

Pursuant to House Resolution 114, the previous question is ordered.

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

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. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REPORT ON H.R. 1141, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1999

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (during consideration of H.R. 975), from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-64) on the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 1 of rule XXI, all points of order against provisions in the bill are reserved.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Pursuant to House Resolution 113 and rule XVIII, 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. 820.

□ 1337

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 820) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the 11th bill which the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has brought to the floor thus far in this new session. Indeed, the other 10 bills passed overwhelmingly. I believe that this leg-

islation, the Coast Guard authorization, deserves the same kind of overwhelming support.

We are taking action today to authorize funding for one of the most important programs in the United States Government. This Act authorizes approximately \$4.6 billion in fiscal year 2000 and \$4.8 billion in fiscal year 2001 in expenditures for the Coast Guard operations. It provides funds for the Coast Guard at the levels requested by the President with additional amounts provided for drug interdiction operations.

Last year, the Coast Guard received about \$250 million in emergency supplemental funds to boost drug interdiction resources in the Caribbean. I can report to the House that I personally have gone out on missions with the Coast Guard and have seen firsthand the outstanding job they do.

This legislation maintains the level of drug interdiction provided for fiscal year 1999 with additional amounts consistent with the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. This bill also contains additional funds for fishing vessel safety and to modernize the national distress and response system. The bill authorizes \$128 million in fiscal 2001 to construct a replacement icebreaking vessel for the Great Lakes.

I certainly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I would like to close by sharing with my colleagues examples of what our Coast Guard accomplishes every day. In any given day, on the average, our United States Coast Guard saves 14 lives. It conducts 180 search and rescue missions. It keeps \$7 million worth of illegal drugs out of our country. It responds to 32 oil spills or hazardous chemical releases. It stops hundreds of illegal aliens from entering our country.

So in a year, that is over 4,000 lives saved, over 65,000 rescue missions, \$2.6 billion in illegal drugs stopped from entering America's streets, over 11,000 environmental cleanups or responses to pollution, and the stopping of tens of thousands of illegal aliens entering our country.

Indeed, in addition to this, it also is involved in conducting local boat safety courses, port inspections, support of U.S. military and humanitarian missions, and more, all with the stewardship of the resources that should make the taxpayers of America very proud of their investment in the world's finest Coast Guard.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation. It is worthy of their vote.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is very important legislation for this body. As the chairman of the full committee has pointed out, it is supported strongly in a bipartisan manner. That is because almost all of the Members of this Congress and

certainly the Members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure share a common concern in the Coast Guard's activities and giving them adequate resources to fulfill the burdens that we put on them.

The chairman has already gone on at some length, but I think it should be restated just so people remember, the Coast Guard does everything from local boating safety courses to search and rescue. If one is in trouble out on the water, they are the ones who respond. Sometimes in very hazardous situations, sometimes to loss of life to members of the Coast Guard, they are attempting to save mariners in distress.

They safeguard our borders by watching for smugglers and people attempting both to enter the country illegally or to enter drugs and other substances illegally into our country. They are our first line of protection for our coastal resources and the environment.

That leads me to some comments that are very close to home for me. The Coast Guard has been involved now for more than a month in the wreck of the *New Carrisa* which went aground in stormy weather outside the largest port in my district, very close to the mouth of the harbor.

The Coast Guard is still working on its own internal investigation and summary of the events that led up to this tragedy. I think there will be much to be learned from that critical review, perhaps some further changes in authority for the Coast Guard, changes of law regarding insurance of these freighters and other ships.

Today a freighter carries as much oil, these larger freighters, as did a small tanker 20, 25 years ago. They often carry more fuel than they need to accomplish their mission, as did this ship in this case, for ballast.

So the potential for oil spill no longer just extends to tankers and tanker safety, but now the potential for catastrophic oil spills extends to large freighters. Yet, they do not have the same insurance requirements that we put on tankers, nor do they have the same hull safety requirements we put on tankers; and those are critical issues that we will need to look at in the future to safeguard our precious coastal resources here in the United States.

□ 1345

I am very pleased that this bill, with unanimous vote in the committee, and hopefully a similar vote here on the floor of the House, includes some modest initial amendments for changes in the law that I have proposed as I became educated as to what happens when a foreign ship is headed towards the United States. And in this case, had these provisions of law which are in this bill today by my amendment been in effect, we might not have had the *New Carrisa* tragedy on the coast of Oregon; we might not have despoiled our precious coastal waters.

The Coast Guard, under this bill, will now be notified 24 hours in advance before a ship crosses into our 12-mile territorial limit. The Coast Guard will have the authority to hold a ship at that 12-mile limit if they have questions about the safety of the ship, the competence of its crew, or other extraordinary circumstances are intervening that could jeopardize safety.

In this case, the New Carrisa was on a list the Coast Guard keeps called the "Watch List". The "Watch List" is composed of ships that are known to the Coast Guard to have problems or to be registered in countries that are known to abide or to basically not fully enforce, rigorously enforce, international maritime rules. Panama, in this case. Liberia and other countries are also in question.

This ship was on the "Watch List", and it would have been boarded once it reached the harbor. Unfortunately, it never reached the harbor because it went aground, I believe due to the misconduct of the captain, and it caused an ongoing and unfolding tragedy on the Oregon coast. This could happen anywhere in the United States of America.

Under my legislation, the Coast Guard would be able to hold a ship on the "Watch List", ask them a number of questions about the condition of the vessel, the crew, etcetera, out at 12 miles. And if the Coast Guard was concerned about their capabilities or conduct or their navigational capabilities, they could require a pilot be put on board. They could require other actions be followed by that ship once it has entered into our territorial waters.

In this case they may have well have told the ship to hold off out 12 miles, where it was safer, because there was a huge storm brewing and the pilot could not get out to them.

These are tools that the Coast Guard, I believe, will be able to prudently employ and, hopefully, avoid this happening again in Oregon or anywhere else in the United States. There may well be other measures we need to take, and next week, when we hold a hearing to review the oil spill liability legislation on the 10-year anniversary of the Exxon Valdez tragedy, I believe we will see a path to other changes in law that are necessary.

Beyond that, the money in this bill is a good amount of money. Personally, if I had license, I would give the Coast Guard more money to conduct their mission. I believe that, in fact, they are operating in a very frugal manner, particularly compared to the other uniformed services, and they are spending our taxpayer dollars wisely and in a way that most all Americans are grateful on a daily basis.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), and I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the

gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), be permitted to manage our time on this side of the aisle while I must absent myself.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my full support for this legislation and the amendments that will be proposed here in the next few minutes.

I also want to thank the chairman of the full committee for his support of this legislation, the full ranking member for his support of this legislation, and also the support of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the subcommittee, for his work over the last several months on this legislation. We have worked very well together and I look forward to the rest of the session.

Mr. Chairman, I will not specifically go into all of the funding details, because that will be in the statement I will submit for the RECORD, but what I would like to do for the Members of the House, those of whom are listening, is to go through the kind of things that this limited force does for the United States.

Number one, it is the U.S. Coast Guard that is directly responsible for the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 and all of its provisions around this country. Since the Oil Pollution Act went into effect, and since the Coast Guard has been monitoring this issue and enforcing this statute, oil spills in the world have dropped by 60 percent. It is through much of the effort of the U.S. Coast Guard in this area that is responsible for that drop.

I have visited Prince William Sound, the sight of the Exxon Valdez spill, and the infrastructure put in place mainly because of the Coast Guard activities is phenomenal.

Fifty percent of the cargo transported across our oceans is considered hazardous, and it is the Coast Guard that deals primarily with that particular issue.

It is the Coast Guard, which leads the U.S. delegation to the International Maritime Organization that deals with 153 countries around the world, that ensures that not only our coastal waters, and not only our coastal waters out 200 miles of our coastlines but the international regime of the IMO of these 153 countries, that enhances the quality of our international waters.

It is the Coast Guard that is directly responsible for patrolling the North Atlantic in something called "The Ice Patrol", so that not only the U.S. ships traveling in the North Atlantic can be safe from icebergs but the international community can be safe from icebergs.

The coastal fisheries, out 200 miles off our coasts, not only off the Florida coast or the California coast but the Oregon and Washington coast, in the frigid waters of the north Pacific, 200

miles of the Alaskan coast, 200 miles off our coast, we monitor the coastal fisheries. And the U.S. Coast Guard ensures that U.S. law is enforced out that far, and they do a great job.

Interdiction of drugs on the high seas. Just imagine the coastal waters of the United States; the Pacific coast, the Atlantic coast, the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean. We have the technology, we have the resources to interdict almost all the drugs if the Coast Guard is given those resources. Within 5 to 7 years, I am convinced that we can interdict up to 85 percent of those drugs if the Coast Guard is given the right resources.

We talked about safety at life at sea. Not only is the Coast Guard responsible for safety at life at sea for U.S. fishermen, but they also do a good job in the international arena. On every river, looking at the Mississippi River, the Great Lakes, our estuaries, the Coast Guard is responsible for safety at life at sea.

Who inspects vessels, domestic and foreign? It is the Coast Guard. Who inspects these cargo ships, these container ships, these oil tankers, the bulk carriers, the small vessels? It is the U.S. Coast Guard. Who interdicts illegal immigrants being carried through to this country on the high seas? It is the U.S. Coast Guard. Who cuts ice in the Great Lakes; who cuts ice in the estuaries, like the Chesapeake Bay, around this country? It is the Coast Guard. Who cuts the ice leading to McMurdo Station in the Antarctic? It is the U.S. Coast Guard. Who cuts the ice in the Arctic Ocean? It is the U.S. Coast Guard.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that the U.S. Coast Guard does all of this with a force smaller than the New York City police force.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues not only to support this legislation, but to think about the silent service that does a magnificent job, and all they ask for from this body is that we know something about the magnificent job that they and that we vote for this legislation.

H.R. 820 was developed in a bipartisan manner, and deserves the support of all the Members.

The primary purpose of H.R. 820, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1999, is to authorize expenditures for the U.S. Coast Guard for fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

Section 101 of the bill authorizes approximately \$4.6 billion in the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2000, and \$4.8 billion in fiscal year 2001. The amounts authorized for fiscal year 2000 include funding for Coast Guard programs at the levels requested by the President, with certain increases. The funding increases over the levels requested by the President are primarily for drug interdiction and commercial fishing and recreational vessel safety.

Specifically, H.R. 820 contains an additional \$380 million for drug interdiction, consistent with the provisions of the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act which was enacted by Congress last year. H.R. 820 authorizes an

additional \$142 million in operating expenses for fiscal year 2000 and \$148 million in operating expenses for fiscal year 2001. These funds will allow the Coast Guard to operate 15 additional Coastal Patrol Boats, a regional law enforcement training center in Puerto Rico, several maritime patrol aircraft, and six medium endurance cutters. The bill further allows the Coast Guard to construct 15 coastal patrol boats for \$81 million and to begin construction of six medium endurance cutters for \$100 million in fiscal year 2000. These new assets will allow the Coast Guard to execute its role under the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act.

I have supported increases in the Coast Guard's drug interdiction spending because I am convinced that the level of Coast Guard drug interdiction has fallen well below what is necessary to fight the War on Drugs effectively. The \$46 million increase in drug interdiction resources requested by the President for fiscal year 2000 is not adequate to respond to the alarming level of teenage drug use in this country.

The bill also contains additional funds for voluntary fishing vessel safety personnel, and \$100 million to accelerate the national distress and response system modernization project. Also, H.R. 820 authorizes \$128 million in fiscal year 2001 to acquire a replacement icebreaking vessel for the Great Lakes.

Section 102 of H.R. 820 authorizes an increase of Coast Guard military personnel to 40,000 by the end of fiscal year 2000, and 44,000 by the end of fiscal year 2001, to allow the Coast Guard to aggressively fight the War on Drugs in the Caribbean.

Finally, there are a few noncontroversial provisions in the bill, including a provision to require vessel operators to give notice to the Coast Guard 24 hours before they enter U.S. territorial waters. I thank the ranking member Mr. DEFAZIO from Oregon for that addition:

At the appropriate time, I will offer a managers amendment which adds several noncontroversial provisions to H.R. 820.

I urge the Members to support this legislation.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to bring to the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) a matter that concerns the city of Garden Grove and the United States Coast Guard. An oil spill has been detected in the Bolsa Chica wetlands, and the city, unfortunately, has been erroneously identified as the responsible party.

The discharge was caused solely by another party, who discharged waste oil product from his truck into the city's catch basin. This party's waste oil passed through the catch basin and into the public storm drain. The circumstances of this case remain ambiguous.

The city of Garden Grove cannot accept an open-ended obligation to pay future claims in an unknown and potentially enormous amount. The city's revenues are limited, as the gentleman knows, and it is difficult to expand

that tax base. No reasonable public policy is served by having the taxpayers of the city of Garden Grove pay for the cleanup and the spill of a third party.

The office of the Orange County district attorney is continuing a criminal investigation into the third party and we hope that we will have results soon with respect to that.

I urge the gentleman from Minnesota to recommend to the Coast Guard that it closely monitor the situation and to pursue the true responsible party for the reimbursement of the costs and damages.

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

Ms. SANCHEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. We are certainly aware of the Garden Grove problem. The discharge of waste oil product is particularly deleterious to the Bolsa Chica wetlands, a very sensitive environmental area. I had experience with this type of thing in my own Congressional District near Duluth, the Arrowhead Refinery site. It has taken us years to fix up and to fix responsibility on the third parties for that cleanup.

We are particularly sensitive to the gentlewoman's appeal and to her concern. We adhere on this side vigorously to the principle of the responsible party pays: "You make the mess; you clean it up."

We will work with the gentlewoman and the Coast Guard to reach a reasonable conclusion that suits the gentlewoman's constituents, and will continue to work closely with her and the Coast Guard to monitor this situation.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and appreciate his remarks.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 820, the Coast Guard Reauthorization Act of 1999.

What is of special interest and concern to me, and a great pleasure, is that at long last, for 25 years of my service in the Congress, we are approaching the date when we can see on the Great Lakes a replacement for the Coast Guard icebreaker Mackinaw, now older than most Members of this body.

The Mackinaw was built during the 1940s. It is now 55 years of age. It has done valiant service keeping the shipping lanes on the Great Lakes open during the late fall and early spring season to move goods to market. But the Mackinaw, battered by five and a half decades of breaking ice, is badly in need of replacement.

This legislation provides a \$3 million authorization for design competition for a replacement vessel. Not just a study, as we have done in the past and nothing has come of it, but design competition for a replacement vessel for the icebreaker Mackinaw; and \$128 million authorization for the construction of that replacement vessel.

□ 1400

For those who are not familiar with the Great Lakes, this is home to 20 percent of all the fresh water on the face of the Earth. It is the locus of one out of every five industrial jobs in America. The Great Lakes states generate 45 percent of the Nation's agriculture and produce over a third of the Nation's exports. And to move those commodities, to move the 58 million tons of iron ore that moved from northern Minnesota, northern Michigan to the lower lake steel mills, the 23 million tons of stone that are used in the Nation's highway construction project, and 20 million tons of coal each year that move from upper lake to lower lake to fuel with low sulphur western coal, the demands of power plants in Illinois, Michigan, and Ohio with clean coal and the energy they need to keep their industry going, we have to keep those shipping lanes open in the late fall and the early spring to ensure the lowest cost delivery of these goods.

Water borne transportation is the lowest energy consuming means of transportation in our country and anywhere in the world and the Great Lakes waterways are critical to the needs of upper and lower lakes. And it is not just the ports on the Great Lakes that benefit from this, nor the industries, but the farmers of western Minnesota, of North and South Dakota, of Montana, of Iowa, where the grain comes into the Port of Duluth. Grain farmers from Canada, it comes down from Thunder Bay into Lake Michigan and onto lower lake port and ultimately exported to the seven seas of the world.

This Great Lakes waterway system is the great energy source for the national economy and for agriculture that reaches way west of the Mississippi and stretches far east of the Mississippi. The Mackinaw replacement project, a multipurpose vessel, will benefit the entire national economy. And I am delighted and I really appreciate the work of our chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), who has been very understanding of our need on the Great Lakes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman, who has been supportive of this initiative, and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), who has been very helpful on this initiative. And for all my Great Lakes colleagues who for years have joined together and supported, at last we can say the end is in sight, replacement for the Mackinaw is coming.

But this bill goes further. It provides the support for what I consider to be America's greatest return on investment entity, the U.S. Coast Guard. We get more for our dollar investment in the Coast Guard than out of any of the services, perhaps any other entity except maybe the Corps of Engineers. The return on investment in the Coast Guard is extraordinary.

Whether in safety in the inland waterways of the coastal regions or in

protection against drug runners, the interdiction role that the Coast Guard plays is extraordinary. The men and women who wear that special color blue deserve our total support, and this bill provides it.

The \$44 million authorization in this bill to continue the design and development process for the Deepwater project is critical. This is an initiative to replace all of the Coast Guard's vessels and aircraft that operate more than 50 miles out from the U.S. coastline along the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf Coasts. This Deepwater initiative is really critical to keep the Coast Guard competitive, to keep it in line with all the additional responsibilities we in the Congress have saddled upon the Coast Guard, and to keep the United States vigilant in maintaining the integrity of our coastline.

I will not go into all the many other initiatives, the fisheries enforcement, migrant interdiction, drug interdiction along our coast that the Coast Guard carries out. We really salute the men and women with the special blue of the U.S. Coast Guard and do so in a very practical and realistic way in this legislation.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for bringing this legislation to the House floor.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) for yielding time.

First of all, I want to support the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) regarding the Mackinaw and a number of the other issues he raised. The Mackinaw indeed is a worthy ship, but it is also an old ship and will not be able to operate much longer. And the Great Lakes depend mightily upon the efforts of that ship, particularly in the colder months.

I would also point out in relation to the comments from the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) that the Great Lakes are really misnamed. They should be called the "great seas" because in fact they are seas. And that is why the Coast Guard plays such an important role in these bodies of water. It is very important to recognize their magnitude. And not only are they 20 percent of the world's fresh water supply, they are 95 percent of the United States' surface fresh water, and that is a very important factor in our country's future.

I also thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, for working with a number of us in resolving a major problem on Lake Michigan, an important component again of the Great Lakes. The administration, in submitting their budget proposal this year, eliminated heli-

copter service for the Coast Guard in the middle section of Lake Michigan.

Now, recognize that Michigan has more boats per capita, in fact more boats total, than any other State of the Union. Furthermore, recognize that Michigan has more lake shore mileage than any State of the Union except Alaska. A tremendous amount of boating activity on Lake Michigan. And the administration is proposing to remove the Coast Guard helicopter station at Muskegon, Michigan.

I appreciate the efforts of the subcommittee. That includes both minority and majority. We have been able to work this out and come up with a proposal within this that will maintain the Coast Guard station at Muskegon. That is extremely important. And not only that, but to look very carefully or perhaps reestablish the helicopter Coast Guard station in the Chicago area, which was shut down some years ago. Both are very important in terms of achieving what is one of the key missions of the Coast Guard, as outlined by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), and that is ensuring the life and safety of individuals at sea, whether on the oceans or on the Great Lakes.

Finally, let me register a concern about the general overall direction of the Coast Guard funding. The Coast Guard, as we just said, is responsible for the life and safety of individuals at sea. But yet the funding relative to other activities of the Coast Guard has steadily diminished, and the reason is very simple. The drug problem of this Nation and the drug interdiction responsibilities of the Coast Guard continues to drain resources away from the search and rescue operations of the United States Coast Guard.

And even though the drug interdiction is a very important part of their responsibility and very important to this Nation, all of us must recognize that we cannot continue to give more responsibility to the Coast Guard in this area, we cannot continue to require more drug interdiction from them and not give them the money to do that, because by doing that we are pulling men away from their search-and-rescue activities.

So if indeed we want to have the Coast Guard pursue their drug interdiction activities, fine, then good, but let's recognize that we have to provide the funding and not cut and chip away at the life and safety operation of the Coast Guard at the same time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would not only support the Coast Guard reauthorization and associate myself with the words of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) as to the importance of the Coast Guard not just on the Great Lakes but throughout this great Nation, but I want to bring to the attention an

amendment that we are going to have a little bit later here, the Upton amendment, which I believe the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) is going to accept and be even part of his amendment. Anyway, I have had the pleasure of working with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), my colleague and friend, on this amendment.

I would like to maybe take a moment here and highlight the importance and need for the Upton amendment which would help to bring to light the current problem with the Federal Government's assistance for transferring lighthouses.

We have probably more lighthouses on the Great Lakes than anywhere else in this Nation. It helps to tell the story of our maritime history. They stand as a testament to the thousands of mariners who lived and died on these Great Lakes and to those who dedicated their lives to guiding them home safely. The modern technology is replacing the use of the lighthouses for navigational purposes. But there are many groups out there dedicated to preserving these monuments for posterity and history.

Unfortunately, once the Federal Government decides it no longer needs a lighthouse, there is no guarantee that the historical groups that have worked for years to maintain these structures will be able to acquire them, even though the group may have spent thousands of dollars and hours restoring the lighthouses and maintaining the property. They are not given that go-ahead to take the transfer from the Coast Guard as to the physical assets.

While we cannot change the system under this current bill, what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) is trying to do through his amendment and our support we are now considering, this amendment will help highlight the problem and, at the very least, ask the Coast Guard to provide us some advice and technical assistance for the organizations that want to preserve our maritime heritage.

I hope this will further the dialogue to change the way in which the Federal Government transfers the lighthouses, and I urge my colleagues to look carefully at the Upton amendment and to adopt that amendment.

And in final, I hope H.R. 820, the Coast Guard authorization bill, is transferred and approved by this House and we have a strong vote on it to show our support for the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with, basically, the comments on both sides of the aisle.

I want to tell my colleagues, the things about drugs, the things about illegals, California pays a big price for all of the above. And I would tell the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the greatest thing that we do

not have to deal with in San Diego is the ice cutters. They have to do that in Michigan. But I support his issue there.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and I will probably never vote for each other more than a handful of times, but this happens to be one of those times that we do. And I do think also that one of the things the Coast Guard does there is actually a requirement under OPA 90, where we have dual hull tankers. I hope some day we can enforce that so we do not have things like the Valdez.

And even our offshore oil, I put a requirement that the President supported that limited our offshore oil drilling off California because of the pollution not only in our wetland but our beaches. And we see every day these tankers going up and down from foreign countries that are leaking oil and coming on our beaches, and I worked with the gentleman to stop that.

Last year we honored two policemen that died here in defending our Capitol. But we do not hear much about just 96 miles from here right off Point Lookout we lost a Coast Guard cutter, a rescue ship, and people gave their lives in service to that, too. So I think that it is a little unsung part of security that we have in this country but we should not forget, especially them, and it is a reason that most of us on both sides of the aisle support this.

Another area in which they helped, we had a bipartisan vote. There is a Chinese shipping company that wanted to take over Long Beach. I am happy to tell my colleagues that the CIA has come out and said that, yes, there is a national security threat over Long Beach if they would take complete control. It is the Coast Guard that found that they were dealing chemical and biological and nuclear triggers.

So I rise in strong support and I thank the Members on both sides of the aisle for this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

□ 1415

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, it has pretty well been said. The U.S. Coast Guard has made America a better place to live for 208 years. As members of this country's oldest continuous seagoing service, the men and women of the Coast Guard continue to do what they have always done, save lives and protect property at sea; ensure a safe, efficient maritime transportation system; protect and preserve our precious marine resources and environment; enforce laws and treaties in the maritime region; and defend our national security.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) has already indicated that

the Coast Guard, numbers-wise, is smaller than the New York City Police Department. Yet our Coast Guard carries out their vital missions in this country's ports and waterways, along its 47,000 miles of coastline, lakes and rivers, on international waters or in any maritime region as required to support national security.

When I was a member of the Coast Guard, Mr. Chairman, we used to affectionately refer to the Navy as the Big Outfit. Conversely, they would refer to us as the Little Outfit, the Shallow Water Navy, the Knee-Deep Navy, the Hooligans Navy. They did it with tongues in cheek but they did it affectionately. There was good rapport between the two seagoing services.

This essential and fiercely proud service continues its 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week vigilance against a host of transnational dangers, including pollution, illegal migration, international drug trafficking and terrorism.

My friend from Minnesota mentioned the Mackinaw. The Mackinaw was synonymous with Great Lakes icebreaking, I guess, for four or five decades. He is right, the time has come to replace it. I am happy to see that that is going to happen.

I talked with a Coast Guardsman not too long ago who was the recipient of the Coast Guard gold lifesaving medal. I think he had rescued either four or five people in this particular rescue effort. In so doing, he suffered a permanent injury, and he is disabled. As I was talking to him about his heroic rescue, he was very unassuming about it. "No big deal," he said, "this is what I'm supposed to do." Well, it was a big deal to those whom he pulled out of the drink. I can assure you it was a big deal to them. Even though he is now disabled, he said, "I did what I'm supposed to do. I went to the aid of those who were in distress." That is what the Coast Guard men and women have been doing for years, 208, to be exact.

I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, to say to my friend from Pennsylvania that the full committee and the subcommittee has done yeoman work in getting this bill to the floor. It is a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard's motto rings just as true today as it did in 1970, *semper paratus*, always ready.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 820.

In representing the Port of Houston in my district, the U.S. Coast Guard has the primary responsibility for ensuring the safety and security of the vessels not only in my district but in the ports and waterways around the country.

Also, in recent years the Coast Guard has been charged with the task of engaging in drug interdiction activities. In fact, just in late January, the Coast Guard intercepted and seized a Panamanian vessel 125 miles off the coast of Jamaica. The vessel was then es-

corted back to the Port of Houston and upon searching the vessel nearly five tons of cocaine with an estimated street value of \$375 million was discovered. This was one of the largest drug seizures in both Texas and our Nation's history.

In this year's Coast Guard authorization, there is a 10 percent increase in the funds for discretionary activities. I am glad to see that. Hopefully this bill will pass very easily. That will mean approximately \$400 million is earmarked for drug interdiction activities. That increase in funds will fully implement the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, enable the Coast Guard to operate an additional fifteen patrol boats, eight cutters and seven marine vessels to stop drugs before they enter our country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and also in support of the Coast Guard's effort not only for the safety of our harbors and waterways but also for the drug interdiction activities.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 820—the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1999. This much-needed bill authorizes \$3.1 billion in fiscal year 2000 and \$3.2 billion in fiscal year 2001 for Coast Guard operating expenses to carry out numerous missions.

Included in this authorization is funding for the Coast Guard to Participate in search and rescue missions. The Coast Guard spends about 11.6 percent of its operating expenses on search and rescue missions. This is a critical function of the Coast Guard and one that saves the lives and property of many who find themselves in peril on the open seas—particularly the perilous seas off the coast of South Florida.

Recently, the Coast Guard launched a search and rescue mission off of the coast of South Florida in search of Haitian immigrants whose vessel capsized as they were trying to reach the United States. Unfortunately, although three Haitian immigrants were rescued from the Atlantic Ocean between the Bahamas and Florida, perhaps as many as 40 more Haitian immigrants were lost, despite the Coast Guard's best efforts.

Over the years, the Coast Guard has rescued hundreds of Haitians, Cubans, and others seeking freedom and a better life in the United States. Unfortunately, many die trying to secure their dream of freedom. The Coast Guard serves critical role in helping to save human lives in the straits of Florida. The diverse ethnic communities in Miami are most grateful for the Coast Guard's search and rescue efforts.

Search and Rescue is one of the Coast Guard's oldest missions. For over 200 years, the Coast Guard has responded to distress calls at sea. Minimizing the loss of life, injury, property damage, or loss by rendering aid to persons in distress and property in the maritime environment has always been a Coast Guard priority. Coast Guard search and rescue response involves multimission stations, cutters, aircraft and boats linked by communications networks.

The Coast Guard is the Maritime search and rescue coordinator and is recognized worldwide as a leader in the field of search and rescue. Each hour a U.S. Coast Guard

aircraft is aloft costs about \$3,700—and several maybe used in a single search. It is critical that the Coast Guard has the resources it needs to maintain its search and rescue efforts. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 820, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1999. As a member of the Congressional Coast Guard Caucus, I am proud of the U.S. Coast Guard and all the hard work that each and every member selflessly gives each day to our nation. The United States Coast Guard is this nation's oldest and its premier maritime agency. The history of the Service is historic and multifaceted. It is the amalgamation of five Federal agencies—the Revenue Cutter Service, the Light-house Service, the Steamboat Inspection Service, the Bureau of Navigation, and the Lifesaving Service, which were originally independent agencies with overlapping authorities. They sometimes received new names, and they were all finally united under the umbrella of the Coast Guard. The multiple missions and responsibilities of the modern Service are directly tied to this diverse heritage and the magnificent achievements of all of these agencies.

The Coast Guard, through its previous agencies, is the oldest continuous seagoing service and has fought in almost every war since the Constitution became the law of the land in 1789. The Coast Guard has traditionally performed two roles in wartime. The first has been to augment the Navy with men and cutters. The second has been to undertake special missions, for which peacetime experiences have prepared the Service with unique skills. Today the Coast Guard is engaged on many open sea patrols in the war on drugs throughout the vast oceans and seas of the world.

The Coast Guard has helped to protect the environment for 150 years. In 1822 the Congress created a timber reserve for the Navy and authorized the President to use whatever forces necessary to prevent the cutting of live-oak on public lands. The shallow-draft cutters were well-suited to this service and were used extensively. Today, the current framework for the Coast Guard's Marine Environmental Protection program is the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972.

In 1973, the Coast Guard created a National Strike Force to combat oil spills. There are three teams, a Pacific unit based near San Francisco, a Gulf team at Mobile, AL, and an Atlantic Strike Team stationed in Elizabeth City, NC. Since the creation of the force, the teams have been deployed worldwide to hundreds of potential and actual spill sites, bringing with them a vast array of sophisticated equipment.

The 200-mile zone created by the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 quadrupled the offshore fishing area controlled by the United States. The Coast Guard has the responsibility of enforcing this law.

The Coast Guard additionally has the major responsibility for conducting and coordinating Search and Rescue operations and licensing and regulating safety and commercial boating rules. This enormous task is performed day in and day out by the dedicated men and women of the Coast Guard.

As you may be able to tell, the Coast Guard performs a complex but necessary array of missions that effect the very life blood of this

nation in the areas of national defense, commerce, the environment, and lifesaving.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to particularly highlight one essential mission that the Coast Guard is performing right now in America's westernmost frontier, my home district on the island of Guam. During the past year, Guam has experienced a significant influx of Chinese illegal immigrants. Chinese crime syndicates organize boatloads of indigent Chinese citizens to illegally enter the United States for an exorbitant fee of \$8,000–\$10,000 per person. After undergoing an arduous journey under fetid, unsanitary conditions, the Chinese reach Guam dehydrated, hungry, disease-ridden and sometimes beaten. Upon arrival, the smuggled Chinese become indentured servants as they attempt to pay their passage to America.

Guam's geographic proximity and asylum acceptance regulations make it a prime target for Chinese crime syndicates. According to the INS about 700 illegal Chinese immigrants traveled to Guam last year. Since the beginning of this year alone, 157 have been apprehended by the Coast Guard, INS and local Guam officials. Since the INS does not have enough money to detain the Chinese illegal immigrants on Guam, they proposed to release them to the general populace without assistance. Fortunately, the Government of Guam has offered its already strained resources to detain the illegal aliens until they are ready to be adjudicated.

Mr. Chairman, Chinese crime syndicates have exploited Immigration and Nationality (INA) asylum regulations. Because Guam, through INA directives, has to accept asylum applications, Guam becomes a cheap and attractive location for shipment of smuggled Chinese.

The Marianas section of the Coast Guard, stationed out in Guam has been tasked to interdict, when possible, these wretched Chinese vessels that are transporting these illegals. The local command, which is currently undermanned and over extended, is doing the impossible under such circumstances.

In the Armed Services Committee, where I am proud to serve, we have as of late been discussing the high level of OPSTEMPO and PERSTEMPO to describe the state of over-extension of manpower and the drain on resources within our military. In the case of these dedicated men and women of the Coast Guard on Guam, they are no exception to these discussions.

I recently had the pleasure of meeting with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral James M. Loy and I expressed to him the sentiments of the people of Guam as well as praised him for his leadership and dedication to this service. Along with my fellow Coast Guard Caucus Members, I promised to continue to support the fine work of our Coast Guard. I would additionally ask that Congress and Commandant Loy seriously look to find some additional resources for our beleaguered Coast Guard on Guam in order to more effectively contend with the growing onslaught of illegal Chinese immigrants and relieve the high level of OPSTEMPO faced by these Coastguardsmen and women. We are all very proud of the work that Captain Scott Glover, the CO of the Marianas Section, is performing on Guam as well as that of the entire Marianas Section of the U.S. Coast Guard for their compassion when dealing with these desperate Chinese and for their generosity in the performance of their duty. Si Yu'os Ma'ase.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I appreciate the work that the Chairmen of the full Committee and the Subcommittee and their staff have done in addressing safety needs in southern Lake Michigan. For many years, I have been working with the U.S. Coast Guard in addressing the concerns of my constituents and other residents through the reestablishment and operation of a seasonal air rescue facility in the southern lake area. As many of you may be aware, the boat traffic, both commercial and recreational, in this area is the most congested in all of the lake. An air rescue facility in this area would greatly increase confidence of boaters and recreational users and the chance for survival in the extremely cold and dangerous waters of Lake Michigan.

I am anticipating the completion of a report by the Coast Guard in the very near future to determine the best location for an additional facility in this area. In discussions with the Coast Guard, it appears that the regional airport in Waukegan, Illinois may be the ideal location as it is located very near the lake's shoreline thereby enabling a short response time and has additional hangars that could be leased to significantly reduce the cost of this rescue facility. In addition, the Waukegan Regional Airport offers a control tower, instrument landing system and twenty-four hour operation. However, I am very concerned with the cost estimate that the Coast Guard provided for this additional facility. The justification for this estimate includes some expenses that I believe can be reduced once we identify the location of the site, and I look forward to working with the Coast Guard on this.

This legislation is an important step in providing safety and confidence to the boaters in southern Lake Michigan, and I look forward to its implementation and the establishment of this rescue facility.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in favor of the Coast Guard Reauthorization Act. The Act provides the United States Coast Guard with authorization for the funding they need to accomplish the important missions that the Congress and the Nation have asked them to accomplish.

As a member with more than 120 miles of Lake Michigan coastline in my district, I fully understand the Coast Guard's mission and appreciate the fine level of search-and-rescue services that the Coast Guard provides to the boating and beach-going public in West Michigan.

I rise especially today to discuss the way that this authorization bill impacts the operation of the Coast Guard Muskegon Air Facility. The Coast Guard has operated this air facility on a seasonal basis from April 1 to October 1 each summer since 1997. Prior to 1997, the Coast Guard had operated an air facility or air station to cover southern Lake Michigan out of the Chicago area since 1959.

The bill before us today addresses the concerns of the Michigan and Illinois delegations regarding Coast Guard search and rescue air coverage on Lake Michigan. The bill provides that the Coast Guard shall continue to operate the Muskegon Air Facility and shall establish a Chicago area facility for operation through the end of FY 2001. In addition, the bill provides for a study of total search-and-rescue response on Lake Michigan and the establishment of a plan for the coordination of search-and-rescue response in the Chicago area.

I hope that the Coast Guard will aggressively move to take the actions necessary to operate both the Muskegon and Chicago air facilities in FY 2000. I also hope that the Coast Guard will, in the interim, provide a high level of search-and-rescue air coverage for southern Lake Michigan by operating the Muskegon Air Facility on a seven-day, 24-hour-per-day basis during the summer of 1999.

Finally, I want to thank Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman Shuster and the other subcommittee chairmen for their assistance in resolving the Lake Michigan Air Facility issue. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Ehlers, for his assistance on this issue and for helping to maintain the high level of boating safety enjoyed by those boating on Lake Michigan.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to take this opportunity to express my appreciation on the members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and its Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, for the good work they have done in putting together this year's Coast Guard Reauthorization measure (H.R. 820).

As reported, this bill not only makes it easier to conduct the all-important war against drugs, which is so important to this nation's future, but it will also promote public safety in a way that is very important to a great many people in the Upper Midwest. In particular, I am referring to all those folks who fly over, or take to, the waters of southwestern Lake Michigan and the lakes and rivers north and/or west of Chicago.

Mr. Chairman, over 6 million people reside in the counties of northwestern Indiana, northeastern Illinois, and southeastern Wisconsin that border on Lake Michigan. Not only do many of them own a boat or enjoy going out on someone else's, but countless residents of, or visitors to, the region take advantage of the dinner voyages and sightseeing cruises that depart from Chicago's justly famous lakefront. On top of that, literally, hundreds of thousands of people fly in and out of O'Hare Airport and a number of other airports that dot the landscape from Gary, IN, to Milwaukee, WI. In short, there are people on or over southwestern Lake Michigan and nearby waters all the time—people who would be at risk in the event of a boating accident or an airplane crash.

Thankfully, over 40 years have passed since a major commercial airliner crashed into Lake Michigan. However, that is no guarantee against such an accident occurring in the future. Moreover, smaller planes have fallen into, or collided over, the Lake since then and there have been a number of instances where boats have capsized and/or sunk, not just in Lake Michigan, but in the Chain o' Lakes region north of Chicago. In fact, 26 people were killed in those sorts of accidents from October 1, 1995 to October 1, 1996, a figure which helps explain why so many citizens in the Chicago area were so concerned when the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) helicopter rescue unit stationed at the old Glenview Naval Air Station was transferred across the Lake to Muskegon, Michigan several years back.

Not to belabor the point, but those citizens had good reason to be concerned. Not only was that USCG helicopter better equipped and its crew better prepared to deal with accidents well offshore than local rescue boats and helicopters, but the unit was 15 to 30 precious

minutes further removed from the northeastern Illinois shoreline than had been the case previously. Also, the fact that the unit could spend more time in the air searching for accident victims if it were closer to the Chicagoland area argued strongly for either moving it in that direction or bringing in a new USCG helicopter rescue unit to serve the region.

Having joined a number of my colleagues from both Illinois and Indiana in making that pro-safety argument, I am both pleased and relieved to see that the authors of this legislation have recognized its merits and have endorsed the latter course of action. According to the provisions of Section 204 of H.R. 820, a new USCG helicopter search and rescue (SAR) unit is to be situated on the southwest shore of Lake Michigan, where it is to remain until at least September 30, 2001. In the interim, a thorough study will be conducted to determine what SAR equipment will be needed in the region after the year 2001 and a comprehensive plan will be developed for the provision of the SAR services that are deemed necessary. As for the existing unit, it will continue to be based in Muskegon until at least September 30, 2001, thereby assuring the boating and aviation populations on both sides of Lake Michigan that timely USCG air SAR services will be more readily available than they have been heretofore.

Mr. Chairman, while this approach is not quite as definitive as I would have preferred, it has two major advantages that should commend themselves to my colleagues. First, by authorizing additional air SAR resources for the heavily populated (by boats as well as people) Chicago area, it addresses a very significant public safety concern. Second, by leaving the existing unit in Muskegon, MI, it means that people in that area will not face a reduction in their USCG SAR coverage similar to the one faced by Chicagoland residents several years ago. To my way of thinking, each of these advantages would be sufficient to justify enactment of Section 204 of H.R. 820. Together, they and the drug interdiction features of H.R. 820 make a compelling case for the entire measure.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 820.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

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

H.R. 820

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 102. Authorized levels of military strength and training.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 201. Vessel NOT A SHOT.

Sec. 202. Costs of clean-up of Cape May light-house.

Sec. 203. Clarification of Coast Guard authority to control vessels in territorial waters of the United States.

Sec. 204. Coast Guard search and rescue for Lake Michigan.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

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

(1) For the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, \$3,084,400,000, of which—

(i) \$25,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990;

(ii) not less than \$663,000,000 shall be available for expenses related to drug interdiction; and

(iii) \$5,500,000 shall be available for the commercial fishing vessel safety program; and

(B) for fiscal year 2001, \$3,207,800,000, of which—

(i) \$25,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990;

(ii) not less than \$689,500,000 shall be available for expenses related to drug interdiction; and

(iii) \$5,500,000 shall be available for the commercial fishing vessel safety program.

(2) For the acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore and offshore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, \$691,300,000, of which—

(i) \$20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990;

(ii) not less than \$280,300,000 shall be available for expenses related to drug interdiction;

(iii) \$100,000,000 shall be available for modernization of the national distress response system; and

(iv) \$3,000,000 shall be available for completion of the design of a replacement vessel for the Coast Guard icebreaker MACKINAW; and

(B) for fiscal year 2001, \$792,000,000, of which—

(i) \$20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990;

(ii) not less than \$233,000,000 shall be available for expenses related to drug interdiction;

(iii) \$110,000,000 shall be available for modernization of the national distress response system; and

(iv) \$128,000,000 shall be available for construction or acquisition of a replacement vessel for the Coast Guard icebreaker MACKINAW.

(3) For research, development, test, and evaluation of technologies, materials, and human factors directly relating to improving the performance of the Coast Guard's mission in support of search and rescue, aids to navigation, marine safety, marine environmental protection, enforcement of laws and treaties, ice operations, oceanographic research, and defense readiness—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, \$21,700,000; and

(B) for fiscal year 2001, \$23,000,000,

to remain available until expended, of which \$3,500,000 shall be derived each fiscal year from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out

the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990.

(4) 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—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, \$730,000,000; and
(B) for fiscal year 2001, \$785,000,000.

(5) 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 Alteration Program—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, \$11,000,000; and
(B) for fiscal year 2001, \$11,000,000,

to remain available until expended.

(6) For environmental compliance and restoration at Coast Guard facilities (other than parts and equipment associated with operations and maintenance)—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, \$19,500,000; and
(B) for fiscal year 2001, \$21,000,000,

to remain available until expended.

SEC. 102. AUTHORIZED LEVELS OF MILITARY STRENGTH AND TRAINING.

(a) **ACTIVE DUTY STRENGTH.**—The Coast Guard is authorized an end-of-year strength for active duty personnel of—

(1) 40,000 as of September 30, 2000; and
(2) 44,000 as of September 30, 2001.

(b) **MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS.**—The Coast Guard is authorized average military training student loads as follows:

(1) For recruit and special training—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, 1,500 student years; and
(B) for fiscal year 2001, 1,500 student years.

(2) For flight training—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, 100 student years; and
(B) for fiscal year 2001, 100 student years.

(3) For professional training in military and civilian institutions—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, 300 student years; and
(B) for fiscal year 2001, 300 student years.

(4) For officer acquisition—

(A) for fiscal year 2000, 1,000 student years; and
(B) for fiscal year 2001, 1,000 student years.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 201. VESSEL NOT A SHOT.

Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883), section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1886 (46 App. U.S.C. 289), and section 12106 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel NOT A SHOT (United States official number 911064).

SEC. 202. COSTS OF CLEAN-UP OF CAPE MAY LIGHTHOUSE.

Of amounts authorized by this Act for fiscal year 2000 for environmental compliance and restoration of Coast Guard facilities, \$99,000 shall be available to reimburse the owner of the former Coast Guard lighthouse facility at Cape May, New Jersey, for costs incurred for clean-up of lead contaminated soil at that facility.

SEC. 203. CLARIFICATION OF COAST GUARD AUTHORITY TO CONTROL VESSELS IN TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Ports and Waterways Safety Act (33 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 15. ENTRY OF VESSELS INTO TERRITORIAL SEA; DIRECTION OF VESSELS BY COAST GUARD.

“(a) **NOTIFICATION OF COAST GUARD.**—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, a commercial vessel entering the territorial sea of the United States shall notify the Secretary not later than 24 hours before that entry and provide the following information:

“(1) The name of the vessel.

“(2) The port or place of destination in the United States.

“(3) The time of entry into the territorial sea.

“(4) Any information requested by the Secretary to demonstrate compliance with applicable international agreements to which the United States is a party.

“(5) If the vessel is carrying dangerous cargo, a description of that cargo.

“(6) A description of any hazardous conditions on the vessel.

“(7) Any other information requested by the Secretary.

“(b) **DENIAL OF ENTRY.**—The Secretary may deny entry of a vessel into the territorial sea of the United States if—

“(1) the Secretary has not received notification for the vessel in accordance with subsection (a); or

“(2) the vessel is not in compliance with any other applicable law relating to marine safety, security, or environmental protection.

“(c) **DIRECTION OF VESSEL.**—The Secretary may direct the operation of any vessel in the navigable waters of the United States as necessary during hazardous circumstances, including the absence of a pilot required by State or Federal law, weather, casualty, vessel traffic, or the poor condition of the vessel.”.

SEC. 204. COAST GUARD SEARCH AND RESCUE FOR LAKE MICHIGAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary of Transportation—

(A) shall continue to operate and maintain the seasonal Coast Guard air search and rescue facility located in Muskegon, Michigan, until at least September 30, 2001; and

(B) shall establish a new seasonal Coast Guard air search and rescue facility for Southern Lake Michigan to serve the Chicago metropolitan area and the surrounding environment, and operate that facility until at least September 30, 2001.

In establishing the facility under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall study Illinois sites in the Chicago metropolitan area, including Waukegan, Illinois.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In addition to the other amounts authorized by this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation—

(A) for operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard air search and rescue facility in Muskegon, Michigan—

(i) \$3,252,000 for fiscal year 2000; and
(ii) \$3,252,000 for fiscal year 2001;

(B) for acquisition, construction, and improvement of facilities and equipment for the Coast Guard air search and rescue facility for Southern Lake Michigan established under paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) \$8,100,000 for fiscal year 2000; and
(ii) \$13,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

(C) for operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard air search and rescue facility for Southern Lake Michigan established under paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) \$5,505,000 for fiscal year 2000; and
(ii) \$4,060,000 for fiscal year 2001.

(3) **LIMITATION ON CLOSING OR DOWNSIZING OTHER FACILITIES.**—The Secretary of Transportation may not close or downsize any Coast Guard facility for the purpose of accommodating the capability required pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) **STUDY OF SEARCH AND RESCUE CAPABILITIES FOR LAKE MICHIGAN.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall study, determine, and report to the Congress the overall aircraft and vessel search and rescue capability for Lake Michigan, including—

(1) the capability of all Federal, State, and local government and nongovernment entities that perform search and rescue functions for Lake Michigan; and

(2) the adequacy of that overall capability.

(c) **PLAN FOR SEARCH AND RESCUE RESPONSE FOR CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall prepare, submit to the Congress, and begin implementing a comprehensive plan for aircraft and vessel search and rescue response for Lake Michigan in the vicinity of Chicago, Illinois.

(d) **USE OF HELICOPTERS FOR DRUG INTERDICTION.**—During the portion of each year when the seasonal facilities required under subsection (a)(1) are not in operation, the Secretary of Transportation shall use helicopters assigned to those facilities for drug interdiction.

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILCHREST

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILCHREST:

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. . VESSEL COASTAL VENTURE.

Section 1120(g) of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-324; 110 Stat. 3978) is amended by inserting “COASTAL VENTURE (United States official number 971086),” after “vessels”.

SEC. . VESSEL PRIDE OF MANY.

Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883), section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1886 (46 App. U.S.C. 289), and section 12106 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel PRIDE OF MANY (Canadian official number 811529).

SEC. . PROHIBITION OF NEW MARITIME USER FEES.

Section 2110(k) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking the last sentence.

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING OIL SPILL RESPONSE ACTIONS.

It is the sense of the Congress that to ensure that liability concerns regarding response actions to remove a discharge of oil or a hazardous substance, or to mitigate or prevent the threat of such a discharge, do not deter an expeditious or effective response, the President should promulgate guidelines as soon as possible under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 and other applicable Federal laws clarifying that a person who is not a responsible party (as that term is used in that Act) and who takes any response action consistent with the National Contingency Plan (including the applicable fish and wildlife response plan) or as otherwise directed by the President to prevent or mitigate the environmental effects of such a discharge or a threat of such a discharge should not be held liable for the violation of fish

and wildlife laws unless the person is grossly negligent or engages in a willful misconduct.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, we have examined this amendment, and we are prepared to accept it on our side.

Mr. DeFAZIO. We would be happy to accept the gentleman's amendment. We have no problem.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for agreeing to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PICKETT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PICKETT:

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. .VESSEL NORFOLK.

Notwithstanding section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 App. U.S.C. 883) and section 12106 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation may issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement for the vessel NORFOLK (United States official number 1077852) before January 1, 2001, if—

(1) before that date the vessel undergoes a major conversion (as defined in section 2101 of title 46, United States Code) in a shipyard located in the United States; and

(2) the cost of the major conversion is more than three times the amount the owner of the vessel paid to purchase the vessel.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, we have examined this amendment and we are prepared to accept it on our side.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Likewise on our side, Mr. Chairman. We have no reservations.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would provide Jones Act status to a vessel that is U.S.-built, U.S.-owned, and U.S.-flagged, but which is not eligible for the coastwise trade of the United States because at one time it was flagged foreign.

Simply stated, my amendment would provide a Jones Act waiver for the tug "Norfolk" before January 1, 2001 only if before that date the vessel undergoes a major conversion in a

shipyard located in the United States and the cost of this major conversion is more than three times the amount the owner of the vessel paid to purchase the vessel. I emphasize again that the vessel is U.S.-built, U.S.-owned, and U.S.-flagged.

I offer the amendment on behalf of Bay Gulf Trading Company, a locally owned Virginia corporation with its headquarters and principal place of business in Norfolk, Virginia. Jerry McDonald, a former U.S. Navy captain, is the chairman of the company. Bay Gulf is wholly owned by U.S. citizens. It is a small business that owns and operates 8 tugs and 10 tanker barges, and employs about 75 persons.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1920 provides that a U.S. vessel once sold foreign or placed under foreign registry cannot engage in U.S. coastwise trade. Only by special legislation can such a vessel built in the United States, flagged foreign, and reflagged in the United States be documented by the coast guard with a coastwise trade endorsement.

The *Norfolk*—built in 1975 at Mangone Shipyard, Houston, Texas—subsequently it was Norwegian flagged and American Bureau of Shipping classed until 1994. During the early 1990's it was sold and reflagged in Italy. In late 1995, the vessel experienced an extensive fire off the coast of Italy. Much of the interior spaces above the main deck were gutted. It was sold "as is" to a company in Ontario, and was towed from Italy to Canada. Repairs were never completed.

Bay Gulf acquired the vessel in December 1998. The tug was the only American built large tug available anywhere in North America. Bay Gulf proposes to use the tug for anchor handling, coastal/ocean towing, and salvage duties. The necessary repair work—estimated cost of \$3 million—will be done in the Norfolk area by Norfolk shipyards and contractors. The work is estimated to cost \$3 million, which is more than three times the amount the owner of the vessel paid for the purchase of the tug.

Mr. Chairman, existing U.S. law—the Wrecked Vessels Act of 1994—permits the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement for any foreign-built vessel wrecked on the coasts of the United States when purchased by a citizen of the United States and thereupon repaired in a shipyard in the United States if the repairs are equal to three times the appraised salved value of the vessel. My amendment applies this standard in the case of the *Norfolk*, which is a U.S.-built vessel. So, I would argue that this amendment is eminently fair.

There is clearly no surplus of large anchor handling vessels in the U.S. coastwise trade. Based upon the best information that I can obtain, only one U.S. flagged, coastwise certified 8000 horsepower tug is available on the market, and it is not an anchor handling tug.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PICKETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOBIONDO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOBIONDO:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. .DRUG INTERDICTION.

(a) VESSEL SHORE FACILITIES.—In addition to amounts otherwise authorized by this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 for the acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of shore facilities for Coast Guard vessels used for drug interdiction operations.

(b) ACQUISITION OF COASTAL PATROL CRAFT.—If the Department of Defense does not offer, by not later than September 30, 1999, seven PC-170 coastal patrol craft for the use of the Coast Guard pursuant to section 812(c) of the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act (title VIII of division C of Public Law 105-277), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized by this Act, up to \$210,000,000 for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the acquisition of up to six PC-170 coastal patrol craft, or the most recent upgrade of the PC-170 coastal patrol craft, for use by the Coast Guard.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward. It allows the Coast Guard to purchase six PC-170 coastal patrol boats, adding funding to the Coast Guard budget already approved by the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard's ability to effect drug interdiction is tied to this amendment. The Coast Guard with this amendment will bring six fast, highly maneuverable vessels to the front lines of the drug war in roughly 1 year's time. With the intensity that we hear of drugs coming into this country, Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity for my colleagues to be able to do something about it. We all want to talk, every Member of Congress, about how tough we are on drugs. We all talk about how the Coast Guard is the front line of drug interdiction. We all talk about how important it is to give them the resources. Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity to give the Coast Guard the resources they need.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFAZIO) and I also want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) and all the members of the committee for their help with this particular amendment. I urge full support of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the distinguished vice chairman of the subcommittee, we have examined this and we strongly support this amendment.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we support the amendment. We do not want to see the

Coast Guard trying to perform this difficult and dangerous mission with equipment that is not suitable. This is the right equipment for this mission. We are supportive of the amendment.

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, for far too long we have fought the war on drugs as if it were a short-term conflict. It is not. It is a long-haul conflict. We must make a 20-year commitment to drug interdiction operations. This amendment will help us do that. We support the amendment on this side.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for his support.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 113, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UPTON: at the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. . GREAT LAKES LIGHTHOUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Great Lakes are home to more than 400 lighthouses. 120 of these maritime landmarks are in the State of Michigan, more than in any other State.

(2) Lighthouses are an important part of Great Lakes culture and stand as a testament to the importance of shipping in the region's political, economic, and social history.

(3) Advances in navigation technology have made many Great Lakes lighthouses obsolete. In Michigan alone, approximately 70 lighthouses will be designated as surplus property of the Federal Government and will be transferred to the General Services Administration for disposal.

(4) Unfortunately, the Federal property disposal process is confusing, complicated, and not well-suited to disposal of historic lighthouses or to facilitate transfers to nonprofit organizations. This is especially troubling because, in many cases, local nonprofit historical organizations have dedicated tremendous resources to preserving and maintaining Great Lakes lighthouses.

(5) If Great Lakes lighthouses disappear, the public will be unaware of an important chapter in Great Lakes history.

(6) The National Trust for Historic Preservation has placed Michigan lighthouses on their list of Most Endangered Historic Places.

(b) ASSISTANCE FOR GREAT LAKES LIGHTHOUSE PRESERVATION EFFORTS.—The Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Coast Guard, shall—

(1) continue to offer advice and technical assistance to organizations in the Great

Lakes region that are dedicated to lighthouse stewardship; and

(2) promptly release information regarding the timing of designations of Coast Guard lighthouses on the Great Lakes as surplus property, to enable those organizations to mobilize and be prepared to take appropriate action with respect to the disposal of those properties by the Federal Government.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise first to thank my kind colleagues the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the full committee; the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) who has been very understanding as we have worked through this language; the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), always a friend of the Coast Guard; and also my Great Lakes colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) in particular; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) and others that I conferred with before I offered this amendment this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in offering this amendment to protect Great Lakes lighthouses. As I am sure the chairman is aware, lighthouses are a very important part of Great Lakes culture and they stand as a testament to the importance of shipping in the region's political, economic and social history.

In Michigan alone, the U.S. Coast Guard plans to designate approximately 70 of these structures as surplus Federal property and turn them over to the GSA for disposal. Unfortunately, the standard Federal property disposal process is very confusing, complicated, and it does not facilitate transfers to nonprofits. This is especially troubling because in many cases, a local, not-for-profit historical organization has dedicated tremendous resources to preserving and maintaining those lighthouses.

In the city of South Haven, Michigan, this very situation occurred only last year. For years, the Coast Guard leased an historical lighthouse keeper's dwelling to the Michigan Maritime Museum that was going to be used as a curatorial center for maritime artifacts. The property was taken away from the museum, turned over to the GSA for disposal and after many months the GSA offered to sell the property back to the museum for \$300,000. My colleagues have to be aware that they will be seeing this type of situation again and again as the Coast Guard hands these properties to the GSA for disposal.

Fortunately, a group of Michigan historical preservation leaders have formed a group known now today as the Michigan Lighthouse Project which is dedicated to lighthouse preservation and maintenance. I am glad to report that the Coast Guard has been working

hand in hand with the Michigan Lighthouse Project and I applaud their current cooperation and encouragement for their continued involvement.

This amendment states that the Coast Guard shall continue to offer advice and technical assistance to organizations in the Great Lakes region which are dedicated to lighthouse stewardship. Specifically the Coast Guard is urged to promptly release information related to the timing of when a property is going to be excessed by the GSA. That is needed so that organizations can mobilize and be prepared to take action.

Mr. Chairman, I wish that this amendment might be able to go further, but I know that we are going to have some discussions when this bill goes to conference. It is my hope that this body will accept this amendment so that not only the Coast Guard but GSA and other Federal agencies will create a fairer and equitable Federal disposal process that in fact recognizes the historic nature of lighthouses and their wonderful contribution to Great Lakes history.

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, we have examined this and we are pleased to accept this amendment on our side.

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

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. Lighthouses are a matter of particular interest and importance to this Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The very first public works authorized by the very first Congress was done by the predecessor of our today Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure when that Rivers and Harbors Committee authorized the Fort Henry Lighthouse in 1790. Lighthouses have been a critical part of our navigation system in America not only for waterborne navigation but also from the mid 1920s to the mid 1930s, the Lighthouse Service provided the first navigational guide, aids to aviation navigation on land for air-borne transportation.

□ 1430

It was the first nighttime guidance system provided by the lighthouse service to aviation.

For those and for so many other reasons lighthouses have such a fascination for the American public, a point of nostalgia. They are national treasures. They are linked to our maritime heritage. They are landmarks for travel and tourism, and where abandoned and replaced by our modern aids to navigation, lighthouses serve a multitude of purposes including benefits to local economy.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The time of the gentleman

from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has expired.

(On request of Mr. OBERSTAR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. UPTON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, in my own congressional district the City of Two Harbors lighthouse along the north shore of Lake Superior in the Coast Guard Authorization Act last year was conveyed to the local Two Harbors and Lake County Historical Society which will be responsible for the upkeep of the facility while the Coast Guard maintains the light itself, and soon we are going to have a major bicycling event along the north shore from Duluth to another historic landmark, the Split Rock Lighthouse when we, hopefully this summer, convene the Split Rock century, arrived from Duluth to Split Rock and back.

Lighthouses serve many, many purposes. The gentleman's amendment will give the Coast Guard the authority it needs to further the conveyance of lighthouses to non-profit organizations that will have the resources, and the will and the desire to preserve these national treasures, and I compliment the gentleman from Michigan on this amendment.

Mr. UPTON. Just to finish up my time, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's support. I know that it has been there from the very onset, and we worked in a very strong bipartisan basis to make sure this was done, and as I live along the Great Lakes in St. Joseph, Michigan, and I think about all the harbors all the way up to Mackinaw and Lake Superior, these are needed, they are very precious, and this amendment, I think, will really help to preserve those in the future.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. UPTON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. UPTON. But as I think about all these lighthouses in so many different ports throughout the Great Lakes, Mr. Chairman, they are something that needs to be preserved, and we think about, too, the safety of all those boaters. Whether one sails across Lake Michigan at night, or Lake Superior, Lake Erie, Lake Huron, they are important, and they stand as a beacon for every community in terms of historical significance, and I appreciate the gentleman's support and also that of my Michigan colleagues that were instrumental in getting this amendment adopted.

Mr. Chairman, again I appreciate the help of the full committee here in helping me prepare the amendment and the time this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6(f) of rule XVIII, the recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), if ordered, will be a 5-minute vote.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SHUSTER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding we are rolling votes, and I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) wants to move to strike the last word. Are we not rolling votes now?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair was not aware of additional debate. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania may strike the last word.

Mr. SHUSTER. Except the gentleman wants to move to strike the last word I believe.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes prior to conducting the recorded vote.

There was no objection.

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

I want to stand in support of this legislation particularly because the managers saw fit to include a provision of mine which exempts the vessel, *The Pride Of Many*, from Section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. It is popularly referred to as the Jones Act. As my colleagues know, the Jones Act prevents all foreign-built vessels from participating in domestic, coastal and intercoastal trade.

In 1975 the Youth Services Agency of Pennsylvania was established. This is a not-for-profit agency, and it runs four alternative community-based high schools for at-risk youth. The students who are referred to the agency either by their home high school after having established a pattern of negative behavior or by court order. The mission of the agency is to expose at-risk youth to a variety of activities and opportunities in an effort to help these students overcome social and/or personal hindrances so that they can achieve their full emotional, physical, intellectual and spiritual potential.

In an effort to provide the 500 students in this program with a sense of accomplishment, self worth and the need for self-discipline, they are being taught how to man a Canadian-manufactured tall ship similar to the famous *Niña*, *Pinta* and the *Santa María* which they christened *The Pride Of Many*.

Additionally, the vessel will assist in the youths' involvement in port-to-port community service activities. Not only will the nearby communities benefit from their efforts, but it will also

contribute to the youths' realization of the importance of community.

In order to assure that the goals of the Youth Services Agency of Pennsylvania are realized, *The Pride Of Many* needs to be allowed to participate in commercial activities that will offset the expense of the vessel.

Mr. Chairman, the Youth Service Agency of Pennsylvania has already provided many tangible benefits for the local community and its students, and I know that *The Pride Of Many* will help continue their effort of good work. I ask all Members of the House join with me in support of this legislation.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) on which a recorded vote was ordered.

This will be a 15-minute vote and will be followed by a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 428, noes 0, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

AYES—428

Abercrombie	Cardin	Ewing
Ackerman	Carson	Farr
Aderholt	Castle	Fattah
Allen	Chabot	Filner
Andrews	Chambliss	Fletcher
Archer	Chenoweth	Foley
Armey	Clay	Forbes
Bachus	Clayton	Ford
Baird	Clement	Fossella
Baker	Clyburn	Fowler
Baldacci	Coble	Frank (MA)
Baldwin	Coburn	Franks (NJ)
Ballenger	Collins	Frelinghuysen
Barcia	Combest	Frost
Barr	Condit	Gallegly
Barrett (NE)	Conyers	Ganske
Barrett (WI)	Cook	Gedjenson
Bartlett	Cooksey	Gekas
Barton	Costello	Gephardt
Bass	Cox	Gibbons
Bateman	Coyne	Gilchrest
Becerra	Cramer	Gillmor
Bentsen	Crane	Gilman
Bereuter	Crowley	Gonzalez
Berkley	Cubin	Goode
Berman	Cummings	Goodlatte
Berry	Cunningham	Goodling
Biggert	Danner	Gordon
Billbray	Davis (FL)	Goss
Bilirakis	Davis (IL)	Graham
Bishop	Davis (VA)	Granger
Blagojevich	Deal	Green (TX)
Bliley	DeFazio	Green (WI)
Blumenauer	DeGette	Greenwood
Blunt	Delahunt	Gutierrez
Boehlert	DeLauro	Gutknecht
Boehner	DeLay	Hall (OH)
Bonilla	DeMint	Hall (TX)
Bonior	Deutsch	Hansen
Bono	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (FL)
Borski	Dickey	Hastings (WA)
Boswell	Dicks	Hayes
Boucher	Dingell	Hayworth
Boyd	Dixon	Hefley
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Herger
Brady (TX)	Dooley	Hill (IN)
Brown (CA)	Doolittle	Hill (MT)
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Hilleary
Brown (OH)	Dreier	Hilliard
Bryant	Duncan	Hinchey
Burr	Dunn	Hinojosa
Burton	Edwards	Hobson
Buyer	Ehlers	Hoefel
Callahan	Ehrlich	Hoekstra
Calvert	Emerson	Holden
Camp	Engel	Holt
Campbell	English	Hooley
Canady	Eshoo	Horn
Cannon	Etheridge	Hostettler
Capps	Evans	Houghton
Capuano	Everett	Hoyer

Hulshof Miller (FL)
 Hunter Miller, Gary
 Hutchinson Miller, George
 Inslee Minge
 Isakson Mink
 Istook Moakley
 Jackson (IL) Mollohan
 Jackson-Lee Moore
 (TX) Moran (KS)
 Jefferson Moran (VA)
 Jenkins Morella
 John Murtha
 Johnson (CT) Nadler
 Johnson, E. B. Napolitano
 Johnson, Sam Neal
 Jones (NC) Nethercutt
 Jones (OH) Ney
 Kanjorski Northup
 Kaptur Norwood
 Kasich Nussle
 Kelly Oberstar
 Kennedy Obey
 Kildee Olver
 Kilpatrick Ortiz
 Kind (WI) Ose
 King (NY) Owens
 Kingston Oxley
 Kleczka Packard
 Klink Pallone
 Knollenberg Pascrell
 Kolbe Pastor
 Kucinich Paul
 Kuykendall Payne
 LaFalce Pease
 LaHood Pelosi
 Lampson Peterson (MN)
 Lantos Peterson (PA)
 Larson Petri
 Latham Phelps
 LaTourette Pickering
 Lazio Pickett
 Leach Pombo
 Lee Pomeroy
 Levin Porter
 Lewis (CA) Portman
 Lewis (GA) Price (NC)
 Lewis (KY) Pryce (OH)
 Linder Quinn
 Lipinski Radanovich
 LoBiondo Rahall
 Lofgren Ramstad
 Lowey Rangel
 Lucas (KY) Regula
 Lucas (OK) Reyes
 Luther Reynolds
 Maloney (CT) Riley
 Maloney (NY) Rivers
 Manzullo Rodriguez
 Markey Roemer
 Martinez Rogan
 Mascara Rogers
 Matsui Rohrabacher
 McCarthy (MO) Ros-Lehtinen
 McCarthy (NY) Rothman
 McCollum Roukema
 McCrery Roybal-Allard
 McDermott Royce
 McGovern Rush
 McHugh Ryan (WI)
 McInnis Ryan (KS)
 McIntosh Sabo
 McIntyre Salmon
 McKeon Sanchez
 McKinney Sanders
 McNulty Sandlin
 Meehan Sanford
 Meek (FL) Sawyer
 Meeks (NY) Saxton
 Menendez Scarborough
 Metcalf Schaffer
 Mica Schakowsky
 Millender- Scott
 McDonald Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—5

Hyde Myrick
 Largent Pitts

□ 1455

So, the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOBIONDO

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 4, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

AYES—424

Abercrombie Conyers
 Ackerman Green (TX)
 Aderholt Cooksey
 Allen Greenwood
 Andrews Costello
 Archer Cox
 Army Cramer
 Bachus Crane
 Baird Crowley
 Baker Cubin
 Baldacci Cummings
 Baldwin Cunningham
 Ballenger Danner
 Barcia Davis (FL)
 Barr Davis (IL)
 Barrett (NE) Davis (VA)
 Barrett (WI) Deal
 Bartlett DeFazio
 Barton DeGette
 Bass Delahunt
 Bateman DeLauro
 Becerra DeLay
 Bentsen DeMint
 Bereuter Deutsch
 Berkley Diaz-Balart
 Berman Dickey
 Berry Dicks
 Biggert Dingell
 Bilbray Dixon
 Bilirakis Doggett
 Bishop Dooley
 Blagojevich Doolittle
 Bileyle Doyle
 Blumenauer Dreier
 Blunt Duncan
 Boehlert Dunn
 Boehner Edwards
 Bonilla Ehlers
 Bonior Ehrlich
 Bono Emerson
 Borski Engel
 Boswell English
 Boucher Eshoo
 Boyd Etheridge
 Brady (PA) Evans
 Brady (TX) Everett
 Brown (CA) Ewing
 Brown (FL) Farr
 Brown (OH) Fattah
 Bryant Filner
 Burr Fletcher
 Burton Foley
 Buyer Forbes
 Callahan Ford
 Calvert Fossella
 Camp Fowler
 Campbell Frank (MA)
 Canady Franks (NJ)
 Cannon Frelinghuysen
 Capps Frost
 Capuano Gallegly
 Cardin Ganske
 Carson Gejdenson
 Castle Gekas
 Chabot Gephardt
 Chambliss Gibbons
 Chenoweth Gilchrest
 Clay Gillmor
 Clayton Gilman
 Clement Gonzalez
 Clyburn Goode
 Coble Goodlatte
 Coburn Goodling
 Collins Gordon
 Combest Goss
 Condit Graham

Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Lucas (KY)
 Lucas (OK)
 Luther
 Maloney (CT)
 Maloney (NY)
 Manzullo
 Markey
 Martinez
 Mascara
 Matsui
 McCarthy (MO)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McCrery
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHugh
 McInnis
 McIntosh
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Menendez
 Metcalf
 Mica
 Millender-
 McDonald
 Miller (FL)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Minge
 Mink
 Moakley
 Mollohan
 Moore
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Morella
 Murtha
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherman
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shows
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sisisky
 Skeen
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Slaughter
 Souder
 Spence
 Spratt
 Stabenow
 Stark
 Stearns
 Stenholm
 Strickland
 Stump
 Sununu
 Sweeney
 Taler
 Tancred
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Tauzin
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Thune
 Thurman
 Tiahrt
 Tierney
 Toomey
 Towns
 Traficant
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Velazquez
 Vento
 Visclosky
 Walden
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Waters
 Watkins
 Watt (NC)
 Watts (OK)
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Wexler
 Weygand
 Wicker
 Wilson
 Wise
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

NOES—4

Paul Sanford
 Royce Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—5

Houghton Myrick
 Largent Pitts

□ 1507

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. HEFLEY, Chairman pro tempore 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. 820) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 113, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for a recorded vote on the question of passage of H.R. 975.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 7, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

AYES—424

Abercrombie	Brady (PA)	Davis (FL)
Ackerman	Brady (TX)	Davis (IL)
Aderholt	Brown (CA)	Davis (VA)
Allen	Brown (FL)	Deal
Andrews	Brown (OH)	DeFazio
Archer	Bryant	DeGette
Armey	Burr	Delahunt
Bachus	Burton	DeLauro
Baird	Buyer	DeLay
Baker	Callahan	DeMint
Baldacci	Calvert	Deutsch
Baldwin	Camp	Diaz-Balart
Ballenger	Campbell	Dickey
Barcia	Canady	Dicks
Barr	Cannon	Dingell
Barrett (NE)	Capps	Dixon
Barrett (WI)	Capuano	Doggett
Bartlett	Cardin	Dooley
Barton	Carson	Doyle
Bass	Castle	Dreier
Bateman	Chabot	Duncan
Becerra	Chambliss	Dunn
Bentsen	Clay	Edwards
Bereuter	Clayton	Ehlers
Berkley	Clement	Ehrlich
Berman	Clyburn	Emerson
Berry	Coble	Engel
Biggert	Coburn	English
Bilbray	Collins	Eshoo
Bilirakis	Combest	Etheridge
Bishop	Condit	Evans
Blagojevich	Conyers	Everett
Bliley	Cook	Ewing
Blumenauer	Cooksey	Farr
Blunt	Costello	Fattah
Boehlert	Cox	Filner
Boehner	Coyne	Fletcher
Bonilla	Cramer	Foley
Bonior	Crane	Forbes
Bono	Crowley	Ford
Borski	Cubin	Fossella
Boswell	Cummings	Fowler
Boucher	Cunningham	Frank (MA)
Boyd	Danner	Franks (NJ)

Frelinghuysen	Linder	Roukema
Frost	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Galleghy	LoBiondo	Rush
Ganske	Lofgren	Ryan (WI)
Gejdenson	Lowey	Ryun (KS)
Gekas	Lucas (KY)	Sabo
Gephardt	Lucas (OK)	Salmon
Gibbons	Luther	Sanchez
Gilchrest	Maloney (CT)	Sanders
Gillmor	Maloney (NY)	Sandlin
Gillman	Manzullo	Sawyer
Gonzalez	Markey	Saxton
Goode	Martinez	Scarborough
Goodlatte	Mascara	Schaffer
Goodling	Matsui	Schakowsky
Gordon	McCarthy (MO)	Scott
Goss	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Graham	McCollum	Sessions
Granger	McCrery	Shadegg
Green (TX)	McDermott	Shaw
Green (WI)	McGovern	Shays
Greenwood	McHugh	Sherman
Gutierrez	McInnis	Sherwood
Gutknecht	McIntosh	Shimkus
Hall (OH)	McIntyre	Shows
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Shuster
Hansen	McKinney	Simpson
Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Sisisky
Hastings (WA)	Meehan	Skeen
Hayes	Meek (FL)	Skelton
Hayworth	Meeks (NY)	Slaughter
Hefley	Menendez	Smith (MI)
Herger	Metcalfe	Smith (NJ)
Hill (IN)	Mica	Smith (TX)
Hill (MT)	Millender-McDonald	Smith (WA)
Hilleary	Miller (FL)	Snyder
Hilliard	Miller, Gary	Souder
Hinchey	Miller, George	Spence
Hinojosa	Minge	Spratt
Hobson	Mink	Stabenow
Hoeffel	Moakley	Stark
Hoekstra	Mollohan	Stearns
Holden	Moore	Stenholm
Holt	Moran (KS)	Strickland
Hooley	Moran (VA)	Stump
Horn	Morella	Stupak
Hostettler	Murtha	Sununu
Houghton	Nadler	Sweeney
Hoyer	Napolitano	Talent
Hulshof	Neal	Tancredo
Hunter	Nethercutt	Tanner
Hutchinson	Ney	Tauscher
Hyde	Northup	Tauzin
Inlee	Norwood	Taylor (MS)
Isakson	Nussle	Taylor (NC)
Istook	Oberstar	Terry
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Thomas
Jackson-Lee	Olver	Thompson (CA)
(TX)	Ortiz	Thompson (MS)
Jefferson	Ose	Thornberry
Jenkins	Owens	Thune
John	Oxley	Thurman
Johnson (CT)	Packard	Tiahrt
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Tierney
Johnson, Sam	Pascarell	Toomey
Jones (NC)	Pastor	Towns
Jones (OH)	Payne	Trafigant
Kanjorski	Pease	Turner
Kaptur	Pelosi	Udall (CO)
Kasich	Peterson (MN)	Udall (NM)
Kelly	Peterson (PA)	Upton
Kennedy	Petri	Velazquez
Kildee	Phelps	Vento
Kilpatrick	Pickering	Visclosky
Kind (WI)	Pickett	Walden
King (NY)	Pomeroy	Walsh
Kingston	Porter	Wamp
Klecza	Portman	Waters
Klink	Price (NC)	Watkins
Knollenberg	Pryce (OH)	Watt (NC)
Kolbe	Quinn	Watts (OK)
Kucinich	Radanovich	Waxman
Kuykendall	Rahall	Weiner
LaFalce	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
LaHood	Rangel	Weldon (PA)
Lampson	Regula	Weller
Lantos	Reyes	Wexler
Largent	Reynolds	Weygand
Larson	Riley	Whitfield
Latham	Rivers	Wicker
LaTourette	Rodriguez	Wilson
Lazio	Roemer	Wise
Leach	Rogan	Wolf
Lee	Rogers	Woolsey
Levin	Rohrabacher	Wu
Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Wynn
Lewis (GA)	Rothman	Young (AK)
Lewis (KY)		Young (FL)

NOES—7

Chenoweth	Pombo	Sensenbrenner
Doolittle	Royce	
Paul	Sanford	

NOT VOTING—2

Myrick Pitts

□ 1525

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. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 820, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 820, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 820, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section number, and cross-referencing.

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

There was no objection.

REDUCING VOLUME OF STEEL IMPORTS AND ESTABLISHING STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of the passage of the bill, H.R. 975, on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill 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 289, nays 141, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—289

Abercrombie	Bentsen	Brown (CA)
Ackerman	Berkley	Brown (FL)
Aderholt	Berry	Brown (OH)
Allen	Bilirakis	Bryant
Andrews	Bishop	Burton
Bachus	Blagojevich	Buyer
Baird	Blumenauer	Callahan
Baldacci	Boehlert	Cannon
Baldwin	Bonior	Capps
Barcia	Borski	Capuano
Barr	Boswell	Cardin
Barrett (WI)	Boucher	Carson
Bartlett	Boyd	Chenoweth
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Clay