analysis to Congress on expanding these capabilities in other Coast Guard and Department of Homeland Security vessels and units.

As part of this analysis, my amendment would encourage DHS to give priority to expanding mobile biometric collection capabilities to assets and areas that are most likely to encounter illegal border crossings in the maritime environment.

□ 1230

The efforts of the Coast Guard in this area show great promise. Since the collection of limited biometrics on individuals interdicted at sea began, the Coast Guard has collected biometric data from 1,513 migrants resulting in nearly 300 matches against databases of wanted criminals, immigration violators, and others who have previously encountered government authorities. Instead of being released to repeat their dangerous and illegal behavior, these individuals are now detained and prosecuted.

The U.S. Attorney's Office in San Juan, Puerto Rico, has prosecuted more than 118 individuals for violations of U.S. laws, immigration laws, and other offenses based substantially on information obtained through the biometrics program.

The Coast Guard reports that illegal migration in the Mona Pass area, an area between the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico, has been reduced by 50 percent in the past year as a direct result of the biometrics program.

By leveraging its relationships within DHS, the Coast Guard now has access to millions of fingerprint files it can use to positively identify individuals encountered at sea, those who are without identification and are suspected of attempting an illegality and illegally entering the United States. Now that the Coast Guard has determined the most effective way to collect biometrics at sea, the Department of Homeland Security needs to determine the most appropriate way to move forward and expand this effort as cost effectively as possible, which is what my amendment requires.

Given the success of existing efforts on biometrics by the Coast Guard, I believe it is imperative that we strengthen section 708 of the underlying bill on clarifying congressional intent in this area so that these efforts are cost effective and will do the most good. It is clear the collection of biometrics at sea by the Coast Guard is already helping greatly deter illegal migration and prevent the capture and release of dangerous individuals.

I urge the distinguished Members of this House to help further that effort by voting for this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I do support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Florida with whose father I had the pleasure to serve, a person of great personal distinction who served this body very well and with whom I had a delightful personal relationship. And I always appreciated that friendship.

I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment which requires biometric identification of suspected persons, including terrorists, to strengthen border security. Fingerprinting, digital photos, and other technology can be used to identify illegal migrants, smugglers, and terrorists. It will be useful in establishing a database.

It parallels what we do in the TSA for aviation security and in other areas of security. It will be a valuable asset in the ongoing struggle against terrorism, and I appreciate the gentleman offering the amendment.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I want to congratulate Mr. BILIRAKIS on this amendment, and we all had the privilege of serving with his dad, Mike, and he's a ''Gus'' off the old block, and he's doing a fine job not only in this amendment but also the Waterway Watch program.

We're prepared to accept the amendment. The Coast Guard has operated a pilot program in Mona Pass, Puerto Rico. It has been extremely successful. We're aware that the Coast Guard intends to expand the program in the Caribbean Basin to make it a permanent program. His amendment would accomplish these goals.

For that reason, I support the amendment and congratulate Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman THOMPSON and also thank Ranking Member KING for supporting this good bill and my amendment. Thank you very much.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to close on our side to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chairman, this amendment merely, simply stated, makes sense. It amends section 708 to require the creation of a program that will enable the Coast Guard to test the use of biometrics technology to identify individuals intercepted by the service. I have actually seen this procedure and have seen this biometric equipment in operation. This allows us to use our resources, our limited resources that the Coast Guard has, in an efficient and effective manner; and it also will allow us to be able to learn exactly who these terrorists might be and get identification information on them immediately.

And so I want to thank the gentleman for providing us with this amendment, which makes our bill better.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I also want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR for the kind words and Mr. LATOURETTE, my good friend. This is a great amendment. Thanks for your cooperation. I appreciate it.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California) having assumed the chair, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2830) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. HOLDEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2903) to amend Public Law 110–196 to provide for a temporary extension of programs authorized by the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 beyond April 25, 2008, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I rise in support of the temporary farm bill extension. It will extend the provisions of the 2002 farm bill an additional week to give our committee more time to finish the farm bill.

We continue to work towards an agreement on this very complex piece of legislation. While there is a significant amount of work that has been accomplished, there is more that remains to be done. And the House and Senate conferees have been meeting this week and continue to meet. The staff has worked diligently to bring this bill together.

The farm bill is a critical piece of legislation for this country. It's the commodity title, it's the social attrition problems, conservation, rural development and a variety of other things. It is something that must be accomplished and we on the Agriculture Committee, Congressman HOLDEN and myself, take very seriously as we work in that direction.

Mr. HOLDEN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOLDEN. Madam Speaker, I agree with my friend from Oklahoma. This legislation is desperately needed in rural America and in agriculture country. The conferees are making progress, but Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member GOODLATTE are not on the floor right now because they are in meetings with the Ways and Means

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

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

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

There was no objection.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 2903

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

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

□ 1240

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

At the end of title VII add the following:

SEC. 708. REVIEW OF LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS FACILITIES.

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1245

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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