanding leadership on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I want to take this opportunity to thank the Chairman for his hard work on this bill, and make a few observations about its contents.

This bill contains several measures which have previously passed the House of Representatives, including the Coast Guard authorization, the NOAA authorization, and several miscellaneous fisheries measures. The bill has been thoroughly cleared by both the majority and minority in the House. The bill provides necessary re-authorizations for a number of different programs including fisheries management, enforcement of various laws and treaties, and Coast Guard search and rescue.

There is one item that is not included in the bill because, while it affects commercial vessels under our jurisdiction, it also involves the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. This concerns a decision by the U.S. Customs Service to collect a tax on passengers multiple times within a one cruise voyage. This means they will be taxed every time they enter a U.S. port, even if the cruise is from point to point within the United States. The decision was reflected in a letter sent to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee by the Customs Service.

I believe that this interpretation by the Customs Service is incorrect. Congress has increased the amount of tax

that cruise vessel passengers should pay, but clearly did not intend that they pay the tax multiple times, such as when traveling from Juneau, AK, to Sitka, AK, and then again when traveling from Sitka, AK, to Ketchikan, AK. The clear intent of Congress was to only assess the tax once during each voyage.

My colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has indicated to me that he is sympathetic to my concerns and will attempt to address these issues in the proper form in the next Congress. I want to thank him for his offer to take a fair look at this issue.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I will not object to this bill. It is a good piece of legislation that represents all of the hard work our committee has done this year and I urge its passage.

□ 1310

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I think this is a good piece of legislation that should be accepted. If it is not accepted at this point, this authorization will not occur this term.

Mr. Speaker, I withdrew my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will object, and I want to point out that this bill has been indeed worked out with some Members of this House. It has not been worked out with many Members of this House, including the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation, to which most of the amendments will address.

More important, there are five Members of the Senate prepared to put a hold on this bill the moment it arrives in the Senate for the very reason it contains a bill that has passed this House and rejected repeatedly in the Senate dealing with the documentation of Merchant Mariners.

This bill, which is now contained in this bill, has been rejected by the Senate for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that the Coast Guard opposes it, does not believe it should be required, will not inure to the safety of programs in the Foreign Vessel Navigational Safety Act.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the bill that are contained in this unanimous consent on Merchant Mariner documents surprisingly contains an exemption for one State, the State of Alaska.

Now, I contend and the Coast Guard contends that this is not a necessary safety element within this bill. In fact, it is only paperwork and bureaucracy that should not be imposed upon the industry.

But let us assume for purposes of argument that the proponents of this bill

who have been defeated repeatedly in the Senate are correct, that this is some kind of a safety measure. Why on Earth would we want to exempt the State of Alaska, *Erron-Valdez*, Prince William Sound?

Mr. Speaker, the point is that this provision in the bill will be objected to in the Senate. The Senate is now trying to put together a similar package without these provisions in it.

The chairman of our full committee stated during committee markup of this bill that he did not intend to see this bill sink on this one provision. I hope those words are correct.

When the Senate reports the bill, as I believe it will, without these provisions in it, we will have another opportunity to enact all of these good programs that are otherwise contained in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend, and I mean that with all sincerity, my friend, I take issue with the point that this was not done in a bipartisan fashion. I will be the first to admit not everyone agrees with everything in this bill.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I did not say that there was not some bipartisan negotiations. Obviously, when the State of Alaska got exempted, there were clearly some bipartisan negotiations. What I am telling the gentleman is that very many of us in this body were not negotiated with personally, although there were staff discussions.

More important, we did not have the kind of Member-to-Member consultation we should have had on this bill.

But even more important, this is not agreed in the Senate, and five Senators are prepared to put a hold on this bill if this provision is insisted upon. And for that reason, this gentleman intends to object to this unanimous consent.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, what I was going to say to my friend, just so the House will know, we voted on the merchant mariner document, which is the point of controversy. It passed our full committee 30 to 15. The House of Representatives passed the full bill, which contained that provision, 408 to 7.

I am not aware that the Senate has yet acted upon this provision.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, when the House passed the bill, it did not contain an exemption for Prince William Sound in Alaska. The committee rejected that exemption. The gentleman and I know what is happening here.

More important, the Senate has refused to take up this bill for many sessions now because it objects to it. Five Members are prepared to reject this whole package on the basis of that. I

know that, and the gentleman knows that. It is ridiculous for us to proceed with this bill to the Senate.

My suggestion is that we give the Senate a chance to bring us a bill without this provision in it.

It was my understanding, when this bill began to be worked out through whatever staff consultations occurred, that if there were controversial provisions, those controversial provisions would be dropped.

I had one of those. I had a controversial provision that restated the current law. The Coast Guard is about to build some motorized lifeboats, the kind of boats that can flip over in the surf and save people's lives. That is under a small business contract setaside. But there is one company in this country that used its influence in this House to put a provision in the appropriations bill to change the law and, indeed, open that up to big company bidding.

I included a provision to give the Coast Guard the authority in this bill to follow the small business setaside law. That has been deleted, because some Senators objected to following the current law.

Mr. TAYLOR from our committee had an amendment dealing with cruises to nowhere. A Senator objected. That provision I understand has been deleted because it was controversial.

There is no more controversial provision than these mariner document provisions. It is so controversial that my friend from Alaska has worked day and night, after voting for it, to then exempt his State from it. I understand that. It is so controversial that five Senators on the Senate side are prepared to put a hold on this bill to kill the entire bill over it. And yet it is in this package.

I am confused as to why some controversial provisions are deleted when we support them and other controversial provisions are continued.

Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

When we say this on the floor many times it is not meant with sincerity, "My good friend," when under our breath we are saying other things.

In this case, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] is a good friend of mine.

He has mentioned two things about the Alaska exemption. The first he knows it does not affect the Prince William Sound. He knows that good and well. This is the waterways, riverways, and his objection has nothing to do with it. Every vessel that goes into the Prince William Sound, every crewman already has documents. So please do not stretch the truth and bring up *Erron-Valdez*. This is riverways.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman deserves something I am going to extend to him. It does not apply to Prince William Sound, but it applies to the inland waterways, that spill in the Prince William Sound.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, this is riverways, and he and I know that.

Mr. TAUZIN. It applies to towing on inland waterways and inland waterways, to my recollection, do in fact leave waters in the Prince William Sound.

Let me make the point, I am not at all taking umbrage with my good friend from Alaska. He represents his State as well as I have ever seen any State represented in this body. In fact, I am often in awe of his capacities and his abilities to represent his State, certainly in awe of his ability to win this exemption after it was denied him in the committee and denied him on the floor.

I am in awe of his abilities. I am only saying that when one State gets exempted, it kind of tells us that maybe we ought not to have this bill in effect for the entire 49 other States.

I am telling the gentleman that the Senate will not approve it. It is foolish for us to move forward with this provision when we ought to object.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has mentioned the Alaska exemption. Would he lift his objection, if I were to move to remove the Alaskan exemption.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, no. I would not at that point fail to object.

I want to make it clear, the principal reason I object is that it does not belong in this bill, because it is a controversial matter that will sink this bill on the Senate side. It does not belong in the bill. The Senate is prepared to report us a bill that does not contain this controversial provision, but my friend from Alaska knows what I speak when I say, if it is so repugnant to my friend from Alaska and the State of Alaska that they need this special exemption from it, then the whole thing ought to come out for the benefit of the other 49 States and for the benefit of the Coast Guard which opposes it and for an industry which is prepared to indeed live by the very important other safety precautions that the bill contains.

□ 1320

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I just wanted to make the point that I under-

stand the gentleman's concerns. I want to point out that there are other concerns. I have found, for instance, that title 19 was placed in this bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] did not mention that one of the jurisdictions in this bill is that of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. Title 19 is partially within our jurisdiction. We were not consulted with, at least on the minority side, about provisions in that particular part of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have deep concerns about some things that were dropped out that we think are important, and I would not want to see this bill go forward as long as title 19 was a part of it, because we have not been given the courtesy of being able to review these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, have some concerns here that there was not the kind of consultation that I think should have taken place with regard to the measures in the bill.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], chairman of the committee.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], he is correct, there are some items in that title which are of joint jurisdiction. I had been advised by staff that it had been cleared with the staff of the committee. If it has not been, I apologize. There is not, I do not think, any major controversy there. If I have the opportunity, and I just have a feeling from what the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] has said that I would not, I would ask unanimous consent to strike those provisions which the gentleman feels have been the subject of inadequate consultation. That was not our intention.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate what the chairman of the committee has said. I was under the impression that these provisions had been worked out. I hope we can work out something before the end of this session. This is a good bill, and I hope we can work it out.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. It is not my intention to en-

gage in a lengthy debate with the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, the matter to which he objects, as he has alluded to quite clearly, is the towing safety provisions; most specifically, the merchant mariner document qualifications. That is the matter that he says is sufficiently controversial to sink the bill in the Senate. That is a matter which was, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ] has pointed out, debated and voted on overwhelmingly both in the committee and in the House. It is the House position, substantially. It was my information, as of about an hour ago, that as of this moment, miracle of miracles, there were no holds in the Senate. Heaven only knows what will happen between now and when they have the good sense to go away.

However, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman that certainly it is his prerogative to do this. At this time of year we are acting sort of as a Senate for a time, where any single Member can interpose his or her will against the totality of the House.

If indeed the gentleman is correct, that there are Members of the Senate disposed to sink this bill, I would have preferred that the glory be the Senate's and the credit be the Senate's for having sunk the bill, but the gentleman is certainly within his right.

I hope he does not do it, but he may do as he wishes.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I thank the gentleman. Let me point out that the chairman of the committee is correct, that there is no hold currently. There can be no hold until this bill gets over there. The Senate uses a system called the hot wire system. When a bill hits, it is not wired to all offices. We have been informed that five Senators are prepared, the moment that hot wire listing occurs on this bill, to put a hold on the bill.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hears an objection.

REQUEST FOR DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON, AND IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF, H.R. 5238, AUTHORIZING DOCUMENTATION OF THE VESSEL "RV ROSS SEAL"

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5238) to authorize the vessel *R/V Ross Seal* to be documented under the laws of a foreign country during a 3-year period, and ask for its immediate consideration.

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