

Payne (VA) Schiff
Pelosi Schroeder
Peterson (MN) Schumer
Petri Scott
Pickett Seastrand
Pombo Sensenbrenner
Pomeroy Serrano
Porter Shadegg
Portman Shaw
Poshard Shays
Pryce Shuster
Quinn Sisisky
Radanovich Skaggs
Rahall Skeen
Ramstad Skelton
Rangel Slaughter
Reed Smith (MI)
Regula Smith (NJ)
Richardson Smith (TX)
Rivers Smith (WA)
Roberts Solomon
Roemer Souder
Rogers Spence
Rohrabacher Spratt
Ros-Lehtinen Stark
Rose Stearns
Roth Stenholm
Roukema Stockman
Roybal-Allard Stokes
Royce Studds
Rush Stump
Sabo Stupak
Salmon Talent
Sanders Tanner
Sanford Tate
Sawyer Tauzin
Saxton Taylor (MS)
Scarborough Taylor (NC)
Schaefer Tejada

Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Smith (MI)
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—29

Barrett (WI) Fowler
Boucher Frost
Chapman Green (TX)
Chrysler Hayes
Collins (MI) Heineman
Dellums Hobson
Durbin Hoekstra
Ensign Hyde
Filner Jackson-Lee
Forbes (TX)

Kasich
Kennedy (MA)
King
Lewis (GA)
Peterson (FL)
Quillen
Riggs
Thompson
Torrice
White

□ 1727

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 449, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" for this important legislation.

ACCOUNTABLE PIPELINE SAFETY AND PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 1505.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1505, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 276, nays 125, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

YEAS—276

Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kim
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt

NAYS—125

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Becerra
Beilenson
Bevill

Blumenauer
Bonior
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Cummings
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecza
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Lazio
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalfe
Meyers
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Torres
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Williams
Wolf
Woolsey
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—32

Barrett (WI) Fowler
Berman Fox
Boucher Frost
Chapman Green (TX)
Chrysler Hayes
Collins (MI) Heineman
Dellums Herger
Dixon Hoekstra
Durbin Hyde
Filner Jackson-Lee
Forbes (TX)

□ 1736

Mrs. MORELLA and Mr. SHAYS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 450 I was called away from the House floor and therefore was not recorded on rollcall No. 450. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3937

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3937.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the last vote of the evening. Following this discussion we will return to regular order. Pending a further unanimous-consent request, 9 a.m. tomorrow will be the point at which we will reconvene. I would expect no votes before 11 o'clock tomorrow.

We may be putting a few more suspension bills on the floor and, should that be the case, we certainly would notify the minority as soon as possible as to which bills those might be.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members know, there have been trilateral negotiations between the two bodies of Congress and the White House regarding the continuing resolution by which we would complete our spending program and the year's work and allow us to move on to sine die adjournment. These have been going very slow, as they tend to do. That is all very understandable.

If I may just take a moment, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to express my commendation for the long hours of work that have been devoted to this task by Members from both bodies and the White House. We have had people that worked here as late as 4:30 this morning and were back on the job early today and have been at it again, continuing to continue on continuing resolution. They have shown enormous resolve in this matter.

Nevertheless, we have just been informed that there are further complications in the process because the White House has indicated that they are not willing to accept an agreement reached last night by the gentleman from Texas, Congressman LAMAR SMITH, the gentleman from California, HOWARD BERMAN, the gentleman from Wyoming, Senator SIMPSON, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, on the immigration bill.

The White House has indicated that they are not willing to accept title V, even within the context of the negotiated revisions offered by that working group. This has been a very disappointing turn of events for all of us. Perhaps Senator SIMPSON has expressed his disappointment in the most sincere terms.

This, obviously, means that we will spend more time on that since the White House wishes to connect the immigration bill with the continuing resolution and is not prepared to agree on the continuing resolution until we reach some agreement on the immigration bill. All this, obviously, leaves things a bit more tenuous, but still I remain confident and hopeful that we will be able to pick up our work tomorrow morning as scheduled and move on with it, hopefully for a fairly early afternoon adjournment.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the majority leader yielding.

Those of us in California are aware of this issue. Would you explain what is

in title V so this body realizes what the administration is opposing?

Mr. Leader, my question is this: Does the administration realize that the reimbursement for emergency health care that we have is in that package?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas controls the time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about \$375 million for the people of California. I think there should be an answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas controls the time.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time from the gentleman from California, I think it is fairly clearly known by all of us concerned that title V has to do with the question of welfare benefits for illegal aliens and the enforcement of the sponsorship provision on legal immigrants so that they too would be kept off the rolls. And that, obviously, has been a matter of concern and we will have to go back and work on that.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding and for informing us what the schedule is for the remainder of the afternoon and for tomorrow.

I would just say to my friend from California that I have just been advised by my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], that the administration is indeed in favor and supportive of reimbursements to hospitals in the situation that the gentleman has described.

And while I do not want to get into a full-fledged debate here tonight on the immigration piece, the gentleman should rest easy tonight that that will be taken care of.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, there are millions of people, over 5 million people voted for an initiative that says we need to stop giving benefits. I just want to know, does that include the benefit packages that were all in this?

We cannot ask those of us in California to walk away.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas controls the time.

Mr. ARMEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, it has, in fact, been rather commonplace and, I think, quite frankly a good time has been had by all on many occasions when difficult questions have been put to me while announcing the schedule. The colloquies have lasted sometimes, it seemed, well into the night.

□ 1745

The gentleman from California wishes to express his concern and his anxiety related to his State, and it does not seem to me it would be fair, in the respect that has been given to me in the

past as we have dealt with these fascinating discourses, that we let the gentleman from California proceed without the catcalls.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry if I ask questions on this. We disagreed on certain elements of the immigration bill across the aisle. There are those of us that tried to find a compromise and felt that this body went too far. I am sorry if I am saying now that those of us that went to the compromise and agreed now feel the goal post has been moved. I have got to go back to California and explain this to the people of San Diego County. I apologize for asking questions.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out, if we are going to debate this, let us do it. The provisions we are talking about do not just deal with illegal immigrants but the medical and other benefits that do to legal immigrants. If we are going to ask questions, we ought to have the accurate premises. Some of us have objected to restrictions on the ability of legal immigrants to get medical care. I think it ought to be accurately phrased.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, his points are well taken, very fast and very rapidly, and some of us are still trying to understand them.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a simultaneous translation?

Mr. ARMEY. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman, my good friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the gentleman from California doing this, although he says he has to go back to California and he is, of course, delaying the moment when that will happen. But if we are going to debate the immigration bill, it should not be as part of this measure. Let us have more time to debate it tomorrow morning. I object to a one-sided discussion of the issues.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if I may reclaim my time, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has made the point. The House has, in fact, debated this bill, has, in fact, passed it by over 390 votes. We are waiting to complete the conference work on it, and I think the gentleman from Massachusetts makes a good point that we ought to have the debate at the time we deal with the conference.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify two issues. No. 1, the administration wants the provision in title V that reimburses hospitals, public and private, nonprofit and proprietary, who treat illegal immigrants in emergency

care. They want that reimbursement. They think that is the Federal obligation and they support it. Let there be no more fuzzing over that issue.

Second, before we all get too high and mighty about what is happening, remember the Republican conference committee, where no one was allowed to offer an amendment, where the bipartisan relationships in both the Senate and House to put together a bill that passed the House and Senate were totally violated, where months went by without a conference committee, where things were changed so far beyond the scope of either House's bill that the Committee on Rules had to grant a waiver of that and where no amendment was made.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from California for his first point. I think it is helpful and encouraging.

I can only say that the Members of this body, as I pointed out, voted by a vote of over 390 votes for this, and we do need to work on that. I expect and feel somewhat encouraged by the gentleman from California that we must get back to these negotiations.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, my question to the gentleman from Texas is this, we would like to have a list of the bills that you propose to put on suspension tonight so that the membership will have the opportunity, if we are going in at 9 a.m. and going to vote at 11 a.m., we need some notification of what we will be discussing. I hope you could accommodate us there.

I might also say, I understand the difficulty of putting these schedules together, but I would hope that we could have come in a little bit later. I suspect we are going to have more than just a few suspensions, and we would have time to debate that. It seems to me noon or 1 p.m. would be a more convenient time for us to debate fully these resolutions.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would ask my colleagues on this side of the aisle, please do not further provoke the gentleman from Massachusetts. I cannot listen that fast.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's point is well taken. We have delivered to the minority leader's office a list. While it may not be necessarily complete, the gentleman is absolutely right; we should get any further additions to you as quickly as possible this evening.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, on the schedule, approximately how many do we have, 8 or 10 suspensions for in the morning?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. We have, as the gentleman has indicated, 8 or 10. As the

gentleman from Michigan expresses his concern about having time to debate them, and I can only express to the body it is my firm hope, and all consideration to those who may be disappointed, that we will wrap up our negotiations and come back with the continuing resolution in such a timely fashion that there will not be time to consider everything that is on the list.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman has been here before. I have been here before. From what I understand is going on in the negotiations, very little was done today. There is a good likelihood that we are going to do these suspensions tomorrow and whatever few you have left over, and then we are not going to have anything to do, because I understand Puerto Rico has pretty much dropped by the wayside. We are going to sit, and we are going to sit, and we are going to sit, and we are going to sit, and we are going to sit.

Let us say we are here by tomorrow evening and that conference still is going on. Do we come in Sunday?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, again, I thank the gentleman from Missouri. We, in our offices, every now and then have in the past historically seen that blue screen, and it does bother us. It is not our intention to do that. We think these negotiators are approaching a conclusion of their work.

I frankly am anxious to go back and join them with it. Again, I think we need to appreciate how hard they have worked, how clearly they have shown their resolve to complete this work. And I do believe that, if the gentleman from Missouri will just bear with everybody who sits at that table, we will find ourselves tomorrow able to complete our work here.

I think we should entertain only the greatest expectations born out of appreciation for the effort already made. If, in fact, there are disappointments, I will certainly be the one to come back and share that information later. At this point I do believe that between 1:00 and 2:00, maybe 3:00 tomorrow, we will be able to complete that work.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, let us say, 3:00 or 4:00 tomorrow, perhaps we could know at that time whether there is a likelihood we will finish up tomorrow, or we will be back Sunday or be back Monday. Can I get that from the gentleman?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's point. I am sure that, if we are back in these circumstances conducting a colloquy at 3:00 or 4:00 or 5:00 tomorrow, the gentleman from Missouri will want me to yield time for the purpose of telling me he told me so. And I will be happy to yield time for that purpose at that time.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I am looking at Sunday and for all Members. There are a lot of Members here that

have a lot of things scheduled Sunday. I do not have much scheduled Sunday. My big day is tomorrow. That is gone. There are Members here, and I think everybody would like to have some idea, if we can, whether we are going to be here Sunday.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think we really need to go back to our work. We are working, and I have to say there are a good many of our Members that have been working and continue to work tirelessly. We want to go back and complete that work.

The fact of the matter is, we all know how difficult it is to finish up under these circumstances. It is not a new way. It always happens. We do have Members working, I believe, in good faith with one another. We need to encourage that work through our appreciation, and I think it will be done soon.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if I may for one last final time—and then I will have to close this out—I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding. We are now getting down to a time when, of course, the fiscal year ends on Monday at 12 midnight. I would hope the majority party, along with the leadership in the minority party, is considering the contingency to ensure the operations of Government for Monday and Tuesday, maybe only 48 hours or 72 hours.

I know; I have been in some of these negotiations. They are tough. Everybody has an opinion. I think everybody is working honestly and hard to try to get to resolution. I would hope that we are providing for the contingency that for whatever reasons we do not get to closure prior to midnight on Monday.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I do feel obliged, and I think it is of due consideration that I fulfill that sense of obligation, to yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS].

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, on today's list of suspensions was House Concurrent Resolution 218 dealing with instructions to the President concerning pardons. Will that be on the list for tomorrow?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his inquiry. Let me say that is one of the items that is under consideration. I am sorry to say I have no announcement to make at this time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the gentleman to consider that we work on this very important matter.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, would it be possible for the distinguished majority leader, on the CR vote itself, to provide us with two or three hours', preferably, notice so that Members could be here for that important vote?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman, his point again is well taken. Once the work is completed

on filing, we will try to give Members as much notice as possible. If I may ask the Members, if they will check the whip notice, perhaps even before they retire for the evening, we will certainly make every effort. Some folks will be driving and traveling. We want to be sure that everyone has an opportunity to make that vote. I do appreciate the gentleman's inquiry.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if I might remind the Members that we are going to have a Committee on Rules meeting right now to deal with some procedure resolutions so we can get out of here tomorrow, if possible, right away.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the conference report to accompany the Senate bill (S. 1004) to authorize appropriations for the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], chairman of the committee, for a brief explanation of the item concerning tort reform. Is the final language what we had agreed upon subsequent to the conference?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding. This is the conference report that we agreed upon.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, so I have that language. We are comfortable with it, and with the gentleman's assurance that that is the language.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

□ 1800

Mr. NADLER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, could I ask is there any language in this bill regarding Governors Island?

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

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. No, it is not in this conference report.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania very much.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

(For conference report and statement see immediately preceding proceedings of the House.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBERSTAR] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report, Bipartisan Authorization Act of 1996. I want to thank all the conferees as well as the Senate conferees for their cooperation in reaching a fair compromise on this important legislation.

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

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

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, this is a landmark day. It has been 5 years since the House has had a Coast Guard authorization bill ready to be sent to the President. This bill does that.

Mr. Speaker, this is a landmark day. It has been 5 years since the House has had a Coast Guard Authorization bill that is ready to be sent to the President.

S. 1004, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996, authorizes funding for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for their many missions: search and rescue; providing aids-to-navigation; drug interdiction; fisheries enforcement; icebreaking; marine pollution prevention and response; and commercial and recreational vessel safety.

The House first passed its version of this legislation, H.R. 1361, way back in May of 1995. The Senate passed S. 1004 in November 1995. The House requested a conference on the Senate bill in February 1996 and the Senate finally agreed to go to conference in July. Mr. Speaker, it has been a long and arduous process. Everyone has had to reach deeply to achieve a compromise that a consensus of the Members can support. On balance, this is a very good piece of legislation.

Not only does it provide funding for the Coast Guard, but it improves their personnel management system, improves our marine safety laws, provides clear authority for the Coast Guard Auxiliary, implements the administration's proposal for streamlining the Coast Guard's regulatory system for commercial vessels, provides for the safer operation of towing vessels, conveys many lighthouses whose grounds will no longer need to be maintained by the Coast Guard, decreases the cost of financing U.S.-flag ships which will benefit both our vessel owners and our shipyards, and many other programmatic improvements to our Coast Guard laws.

I would like to thank the leadership of our committee, our distinguished chairman, Mr. SHUSTER, as well as Mr. COBLE and Mr. CLEM-

ENT for their outstanding work on this bill and for their dedication to improving the Coast Guard and all of our maritime programs.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support passage of the conference report on S. 1004, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, included as a provision in the Coast Guard Authorization Conference Report is the California Cruise Ship Act, which I and other members of the California delegation re-introduced earlier this Congress to help our State's tourism industry.

Currently under the Johnson Act, a cruise ship that makes an intrastate stop is subject to State law even if that ship travels in international waters and is destined for another State or foreign country. Using this loophole and its authority to regulate gambling, States like California prohibit gambling aboard these ships.

The provision included in this conference report, and which passed both the House and Senate in our respective Coast Guard authorization bills, would allow gambling on internationally-bound cruises and cruises bound for another State. It does not result in the expansion of gambling on the mainland, which remains under State control. Instead, the provision simply amends the Johnson Act to allow Federal control over voyages that begin and end in the same State so long as part of the voyage is to another country or another State within 3 days of leaving State waters.

This issue is of great interest of the citizens of San Pedro and Catalina Islands whom I represent. According to Catalina's Chamber of Commerce, the city of Avalon itself loses \$1.5 million annually in canceled port visits because of the existing restriction.

Similarly, the city of San Diego, from which many cruises originate, is affected. That's why Lynn Schenk, my friend and colleague who was elected with me in 1992, introduced the original California Cruise Ship Act. Her measure passed the House in the 103d Congress, but was not considered in the other body.

Today's action, and the final enactment of the California Cruise Ship Act, is a tribute to her dedicated efforts and perseverance.

I strongly support this provision and thank the members of the Transportation Committee and the Coast Guard Subcommittee for their help in moving this important change forward toward enactment.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER THE CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar be in order at this time.

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

There was no objection.