African American woman elected to the California State Senate, where I served for 20 years.

□ 1115

I was further privileged to serve as a United States Ambassador to the Federated States of Micronesia under President William Clinton.

But through all these incredible endeavors, I never dreamed that this walk would direct me in the footsteps of my dear friend, the late esteemed Julian Dixon.

As my Congressman, Julian was both admired and respected. He was respected by his constituents, by his colleagues, and mostly by myself. As public servants for our communities, we worked together to bring resources back to the people of the 32nd Congressional District. We both approached our duties with the zealousness and dedication expected of us today by those who we so diligently served.

Now, I have been given the supreme honor to carry on and add to Julian's legacy, and address those issues deemed important to our community: solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund, affordable prescription drugs, significant meaningful education reform for our children. These are the issues on which I ran, and these are the issues that my constituents asked me to champion as their representative in Congress.

I am sure today that Julian smiles upon all of us because his legacy indeed will live on. I thank him for his distinguished years of service, and thank him, too, for his dedication as a champion of the people. I thank him most of all for his lifetime friendship.

I commit myself today to reach the highest standards of public service. I will strive to be a Representative who will serve her district by engaging in relevant policy debates and providing strong constituent services. To Mr. Dixon and to the constituents of the 32nd Congressional District I pledge my commitment and my dedication to the greater good.

Finally, I shall take my place with honor in this most prestigious body in the gentleman's memory, and I would like to rise to the level of respect that he carried with him.

The great State of California stands as a shining example of the diversity that makes this Nation so great. In light of the recent consensus results, California is now a minority majority State. Our Democratic delegation reflects the parity that is synonymous with diversity. Upon this, my swearing in, as was mentioned, I became the 16th woman, along with 16 men, that make up our delegation. We have finally reached parity, and act as a model for the rest of this country.

Despite the many obstructions that face California, including our current energy crisis, we possess the ability to be creative and apply practical solutions that work to benefit our State, our Nation, and today's global economy. I look forward to joining all of my colleagues as we tackle these problems.

I stand today with the Democrats and the Republicans and the Independents. I stand with my colleagues in the California delegation. I stand with the Congressional Black Caucus, the Congressional Women's Caucus, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, and challenge all of us to work together towards the greater good of this country, and particularly, our State. Let history judge us not by laws that we pass in these great Chambers, but by the civility with which we pass them. Our best days are yet to come.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, my friends, and supporters for being here with me to have this great honor bestowed upon me. I cannot ever repay them for their support, their commitment, and their dedication.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 155 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. 1699.

□ 1120

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. 1699) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2002, with Mr. MILLER of Florida 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 New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2001. Before I discuss this bill, however, I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), for his time, energy, enthusiasm, and guidance in working out this authorization bill, which sometimes had its moments.

Also, I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), who once again has helped us with crafting a bill on which we have strong bipartisan support, and thank the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), and their staffers for their help and cooperation on this legislation. H.R. 1699 was developed in a bipartisan manner and deserves the support of all Members of this body.

The primary purpose of H.R. 1699, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2001, is to authorize expenditures for the United States Coast Guard for the fiscal year 2002.

Section 2 of the bill authorizes approximately $5.4 billion for Coast Guard programs and operations for the fiscal year 2002. The bill funds the Coast Guard at the levels requested by the President, with an additional $300 million in Coast Guard operating expenses. The amounts authorized by this bill will allow the Coast Guard to address chronic budget shortfalls.

Many of the Coast Guard's most urgent needs are similar to those experienced by the Department of Defense, including spare parts shortages and personnel training deficits. H.R. 1699 addresses those needs, and also increases the amounts available for Coast Guard drug interdiction, something very important for our country.

H.R. 1699 provides $338 million for the Coast Guard's essential deepwater asset modernization program. To date, the Coast Guard has spent $117 million to develop a plan for replacing or modernizing existing deepwater assets. I strongly believe that the Integrated Deepwater System is the most economical and effective way for the Coast Guard to provide future generations of Americans with lifesaving services.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the men and women of the United States Coast Guard for the exceptional services that they provide to our Nation. From the new recruits at the Coast Guard Training Center in Cape May, where I was proud to keynote their 53rd Anniversary celebration last week, to the men and women of the Coast Guard Air Station in Atlantic City and the LORAN Support Unit in Lower Township, I have been impressed by their devotion to duty and their constant readiness to stand watch over our shores. Their efforts are representative of their fellow shipmates all over our Nation.

All Americans benefit from a strong Coast Guard that is equipped to stop drug smugglers, support the country's defense, and respond to national emergencies. Unfortunately, the Coast Guard, like other military services, suffers from readiness problems related to deferred maintenance, aging equipment, and personnel training and retention. We must act to correct these problems and put the Coast Guard on sound financial footing to be ready to respond to increasing demands on Coast Guard resources, especially the need to increase drug interdiction operations.

Mr. Chairman, Coast Guard operations must be made whole next year, ending the destructive cycle of funding shortfalls and end-of-the-year supplemental funding bills, which are only bandaid approaches. The funding provided in this bill will accomplish this

goal. In order for the Coast Guard to continue to live up to its motto, Semper Paratus, always ready, Congress today needs to stand up for the Coast Guard. With today's vote, we will do just that. I urge all Members to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1599. This is a bipartisan bill. I thank the ranking member, the chairman of the Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), for her support, and those people directly involved.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that we are taking action today to authorize the funding for these important programs. H.R. 1699, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2001, authorizes the fiscal year 2002 Coast Guard budget at the level requested by the President, with an additional $300 million, as the gentleman has mentioned.

I, being from Alaska, and my Alaskan constituents have had a love affair with the Coast Guard for as long as we have been a Territory and a State. The first Federal officer that was stationed in Alaska was a Coast Guard employee, a captain.

□ 1130

They are dedicated people. They are committed and they are courageous, especially in search and rescue of our fishing fleet, which is the most dangerous fishing fleet in the world because of the climate conditions.

Just this year, there has been numerous rescue attempts successfully done by the Coast Guard using equipment that is outdated and not properly, very frankly, funded for the fuel that needs to do the mission. They have done so.

This bill does the authorization that we believe will not only fund them adequately, but will increase their deep water capability.

Many of the ships that are used by the Coast Guard in Alaska and other areas of the United States are 50 years old and older. The living conditions of those ships is deplorable, and this Congress has been neglectful. Our President has recognized it, and this Congress has recognized it for the leadership of the chairman. We are now authorizing the funding as it should be.

I have a little comment to make for those that may question the amounts of money. This is long overdue. We hope to have supplemental money in the supplemental appropriation bill for the backlog of $92 million that the Coast Guard was shorted last year.

We have some people in OMB and other areas that have decided to make this an issue, and I will tell them and I will tell my colleagues on this floor, we are going to prevail to make sure our Coast Guard is adequately funded. This bill does that.

We have to recognize the importance of this ability of this unit is really on the front lines all the time. I have great respect for my Army, my Navy. I have great respect for my Marines, my Air Force. But this unit of the Coast Guard is always on the front lines: drug interdiction, oil spill responsibility, immigration, all the things that they are charged with, we have not adequately done our job, and it is up to us to do so.

Again, I want to thank those people that are directly involved in this, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), the chairman of the subcommittee, who has actually mentioned the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) and himself have done the job that I believe is correct for this great agency which serves every man, woman and child.

There is a tendency sometimes to believe that the Coast Guard only serves those on the coast. That is why they call it the Coast Guard. But the fact is it serves every person in the United States inland and along the coast through drug interdiction, illegal immigration, oil spill responsibility. The work that they do affects every man, woman and child in the United States.

So I urge this Congress to, not only to pass this bill, but to pass it overwhelmingly.

At this time, I would also like to compliment numerous people that had amendments. There will be some dialogue between those people. We have kept this a clean bill. There is nothing in here to slow it down like happened last year. We have agreed and reached a compromise with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT). He will be offering an amendment which we will accept. But it is the only amendment because it pertains to Buy America. But the rest of the amendments, and some of them were very well-warranted, we will talk about, we will discuss, and then they will be withdrawn.

I will compliment the wisdom of those Members to keep this bill clean so when it goes over to the Senate, they will not have the opportunity to do what they tried to do last year and put a lot of garbage on the bill that should have been passed.

So I want to congratulate those involved.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1699, the Coast Guard reauthorization Act of 2001. This legislation is vital to the future operation of the United States Coast Guard. Most importantly, H.R. 1699 authorizes an additional $300 million above the President's request for Coast Guard operations. This means more money for law enforcement, drug interdiction, fishery enforcement and migrant interdiction. For the past several years, the Coast Guard has been forced to either decrease operation or transfer money from maintenance to operation.

Each day the men and women of the Coast Guard are putting their lives on the line to save those in distress, stop migrants and immigration, drugs, enforce maritime safety laws, and provide security to our Nation's ports.

The time has come to provide the Coast Guard with the financial resources it needs to successfully carry out its operations. The $300 million in additional funds for operations will help pay for the backlog in maintenance for aircraft, allow the aircraft and cutters that were to be mothballed to continue to operate, and enable all of the Coast Guard's vessels and cutters to operate to their full capacity.

In addition, H.R. 1699 authorized $338 million for the Coast Guard's Deepwater Acquisition Project. The Coast Guard has been a wise guardian of the people's money. They have managed to keep cutters operating that was built in the 1940s. However, it is time to modernize the Coast Guard aircraft and fleet of cutters. I am hopeful that the money authorized will allow the Coast Guard to successfully award the Deepwater contract early in fiscal year 2002.

The bill before us is a clean authorizing bill. It contains no changes to Coast Guard policies or programs. We are hopeful that the Senate will agree with us that it is in the Nation's interest to enact a Coast Guard authorizing bill in time for the Committee on Appropriations to provide the authorizing funds.

Mr. Chairman, failure to enact a bill authorizing appropriations to the Coast Guard is a failure to fulfill our obligations to the American people.

A vote for H.R. 1699 is a vote to provide an extra $300 million to support Coast Guard operations. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 1699, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2001.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and congratulate her on managing on our side the first Coast Guard bill of this session and look forward to her splendid work in the future.

I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), the chairman of the subcommittee, for the professional and thorough way that he has conducted the leadership of the subcommittee on this matter.

I express also my appreciation for the splendid working relationship with our chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG). He is as vigorous an advocate for the Coast Guard as I, virtually a cheerleader for this special color blue uniform that makes such an enormous

contribution to our safety, the safety of our inland waterways, our coastal waterways and of our Deepwater service.

This bill is simply a numbers bill, if I could put it that way. We are trying to make up for failure of the past 2 years in the other body to move a Coast Guard authorization bill. In these past 2 years, this body and this committee has done its job. We have carried out our responsibility to the Coast Guard by bringing to the floor and passing an authorization bill that gives the Coast Guard the full authority to do its work.

But when the bill got over to the other body, there were extraneous issues such as death on the high seas that have nothing to do with the mission of the Coast Guard that bogged the bill down, and we then did not get to an authorization. Now I urge the other body to take this bill and just without amendment, without extraneous matters, move the bill on to the President.

We are authorizing $5.3 billion for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2002. There is $300 million in here for the Coast Guard's operating expenses and for their drug interdiction mission.

Because of the failure to enact a full authorization bill over the past 2 years, the Coast Guard has had to reduce its operations because they have had insufficient funds. This bill gives the Coast Guard the sufficient funding, full operations and maintenance to do its mission. The other body ought to move along. We ought to get this job done.

This bill also addresses the long plan and carefully thought out Deepwater Replacement Project. This will involve replacing every ship and every aircraft that operates more than 50 miles offshore for the U.S. Coast Guard. It is a unique initiative. We have examined it in hearings over the past 2 years and studied the proposals carefully thought out. It ought to go ahead.

Instead of authorizing a specific type of ship built in a specific shipyard, this proposal authorizes a 20-year acquisition program, a performance-based procurement to obtain the very best aircraft and the very best cutters the Coast Guard needs for its mission at the lowest operational cost.

While we are here debating this legislation, it is a typical day for the 35,800 men and women of the U.S. Coast Guard: doing 109 search-and-rescue cases, saving 10 lives, rescuing 192 people in distress, saving $3 million in property, seizing 169 pounds of marijuana, 306 pounds of cocaine worth collectively $10 million. In fact, in some years, the Coast Guard seizes drugs, illegal drugs that have a street value greater than the Coast Guard's appropriated budget.

The Marine safety personnel are conducting safety checks on 100 large vessels, investigating six Marine casualties, responding to 20 oil or hazardous chemical spills, and servicing 135 aids to navigation. That is a very impressive day's work for the men and women in this special color blue.

I stand here in awe of them and in respect of their mission and their contribution to America and urge this body to move quickly on and affirmatively on this legislation.

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, as a person who has been heavily involved in the drug war in Central and South America, I want to speak out in praise of the work of the Coast Guard.

In their effort to reduce the drug flow into the United States, no one has done more and received less recognition than the United States Coast Guard. They work to interdict the fast boats that cover the Caribbean with the flood of drugs and should be commended for the results that they have shown. If other branches of the services were doing a comparable job of fighting this war, we would be in a much stronger position to face the future.

The Coast Guard continues to deliver services without complaint in spite of the shortages of funds provided to them and the difficulties and dangers in their job.

I wish other government participants would demonstrate the same level of commitment to fighting the war on drugs as the U.S. Coast Guard. Today I stand to applaud their efforts and urge this Congress to renew its commitment to this valued service.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

It is my great privilege to represent the part of Washington State that borders on the southern part of our coastline and the Columbia River. I have had the opportunity to join our Coast Guard crewmen as they go out in the motor lifeboat school on one of the most dangerous river bars in the world, the Columbia River Bar. That is why I am so proud today to join with the Chair and the ranking member in supporting this critical authorization bill.

Our Coast Guard Members save American lives every single day, and they deserve our support. They currently operate what would otherwise be one of the oldest navys in the world, and that should not be so. We need to make sure we give them support when they perform their critical life-saving needs when they work on environmental protection, when they enforce our fisheries laws, and when they patrol our coastline for whatever need they may be called upon to serve.

I am proud to join with the members of this committee and urge passage of this critical legislation.

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), a long-time supporter of the Coast Guard, who is the very shy, reserved, quiet chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, as a former chairman of the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard and Marine Transportation, I want to admit a prejudice. I have a huge incredible appreciation and admiration for the work of the young men and women of our United States Coast Guard.

I have seen firsthand incredible sacrifices and the extraordinary valor and courage they exercise every day in saving lives and interdicting drugs and opening up seaways and keeping our waterways safe and keeping the traffic that is critical to international trade in and out of our harbors without collisions and damage and oil spills and all the other things, the incredible number of missions that they perform on a daily basis without a whole lot of thanks and without a whole lot of expectation of reward.

□ 1145

But it is time we recognize something; that the sons and daughters of American citizens, who serve in the United States Coast Guard and who daily save lives and save us from human suffering with their drug interdiction and who save damage and destruction in our harbors as they keep safety in these critical national commerce areas, that these men and women too often work with outdated and outmoded equipment and that their lives are at risk unnecessarily. It is time we put some real resources into upgrading and updating the equipment, the boats and planes and the equipment they use to carry out these extraordinary missions.

I was on a flight one time in a Coast Guard plane whose engine gave out on us, and communication was lost, and I thought we were all gone for a little while. That should never happen to any young man or woman who volunteers for service in the United States Coast Guard. Let us today, in this vote, declare with a ringing sense of appreciation the gratitude of the American people through this Congress for the extraordinary sacrifice and service of the young men and women of our United States Coast Guard. And let us dedicate ourselves to making sure that as they save lives, as they perform the incredibly important missions we have assigned to them, that we make their lives as sacred as the lives they are saving, that we protect them with better equipment and better boats and better planes.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly urge the passage of this bill.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Committee on

Transportation and Infrastructure, both the chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the ranking member of the subcommittee, for bringing this bill forward. And I am glad to follow my colleague, who is chair of the House Committee on Commerce, because I served with him in my first term in Congress on the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation when we had a Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I rise in support of the authorization that recognizes the United States Coast Guard and provides the necessary funding so that our waterways will continue to be the safest in the world. And I would like to speak briefly about the impact the Coast Guard has on not only Houston but also on the Port of Houston that I am honored to represent.

The Houston-Galveston Vessel Traffic Service, the VTS, is located in Galena Park, Texas. That Coast Guard facility plays a key role in maintaining maritime safety and efficiency in the Houston-Galveston region, which includes the Port of Houston.

The Port of Houston represents the largest petrochemical port in the United States. It has the largest volume of foreign tonnage of all U.S. ports and the second largest in combined tonnage and serves over 7,000 vessels a year. Acting as a communications hub, our VTS accomplishes its mission by providing accurate, relevant, and timely information to mariners, port authorities, facility operators, and local, State, and Federal agencies. This information prevents vessel collisions, groundings, and consequently reduces the loss of life, property, as well as environmental damage associated with these incidents.

We basically have an industrial port. Our VTS information also enables waterway managers, mariners, and advisory groups to better understand the port's waterway systems and to make improvements to vessel routing and safety.

Our area is also served by a Coast Guard Marine Safety Office that protects the lives and the properties of all of us that enjoy and benefit from not only our industrial port but the boating public. I congratulate our local commander, Peter S. Simons, and the 48 men and women under his command for their excellent job and performance.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage passage of this bill.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time and for his leadership on this matter, as well as the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I am fortunate enough to represent Staten Island and the Port of Brooklyn, that portion which is the gateway to the Port of New York and New Jersey, one of the largest most active ports in the entire world. I am also privileged to represent one of the largest Coast Guard operations. Indeed, Activities New York is the largest operational field command in the Coast Guard. Its responsibility stretches from Long Branch, New Jersey to New York City, up to the Hudson River to Burlington, Vermont.

I have come to appreciate over the last several years, and we have heard it here but let me add my voice to the chorus of those commending the dedication and the commitment and truly the love and honor of their job, the men and women serving in the United States Coast Guard. We have heard about the law enforcement. Indeed, they are saving kids, they are preventing drugs from hitting our streets. When it comes to the environment, just last year we had an oil spill off the shores of Staten Island. There was the potential to damaging our beaches at a critical time of the year. The Coast Guard, without hesitation, was on that scene and curtailed what could have been a big problem. So they are out there protecting the environment.

Above all, they need resources to do the job that they do so well every single day. So I commend all the Members who have shown a true passion to supporting the Coast Guard because they are out there for us. They do this job without real call for attention, without the desire to be heard. They do it for us, they do it for America, and I think it is wonderful that we are finally taking a moment, this Congress, to say we appreciate the job you are doing; we are going to give you the tools you need to do the job you do so well.

Mr. Chairman, when men and women willingly and with honor serve our country, I think without a moment's hesitation we should respond in kind. And so I add my voice to the chorus of those who truly appreciate what the Coast Guard does.

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

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from the great State of Minnesota for yielding, and I rise to commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) for their bipartisan work on this bill.

I also rise to express my support for the Coast Guard Authorization Act and commend the chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), for reporting to the full House a balanced and bipartisan measure to meet the requirements of the United States Coast Guard in providing for a wide variety of maritime activities throughout the broad scope of law enforcement, humanitarian, and emergency response duties.

I also commend the committee for working in a bipartisan manner to increase funding in the bill by $300 million above the President's request to ensure that the Coast Guard can continue to operate in a complex and dangerous maritime environment characterized by rapidly changing security threats at home and also abroad.

The Coast Guard's counter-drug missions are critical to achieving the national drug control strategy goals: to detect, disrupt, deter, and seize illegal drugs that kill 15,000 Americans and cost the public more than $110 billion each and every year. In fiscal year 1999, alone, the Coast Guard interdicted more than 111,000 pounds of cocaine, keeping some 500 million so-called hits with a value of $4 billion off America's streets and out of our schools.

However, even more needs to be done. I recently returned from Cuba, an area of significant concern to the United States in the war against drugs. Despite our best efforts, including record drug seizures, Cuba remains a transit point for trafficking between Central and South America and Europe and North America. Moreover, only one drug interdiction specialist is assigned to our interest section in Havana. Certainly it could benefit from more manpower, more surveillance for equipment, and more cutters.

While providing for this first drug interdiction specialist is an important milestone, clearly a lone Coast Guard official in Havana does not provide a strong and sustained presence in the region to make a difference in our war on drugs. Therefore, I would encourage the committee to direct at least a small portion of the $300 million plus-up approved by the committee to additional drug interdiction around this area of the Caribbean. I am confident, based on what I witnessed in Cuba, that the United States would be making a sound investment by bolstering our presence in the region and working toward mitigating Cuba as a transit point and a gateway for the influx of illicit and dangerous narcotics imported in ever-expanding amounts into the United States.

I am hopeful that the committee will address this matter in conference in the years ahead, and I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me the time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the work of the gentleman from Indiana. He has again demonstrated once more his genuine concern in international affairs and hemispheric affairs, and I greatly appreciate his interest in Cuba and the role that Cuba and the United

States together can play in drug interdiction. He has certainly made a valiant effort in this regard. I greatly respect his mission to Havana just recently.

The committee has worked for years on this problem, and what we have found is that when the Coast Guard or any of our drug interdiction entities in the Federal Government clamp down in transit zones, say in the Caribbean, drugs pop up on the West Coast. When we move assets to the West Coast, they move back to the Caribbean or elsewhere. It is a very delicate balancing act.

The Defense Department is also rethinking their role in the counter-drug mission. The Coast Guard now has law enforcement detachments on U.S. Navy vessels working in the Caribbean and off the west coast, which have been of great value to our war on drugs, and we have come to see the drug interdiction effort as a national security measure for the United States.

So the question of where to deploy these assets and how to balance them between the Caribbean, the west coast, the east coast and, frankly, the U.S.-Canadian border, which my district borders on and is becoming an entry point for drugs, is a very delicate matter.

We will continue our efforts to provide the Coast Guard with the resources they need in high-endurance aircraft, high-endurance cutters, additional personnel to participate in the already highly successful interdiction effort of the Coast Guard on drug smuggling efforts, and I will certainly bring to the attention of the Coast Guard the gentleman's recommendation for additional personnel in the Havana office.

We look forward to working with the gentleman as we proceed not only with this bill but with the regular authorization bill when further policy issues will be addressed, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), the former chair of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation, a Member of this body whose name is synonymous with support of the Coast Guard over the years. We affectionately refer to him as the Master Chief. He has been to my district, the second district of New Jersey, with me, to visit the Coast Guard Recruit Training Center. But more importantly he trained there, so he knows it very well.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his generous introduction, although unfortunately I was never Master Chief, but I like to claim that honor.

Mr. Chairman, I want to put a different face on this, because we have heard sterling comments in praise of America's oldest continuing seagoing service. I want to put a different face to it.

A man once said to me, he said, ''The Coast Guard is the invisible service. Never hear about them.'' Well, we never hear about the Coast Guard unless we happen to be in distress and we need to be rescued by professionals. I spoke to a man who was once rescued, I spoke to him moments after the rescue, and he said to me, ''That Coast Guard cutter looked like an angel of mercy coming to me,'' and then he began to weep softly. They are indeed angels of mercy. The Coast Guard cutters, the Coast Guard aircraft, what they do is legendary; but it is oftentimes invisible.

I have gone to Memorial Day and Veterans Day services across the land. My good friend, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), said we appreciate all of the services, Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines. Those four will be recognized; the Coast Guard inevitably will be omitted. I went to a Veterans Day service back home in my district 4, 5, 6 years ago, and sure enough the inevitable happened, the four services were recognized by the playing of their respective hymns, but nothing about the Coast Guard.

□ 1200

Mr. Chairman, I went to the music director of the school that day. I asked about the omission. She said, I do not have the music. I said, It is the most beautiful marching hymn of the services. Now, I am not completely objective about that, Mr. Chairman.

She said, Get me the music; and I did.

The next year, the Coast Guard hymn was the first one played. She came to me and she said, Are you satisfied? I said, Yes, indeed.

But oftentimes folks do not recognize that the Coast Guard is one of our five armed services. Years ago the Coast Guard was the beneficiary of Navy hand-me-downs. I am not putting down the Navy for this. We were glad to get them and made the best of what we had. Now it is a little better. We still get hand-me-downs, but part of the problem from years gone by, many of the Coast Guard spokespersons would come up here and say, We can get along with $5 million; we do not need $99 million.

Mr. Chairman, the other services were waiting to take that overflow. Now I think that attitude has changed. The Coast Guard comes up here more aggressively, not to embellish their budgetary needs, but to make it clear, matter of factly, what is needed to keep those search-and-rescue missions going, and to keep those drug interdiction raids successfully executed.

I want the American people to recognize, and many do not, and it is not their fault because oftentimes the Coast Guard is omitted, we need to be aware that there are five armed services in this country; and the Coast Guard is equally important, as are the other four.

The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) have addressed this issue well. They have said this is a service whose time has come to be fully and openly recognized as a vital cog in the armed services wheel. I commend those who have brought the bill to the floor today; and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his generous introduction.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, on December 11, 1998, a great tragedy occurred on Lake Michigan. The fishing vessel *Linda E.* and her crew of three were out working hard, pulling in fish off Port Washington, Wisconsin.

The *Linda E.* never came home. After 18 months of wondering and worrying, the *Linda E.* was located in 260 feet of water at the bottom of Lake Michigan. A Coast Guard investigation determined that the vessel was struck by an integrated tug/barge. The accident resulted in three unnecessary deaths and one of the crew members of the barge losing his license.

There are two specific issues that relate to this tragedy and other tragedies like it that I would like to work with the subcommittee and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), the chairman, on. First, this accident could have been prevented if the barge had been required to have a collision-avoidance radar detection system on board. Unfortunately, it did not.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to work with the subcommittee to further explore the issue of requiring vessels of this size operating on the Great Lakes to install some collision-avoidance technology.

Second, while the Coast Guard followed all of the procedures required under law with respect to the investigation of the *Linda E.*, I, along with the family members of the *Linda E.* crew, would like to explore ways to clarify the investigation and recovery process. We would hope to work closely with both the Coast Guard and the subcommittee on this matter.

Would the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman, be willing to devote some of the time of the subcommittee to review these matters?

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his continuing interest on this very important issue. The sinking of the *Linda E.* was a terrible tragedy. We will be pleased to work with the gentleman to explore his suggestion that collision-avoidance radar be placed on barges operating in the Great Lakes and to look at the issue of Great Lakes maritime safety and response to maritime accidents in general.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his consideration and look forward to working with him to ensure that the safety of all vessels operating on the Great Lakes is of utmost importance.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK).

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Chairman, the goals of the Coast Guard are straightforward: supply maritime safety, provide maritime security, protect our natural resources, facilitate maritime mobility, and support our national defense. Fulfillment of these goals is essential for commerce and the safety of Americans, but they come at a price.

The Coast Guard fleet of ships and aircraft is aging and requires rebuilding. They have implemented a strong recruiting drive that now requires an increased focus on training for new recruits.

The Coast Guard has also taken on increased responsibility in refugee and drug traffic interdiction. These and other new missions require additional funds, and I am glad that we can supply the Coast Guard with the needed resources to meet these tasks.

With over 78 million recreational boaters and over 250,000 maritime workers in the U.S., the Coast Guard's mission of providing maritime safety cannot be neglected. In fiscal year 2000, the Coast Guard saved over 3,000 lives in imminent danger.

A recent rescue success story demonstrates the courage and dedication of the Coast Guard. As an example, a 110-foot tugboat and its three crewmen sent out a distress call in the middle of a blizzard with snow, ice, freezing rain and near subzero visibility in the Chesapeake Bay.

The Coast Guard took a 41-foot utility boat from Coast Guard Station Cape Charles, Virginia, and after a long period of time were able to rescue these people, knowing that their lives could be lost as well.

Mr. Chairman, these guardsmen were not required to dispatch that day, but they did, and they entered the high seas in a boat not equipped to embark on such conditions. This is quite usual for the men and women of the Coast Guard.

When the brave crew of this mission were congratulated for their successful mission, Third Class Boatswain's Mate Scott Palmer modestly said, ''Coasties do this every day.'' And they do.

We cannot let the brave men and women of the Coast Guard go out on obsolete vessels. We must provide them with safe and up-to-date means of transport in negotiating our waterways and shores in order to protect the people who travel these waterways every day.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation we are considering today authorizes $5.4 billion for Coast Guard operations for fiscal year 2002. This represents a sorely needed increase of $1.39 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska and the gentleman from New Jersey for supporting this increase, and urge my colleagues to support this bill which protects our commerce, our national security, and the American people.

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address the tragic issue of carbon monoxide deaths on lakes around the country and in any body of water.

A little under a year ago, two young boys, Dillan and Logan Dixey, ages 8 and 11, died tragically swimming off the swim-step of their houseboat on Lake Powell. That triggered a study that revealed that there have been at least nine deaths on Lake Powell alone, and a total of over 111 injuries on that lake in my State. Following that, there had been a study by NIOSH which has documented at least an additional 30 deaths and 107 injuries.

Mr. Chairman, these deaths are caused by the intake of carbon monoxide, both to people onboard boats and people swimming off the swim platforms of houseboats on various lakes.

It was my intention to offer an amendment today to require the Coast Guard to perform a study of these carbon monoxide deaths and to study not only how they could be prevented by adding the correct venting mechanism to the boats but also how the carbon monoxide detecting devices, which are on many of these boats, could be improved so these tragic deaths do not occur.

Over the past seven seasons, nine deaths and 111 injuries on Lake Powell alone, 30 more deaths and 107 injuries on other lakes besides Lake Powell. These are based solely on voluntary reports.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LoBIONDO) conducted a hearing on this issue, and I commend the gentleman for doing so. At that hearing, the heart-wrenching testimony of the parents of Logan and Dillan Dixey brought this issue home; but there are many others. This is the NIOSH study discussing the 30 deaths that they know of on other lakes. I hold press reports of deaths on bodies of water around the country. This documents the death that the gentleman from Louisiana spoke about in that State.

Mr. Chairman, it is extremely important that we study these deaths and find out the cause of them. The Coast Guard has been given a grant of money to study these deaths; but, unfortunately, I believe it is critically important that we put language in the law that the study be complete, that they study not only the cause of the deaths so we can end these tragedies, but also study the mechanism to improve the carbon monoxide-detecting equipment on these vessels.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding is the gentleman from New Jersey will work with us hopefully through the passage of this legislation; and if not otherwise, to insert this language requiring such a study for the safety of all recreational boaters in the country.

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

Mr. SHADEGG. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman indicated, we have had quite a bit of testimony on this issue already. I understand how important this issue is to recreational boaters throughout the country, and I pledge to work with the gentleman to include language in the next maritime bill developed by our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

In 1976, a young man 16 years old took the family out for a sail off the coast of my district. After capsizing several times, his judgment became impaired, and he decided to swim for it. In the cold May waters, he had only about a half hour to live. Body temperature fell; he went through a classic near-death experience, and eventually passed out.

Mr. Chairman, this young man woke up inside a Coast Guard vessel from the auxiliary station out of Wilmette, Illinois. He asked the guardsman if he was going to live or die, and the man said, I do not know. But thanks to the prompt rescue of the Coast Guard, that young man survived.

Mr. Chairman, I am that young man. Every day of my life after my 16th year is a borrowed day given to me by virtue of the United States Coast Guard. It is a difficult thing to say for a Navy man, but the Coast Guard saved my life; and that is the essence of their mission here.

The kind of life-saving that happens off of the coast of the 10th Congressional District of Illinois is critical because Lake Michigan, most months of the year, is lethal due to temperature. It is the kind of work carried out by Air Station Waukegan, now providing life-saving services via helicopter throughout the entire south Lake Michigan region.

Mr. Chairman, I am incredibly supportive of the Coast Guard. I strongly support this legislation. But for the Coast Guard, I would not be here.

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

I thank the gentleman from Illinois, whose story is indicative of the work that the Coast Guard has done for so many years throughout the Nation and that does not get the attention that it deserves. The men and women of the Coast Guard put themselves in harm's way every day. What I think America fails to realize is that it is a branch of

the military that saves civilians every day. There is not a day that goes by that lives and property are not saved. There is not a day when America is not benefited by the work of the Coast Guard, the men and women, whether it is drug interdiction, whether it is saving lives and property, whether it is responding to a national emergency or aiding other branches of the military. Our examples go on and on and on.

□ 1215

We have many Members in this body who individually expressed strong support over the years for the work that the Coast Guard does. Now is the time for us to stand up for them. They stand up for America every day. It is our time to stand up for them during this authorization bill or, more importantly, as we move through the appropriations process, so we can provide the resources to the men and women who do this job every day unselfishly the way they really deserve, with the assets that they need.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard provides a number of vital services to protect and defend our Nation's coastal areas and waterways. H.R. 1699 authorizes funding to conduct search and rescue efforts, vessel safety compliance, as well as wildlife promotion and protection. I am particularly supportive of the funding increases provided through H.R. 1699 that will increase the Coast Guard's drug interdiction operations.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to show my strong support for H.R. 1699, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2001, sponsored by my colleagues DON YOUNG of Alaska, JAMES OBERSTAR of Minnesota, FRANK LOBIONDO of New Jersey, and CORRINE BROWN of Florida. As you know, this bill would authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2002 in six main areas: operating expenses; acquisition, construction, and improvement; research, development, test, and evaluation; retired pay; alteration of bridges; and environmental compliance and restoration. In addition, it sets end of the year strength levels for active duty personnel and establishes military training levels.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and as a representative from a State with a substantial Coast Guard presence, I have had the opportunity to witness the efforts and initiatives of the essential life-saving mission of the U.S. Coast Guard. For over two centuries, it has been saving lives from Maine to Guam. Last year alone, the Coast Guard saved 5,000 recreational and commercial boaters, inspected over 34,000 vessels, maintained 50,000 aids-to-navigation, managed 13,000 marine pollution incidents, intercepted 4,200 illegal immigrants, and seized over 130,000 lbs. of pure cocaine. However, the U.S. Coast Guard is being asked to do more with less.

In my own State of Connecticut, the Coast Guard employs over 900 active members, in addition to the cadets at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in New London. There are also sizable search and rescue stations in New London and New Haven, as well as a research and development center in Groton. I would like to commend the outstanding work of the Congressional Coast Guard Caucus, chaired by my colleagues BILL DELAHUNT of Massachusetts, GENE TAYLOR of Mississippi, and HOWARD COBLE of North Carolina. I strongly agree with its assertion that unless the Coast Guard's current budget crisis is dealt with in a timely fashion, the Coast Guard may be forced to make cuts in search-and-rescue services, reduce hours at sea, consolidate small boat stations, and compromise its other crucial missions.

Based on the Congressional Coast Guard Caucus' findings, it is clear that certain pressing problems merit our immediate attention. First, the Coast Guard has assumed a variety of increased responsibilities—from drug interdiction to fisheries management to environmental cleanup—while like other services, they have been unable to adequately compensate its personnel, causing many of its best and brightest to leave the Coast Guard for the private sector. Second, although the U.S. Coast Guard is currently the seventh largest naval service in the world, its cutter fleet is also one of the oldest—currently 40th out of 42. Finally, many of its cutters, buoy tenders and aircraft are reaching the end of their life expectancy. Unfortunately, with its budget rising insufficiently in real dollars in the past, the Coast Guard has not been able to address capital expenditure issues.

This Coast Guard Authorization Act will help address this situation by authorizing $5.4 billion for Coast Guard programs and operations. According to testimony by Admiral James M. Loy to the House Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, the fiscal year 2002 budget request will help to restore the readiness of Coast Guard personnel while ensuring that all of the agency's missions are performed at a level that can be sustained by its infrastructure. In conclusion, I applaud the past efforts and service of the U.S. Coast Guard, and I urge all of my fellow Members to vote with me in support of this bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1699, the ''Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2001.''

I have the honor of representing the Second District of Connecticut, home of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy. Through the years, I have had the opportunity to witness first-hand the excellence of the Coast Guard.

On any given day, on the average, our U.S. 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 taxpayers very proud of their investment in the world's finest Coast Guard.

The bill before us today will allow the Coast Guard to continue its unique, multimission capabilities that are characterized so well by its motto, ''Semper Paratus—Always Ready.''

I want to complement Chairmen YOUNG and LOBIONDO for moving this bill forth and for their long-time commitment to, and support of, the U.S. Coast Guard.

As vice chairman of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee and a die-hard supporter of the U.S. Coast Guard, I urge my colleagues to support this authorization bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, too often the great role the men and women of our Coast Guard play in up keeping our national security is overshadowed by the larger Department of Defense.

Certainly, their funding is insufficient and they are operating under conditions that hold them back from doing all they can do. By supporting this rule and the underlying legislation, we have the ability to recognize and aid the importance of the Coast Guard to our Nation's security and well being. Its responsibilities are varied and numerous ranging from protection of natural resources to search and rescue to stopping the drug trade at sea and more.

Since 1790, the Coast Guard has been defending the United States in times of war. With the $300 million increase in operating expenses, the Coast Guard will be able to continue to support the armed services. This additional money, among other things, provides the needed fuel and maintenance to fully employ their cutters and planes to keep seafaring Americans safe on the open waters and fulfill myriad other missions. In fully utilizing the Coast Guard's resources and improving their assets, our shoreline and our Nation at large will be safer and the war on drugs will be fought even harder.

Despite aging equipment and low funding levels, the Coast Guard has demonstrated its commitment to winning the war against drugs. In fact, in the first 6 months of 2001, over 60,000 pounds of cocaine has been seized. This success indicates the Coast Guard is well on its way to matching and even surpassing last year's record-breaking confiscation.

Illegal drug activity is creeping into all corners of the United States and the Coast Guard must be commended for their achievements to date in stopping illegal drugs before they hit American soil. Funding provided in H.R. 1699 is a step in that direction.

A special aspect of the Coast Guard's budget for fighting the war on drugs is the ''Deepwater'' Program. This program exemplifies the Coast Guard's ability to look ahead and plan for the constant battle against the drug traffickers at sea. The goal of this program is to update the Coast Guard's fleet and allow it to keep up with illegal activities in the waters off our shore. Currently the Coast Guard's ships and planes are not fully capable of stopping the high-tech drug world. The $338 million targeted for the Deepwater project will provide needed funding to acquire certain improved assets. If we are serious about success, it is imperative that we provide funding to enable the Coast Guard to do its many missions. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in full support of H.R. 1699, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2001. This authorization will increase the Coast Guard's funding by $845 million over last year's appropriation, an amount that is vital to correct persistent funding shortfalls over the past years. The bill also provides $338 million to implement the Coast

Guard's Integrated Deepwater System, a program that will enable the Coast Guard to replace and modernize its fleet of offshore assets.

As a member of the Coast Guard Caucus and Representative of a coastal district, I see firsthand the vital role played by our Coast Guard in protecting our natural resources, providing for our national defense and ensuring the mobility, security, and safety of our maritime community.

A key provision of this bill will increase the Coast Guard's personnel endstrengths, a requirement to continue the Coast Guard's ability to protect our borders from drug smugglers. In Fiscal Year 2000, the Coast Guard set a maritime seizure record of more than 60 metric tons of cocaine. Drug smugglers have become increasingly sophisticated through the use of small, extremely fast boats that are difficult to detect by the larger, slower moving fleet of Coast Guard vessels.

Commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral James M. Loy recently stated that, "We know that we are sustaining our operations only through the heroic efforts of our people, but faced with tired and aging platforms, depleted inventories, stretched logistics and support systems, even our heroes are getting tired."

This bill will give our Coast Guard personnel the tools, benefits and capabilities to provide a vital and multipurpose entity to the defense of our national interests and resources. I ask my colleagues to fully support this bill and support the heroes of the U.S. Coast Guard.

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

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

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 1699 is as follows:

H.R. 1699

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 2001".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2002 for necessary expenses of the Coast Guard, as follows:

(1) For the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, $3,682,838,000, of which—

(A) $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; and

(B) $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, $659,323,000, of which—

(A) $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; and

(B) not less than $338,000,000 shall be available to the Coast Guard only to implement the Coast Guard's Integrated Deepwater System.

(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, $21,722,000, 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, $876,346,000.

(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, $15,466,000, 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), $16,927,000, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 3. 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 44,000 as of September 30, 2002.

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

(1) For recruit and special training for fiscal year 2002, 1,500 student years.

(2) For flight training for fiscal year 2002, 125 student years.

(3) For professional training in military and civilian institutions for fiscal year 2002, 300 student years.

(4) For officer acquisition for fiscal year 2002, 1,000 student years.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Amendments printed in the RECORD may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed, or his designee, and shall be considered read.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. BIGGERT

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mrs. BIGGERT:

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. ____. ASSISTANCE FOR MARINE SAFETY STATION ON CHICAGO LAKEFRONT.

(a) ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Transportation may use amounts authorized under this section to provide financial assistance to the City of Chicago, Illinois, to pay the Federal share of the cost of a project to demolish the Old Coast Guard Station, located at the north end of the inner Chicago Harbor breakwater at the foot of Randolph Street, and to construct a new facility at that site for use as a marine safety station on the Chicago lakefront.

(b) COST SHARING.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a project carried out with assistance under this section may not exceed one third of the total cost of the project.

(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—There shall not be applied to the non-Federal share of a project carried out with assistance under this section—

(A) the value of land and existing facilities used for the project; and

(B) any costs incurred for site work performed before the date of the enactment of this Act, including costs for reconstruction of the east breakwater wall and associated utilities.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to the other amounts authorized by this Act, for providing financial assistance under this section there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, to remain available until expended.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I intend to ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment at the end of my time; but before I do, I would like to explain its purpose and then enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation.

Simply put, my amendment authorizes funding for the Federal share of a Federal-State-local partnership to build a maritime safety station along Chicago's lakefront. Though my congressional district does not encompass any of the Chicago lakefront, I, like most Illinoisans, am concerned about the area's safety needs. Many of my constituents sail on Lake Michigan, and the U.S. Coast Guard's marine safety office is located in Burr Ridge, Illinois, in the district I represent.

From the Burr Ridge location, the servicemen and women of the U.S. Coast Guard are responsible for commercial vessel safety, marine environmental response, port safety and security, and waterways management for the Illinois River and its tributaries, the Des Plaines River, the Chicago River and portions of Lake Michigan.

Despite this extensive mission, the U.S. Coast Guard has no presence or base of operation in Chicago along the lakefront. The U.S. Coast Guard resources nearest to the Chicago lakefront are in Burr Ridge, Waukegan, or Calumet Harbor, all of which are at least 45 minutes away. Anyone who has visited Chicago knows how much Chicagoans enjoy and take advantage of our beautiful lakefront. In fact, Chicago's lakefront includes a number of very busy harbors and marinas and hosts a number of important events.

There are approximately 95,000 recreational boats registered in the nine-county Chicago metropolitan area, and over 30 excursion, dining, or tour vessels operate out of Chicago. The city of Chicago also celebrates many events, including the Air and Water Show, the Chicago/Mackinaw Sailboat Race, the Fourth of July Fireworks and the Taste of Chicago, and Venetian Night along its lakefront, attracting substantial pedestrian and recreational boat traffic from around the Great Lakes region.

I believe we can enjoy the lakefront with greater safety if we establish a marine safety station along the lakefront. Let us not wait until it is too late. Let us not wait until the Coast Guard finds itself unable to respond in

a timely fashion to an emergency situation along Chicago's lakefront.

An intergovernmental group of marine emergency service providers consisting of the U.S. Coast Guard, the city of Chicago's Marine Police and Illinois' Department of Natural Resources Conservation Police identified the old Coast Guard station, a facility in a state of disrepair and partially condemned, as an ideal location for redevelopment as a Chicago marine safety station. The U.S. Coast Guard has offered to relocate some of its existing resources including staff and rescue vessels to this facility to provide a more effective response in the downtown Chicago area. The total project would cost $6 million split evenly between the Federal, State and local jurisdictions. It is my belief that the $2 million Federal share is a small price to pay for significantly improving public safety and law enforcement.

I respect the chairman's wish that this authorization bill not include projects and withdraw my amendment. I believe strongly in the bill that has just been debated, but I would like to engage him in a brief colloquy to ask for his assistance in moving this project forward.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LoBIONDO. I would be happy to engage in a colloquy with the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Will the gentleman work with me and other interested parties to include authorization for this much-needed project in future legislation to be considered by the subcommittee and full committee?

Mr. LoBIONDO. Yes, I would like to assure the gentlewoman that I will work with her and other Members of the Illinois delegation, the State of Illinois, the City of Chicago, and the United States Coast Guard to give this project full and fair consideration in future legislation and ensure that the safety needs of the Chicago lakefront are met.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman very much for his efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. ___. REQUIREMENT TO CONSTRUCT ONLY AMERICAN-MADE VESSELS.

Any new vessel constructed for the Coast Guard with amounts made available under this Act—

(1) shall be constructed in the United States;

(2) shall not be constructed using any steel other than steel made in the United States; and

(3) shall be constructed in compliance with the Buy American Act.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

In lieu of the matter proposed on page 1, strike lines 1 through 9 and insert the following:

SEC. ___. REQUIREMENT TO CONSTRUCT ONLY AMERICAN-MADE VESSELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any new vessel constructed for the Coast Guard with amounts made available under this Act—

(1) shall be constructed in the United States;

(2) shall not be constructed of steel or iron produced outside of the United States; and

(3) shall be constructed in compliance with the Buy American Act.

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—Subsection (a)(2) shall not apply—

(1) if the Secretary finds that the application of that subsection would be inconsistent with the public interest;

(2) to the use of steel or iron produced outside of the United States if the Secretary finds that such material is not produced in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available quantities and of a satisfactory quality; or

(3) if compliance with subsection (a)(2) will increase the cost of the overall project contract by more than 25 percent.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the modification is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the Coast Guard for seizing 111,000 pounds of cocaine that when stepped on will be worth more than $12 billion on the streets of the United States of America. I also listened carefully to the wise remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) when he mentioned the national security issue of narcotics.

I would like to remind this committee that former President Bush created Task Force 6, a military operation that worked in conjunction with civilian forces on our border. I do recommend and will be offering legislative amendments to future national security measures to enhance and reapply and to make Task Force 6 once again a strong and even bigger reality.

Today's amendment is straightforward. If we are going to be constructing vessels for the Coast Guard, it should be American workers and American steel where at all possible. I want to commend the leadership of the committee: the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LoBIONDO), who has done a fine job the first time I have seen him on the floor and the excellent work of the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN.)

With that, I ask that my amendment be passed over without prejudice, be kept in the bill, and I do not get shafted in conference.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, the committee, in bringing this legislation to the floor, had agreed that this is not a policy bill. This is the only policy-type amendment to be accepted on the floor, which I will accept in consultation with the chairman, he will speak for himself on the matter, but because it already is a statement of already existing law in a previous iteration of transportation legislation from this committee in a Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 and the gentleman's language offered here tracks exactly current law in the Federal aid highway program which has served to protect 60 million tons of American steel in the Federal aid highway program over the last 20 years.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to commend then Chairman OBERSTAR in his role in that legislation and for being perhaps the original leader of a Buy American movement in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LoBIONDO), the distinguished subcommittee chair.

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) for his determination and energy over the years for his Buy American program. In consultation with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), I am very pleased to endorse and accept this amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for an ''aye'' vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HOEKSTRA

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. HOEKSTRA:

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. . COAST GUARD AIR SEARCH AND RESCUE FACILITIES FOR LAKE MICHIGAN.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to the other amounts authorized by this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation for operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard air search and rescue facility in Muskegon, Michigan, $2,028,000 for fiscal year 2002.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), the chairman of the subcommittee.

As the gentleman from New Jersey knows, I have filed an amendment to authorize to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation roughly $2 million for the continued operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard air search and rescue facility in Muskegon, Michigan for fiscal year 2002.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, that is correct. I am familiar with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I also understand the gentleman's desire to expedite a Coast Guard authorization bill this year and avoid the difficulties that have plagued Coast Guard authorization bills in years past.

As the gentleman is aware, the Coast Guard's primary mission on the Great Lakes is that of search and rescue. Unfortunately, the U.S. Coast Guard's fiscal year 2002 budget weakens that mission by proposing to close the Coast Guard's seasonal search and rescue air facility that has operated out of Muskegon since 1997.

I fear that the closing of this facility puts the safety of Lake Michigan boaters in danger. The Muskegon site was selected by the Coast Guard after an elaborate selection process that proved Muskegon to be the most cost-effective location for their capabilities. In addition, the proposal to close this facility directly violates fiscal year 1999 appropriations language that establishes a seasonal facility to better serve the Chicago area. However, that very provision also directs the Coast Guard not to close or downsize any other facility to accommodate this additional seasonal capability.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the gentleman's desire to maintain the search and rescue facility at Muskegon, Michigan as well as the feelings of the entire Michigan delegation who expressed their support for the facility in a letter to me. The gentleman from Michigan should be commended for his work to ensure the safety of his constituents and Lake Michigan boaters and that they are not jeopardized.

I appreciate his understanding of the need to move this bill before us today as expeditiously as possible, and I pledge to work with the gentleman from Michigan on this issue when my committee takes action on additional Coast Guard-related matters in the very near future.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I also appreciate his willingness to address this matter on a more appropriate piece of authorization legislation from his committee. In addition, will the gentleman agree to express his support for the safety of Lake Michigan boaters and the need for additional funds to maintain the operation of the seasonal search and rescue facility in Muskegon?

Mr. LOBIONDO. As the gentleman from Michigan noted, I will work to address with him this matter in my committee as well as express the need for additional funds to maintain the search and rescue capabilities from Muskegon, Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership. I look forward to continuing to work together on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

□ 1230

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Are there any further amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS, 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. 1699) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2002, pursuant to House Resolution 155, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

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.

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 3, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel

Regula	Shaw	Thornberry
Rehberg	Shays	Thune
Reyes	Sherman	Thurman
Reynolds	Sherwood	Tiahrt
Riley	Shimkus	Tiberi
Rivers	Shows	Tierney
Rodriguez	Shuster	Toomey
Roemer	Simpson	Traficant
Rogers (KY)	Skeen	Udall (NM)
Rogers (MI)	Skelton	Upton
Rohrabacher	Slaughter	Velazquez
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (MI)	Visclosky
Ross	Smith (NJ)	Vitter
Rothman	Smith (TX)	Walden
Roukema	Smith (WA)	Walsh
Roybal-Allard	Snyder	Wamp
Royce	Souder	Watkins (OK)
Rush	Spence	Watson (CA)
Ryan (WI)	Spratt	Watt (NC)
Ryun (KS)	Stark	Watts (OK)
Sabo	Stearns	Waxman
Sanchez	Stenholm	Weiner
Sanders	Strickland	Weldon (FL)
Sandlin	Stump	Weldon (PA)
Sawyer	Stupak	Weller
Saxton	Sununu	Whitfield
Scarborough	Sweeney	Wicker
Schakowsky	Tanner	Wilson
Schiff	Tauscher	Wolf
Schrock	Taylor (MS)	Woolsey
Scott	Taylor (NC)	Wu
Sensenbrenner	Terry	Wynn
Serrano	Thomas	Young (AK)
Sessions	Thompson (CA)	Young (FL)
Shadegg	Thompson (MS)	

NAYS—3

Paul	Schaffer	Tancredo

NOT VOTING—18

Burton	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
Dingell	Lofgren	Towns
Ferguson	Miller, George	Turner
Hutchinson	Putnam	Udall (CO)
Jefferson	Simmons	Waters
Jones (OH)	Solis	Wexler

□ 1258

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 155, I was the speaker at my son's high school graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 155 on H.R. 1699, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, today I attended my daughter's high school graduation and was therefore not in Washington, DC. Had I been present in the House Chamber today, I would have cast my votes in the following manner: Rollcall 154—"yes", approving the Journal for June 6, 2001; rollcall 155—"yes", passage of H.R. 1699, Coast Guard Reauthorization Act of 2001.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LoBIONDO. 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. 1699.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1699, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2001

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1699, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section number and cross-referencing.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring on the schedule for the remainder of the week and next week.

I would yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) for any information he wishes to impart to the body.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Michigan for yielding.

I would announce, Mr. Speaker, that the House has completed its legislative business for the week. The House will next meet for legislative business on Tuesday, June 12, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and then at 2 o'clock for legislation business. We will be considering a number of measures under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices tomorrow. On Tuesday, no recorded votes are expected until 6 o'clock.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House plans to consider the following measures, subject to rules. First, H.R. 931, the Sudan Peace Act; and, second, H.R. 1088, which is the Investor and Capital Markets Fee Relief Act. That would be Wednesday and Thursday.

On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if I may inquire a question or two from the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

The security bill that the gentleman alluded to at the end of his remarks has been on the calendar numerous times over the last several months. Is it likely to be brought up this time?

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think our leadership is relatively optimistic that this time we can work out whatever differences there might be between the two committees of jurisdiction and take it to the floor next week.

As the gentleman knows, the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) was out unavoidably this week due to personal health issues in his family, and the Committee on Government Reform does have jurisdiction over this issue, as does the Committee on Financial Services. But it is my understanding that we now have the ability to move it to the floor and differences are being worked out.

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

If I could make just one other comment, Mr. Speaker, and this is not aimed at the gentleman from Ohio but at the Republican leadership in general; I want to express how angry our caucus is about the way the tax reconciliation bill was handled right before the Memorial Day recess.

□ 1300

Members were kept an additional 2 days here, waiting around for a vote. In fact, I think many know that we were kept waiting all night with a vote promised every hour.

Now, I know these issues are difficult and sometimes they take turns that people do not expect in the negotiation process; and by the way, it would have been nice if the Democrats were invited to have participated in the negotiating process which we were kept from. But having said that, let me just say, the American people were also blocked from any knowledge of what was in the bill that would affect our Nation, perhaps for the next 2 decades. Memorial Day, as everyone knows in this Chamber, is a very special and important time for Members to be in their home districts to honor our Nation's veterans and the activities that surround that honoring.

This is the second time, I will tell the gentleman from Ohio, who may want to relay this to others in the leadership, that this has happened this Congress. We have tried to work with our colleagues in a civil and bipartisan way the best we can, but there is a deep amount of anger about the way this was handled because it was the second time.

I just want the gentleman and the Republican leadership to know that if we are brought into the process, I will say this once again, we will be fine. We will work with our Republican colleagues; we will try to figure this out the best we can. But if we are treated the way we were treated on the tax reconciliation bill, we will be very, very vigorous next time. We want to make sure that the people in this body who serve and represent literally tens of millions of people in this country, hundreds of millions on our side of the aisle, have the opportunity to participate and to know what is going on. It is not meant as something that is going to happen, but I just want the gentleman to know how strongly we feel about this, and I hope my friend from Ohio will share that with the Speaker, with the other leaders of the gentleman's party; and I will do so, especially when I see them, and have done so when I have talked to them already.

Mr. Speaker, we are very serious about this, and we are trying to do this in a reasonable way; but when we are