Mr. TURNER described Dayton, Ohio, as the birthplace of aviation in history. Two decades ago, Mr. Speaker, that is stretching the truth a bit. But after sitting on the floor for about an hour and hearing our energy problems blazed by environmentalists, not to mention the fact that ExxonMobil made $40 billion in profits in the fourth quarter of 2007, it seems like a fairly minor stretching of the truth.

An every school child in America knows, with the exception of school children in Dayton, Ohio, the first powered flight was in Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, in December, 1903, or at least it was the first photographed, the first documented powered flight. There is still some dispute about where the actual first powered flight was. But the photograph of the Wright brothers plane above the dunes, just a few feet above the dunes at Kitty Hawk, was probably the most important photograph in history. That photograph, Mr. Speaker, was taken by a North Carolinian.

The first flight, which lasted just 12 seconds, and even with the soft sands of Kitty Hawk to land in, the landing almost destroyed or badly damaged the balsa wood plane. Progress was very rapid. Within just a decade, the airplane proved to be a very effective weapon of war in the First World War, and in another decade, just another decade after that, Charles Lindbergh flew the Atlantic alone.

Mr. TURNER is correct; flight has been an important transformational invention in human history. We are now a connected world, largely because of flight. The Wright brothers and Dayton, Ohio, did have a role in that, Mr. Speaker. So I do rise to support adding Hawthorn Hill, the Wright family home, and the Wright Airplane Factory to the national park in Dayton, Ohio, highly.

In this, taking the lead of my party’s nominee for President, who has urged that we put aside all the old animosities, that we reach across all divisions of society. In that spirit, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. HOBBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4199, which would expand the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park to include additional sites associated with the lives and work of Wilbur and Orville Wright.

Few technological advances have transformed the world or our nation’s economy, society, culture, and national character as the development of powered flight. Therefore, it is important to preserve the historical sites associated with the Wright brothers’ achievements in the field of aviation. That is what this bill will do.

Over the years, the Ohio congressional delegation has worked together to preserve and protect our aviation history. A few years ago, I, along with Congressman Tony Hall, had the privilege of introducing the bill that later became law to designate eight Miami Valley counties and the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park as part of a National Aviation Heritage Area. Today, I commend my colleague, Congressman Mike Turner, for his leadership in sponsoring this bill to add two additional sites to the aviation park.

Specifically, H.R. 4199 will add Hawthorne Hill, which was Orville Wright’s home in Oakwood, and several Wright Factory buildings in Dayton. Where the brothers conducted research and testing. These sites would be part of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, which already includes such historic sites as: Huffman Prairie Flying Field, the Wright Cycle Company Complex, and the Paul Laurence Dunbar House. Together, these sites are an important part of nation’s history, and Ohio’s cultural heritage.

Again, I commend Congressman Turner for his leadership to preserve and promote Ohio’s aviation heritage with this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4419.

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation, and I yield the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4199, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chairman’s prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MARITIME POLLUTION PREVENTION ACT OF 2008

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 802) to amend the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships to implement MARPOL Annex VI.

The Clerk reads the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:
Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Maritime Pollutant Prevention Act of 2008”.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES. Wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed to have been made by a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.).

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS. Section 2(a) (33 U.S.C. 1901(a)) is amended—
(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (12) as paragraphs (2) through (13), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) ‘Administrator’ means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;”;

(3) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated) by striking “(V)” and inserting “(V)”;

(4) in paragraph (7) (as so redesignated) by striking “‘discharge’ or ‘garbage’ and, in the case of a ‘harmful substance’ and ‘incident’,” and inserting “‘discharge’, ‘emission’, ‘garbage’, ‘harmful substance’ and ‘incident’”; and

(5) by redesigning paragraphs (7) through (13) (as redesignated) as paragraphs (8) through (14), respectively, and inserting after paragraph (8) (as redesignated) the following:

“(V) ‘navigable waters’ includes the territorial sea of the United States (as defined in Presidential Proclamation No. 2721, as of December 27, 1958) and the internal waters of the United States;”.

SEC. 4. APPLICABILITY.

Section 3 (33 U.S.C. 1902) is amended—
(1) in subsection (a) by striking “(A)” and at the end of paragraph (2) by striking “(A)” and inserting “(A)”;

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting “;” and;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) with respect to Annex VI to the Convention and other than with respect to a ship referred to in paragraph (1)—

(A) to a ship that is in port, at a port or other place of call, at an offshore terminal, or in the internal waters of the United States; and

(B) to a ship that is bound for, or departing from, port, at a port or other place of call, at an offshore terminal, or in the internal waters of the United States, and is—

(i) the navigable waters or the exclusive economic zone of the United States;

(ii) an emission control area designated pursuant to section 4; or

(iii) any other area that the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary and each State in which any part of the area is located, has designated by order as being an area from which emissions from ships are of concern with respect to protection of public health, welfare, or the environment;

(iv) to a ship that is entitled to fly the flag of a party to Annex VI, and is—

(A) the navigable waters or the exclusive economic zone of the United States;

(B) an emission control area designated under section 4; or

(C) any other area that the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary and each State in which any part of the area is located, has designated by order as being an area from which emissions from ships are of concern with respect to protection of public health, welfare, or the environment; and

(v) any other area referred to in clause (iv), to the extent that, and in the same manner as, such ship may be bounded by the Secretary to implement or enforce any other law of the United States or Annex III, or any other law of the United States or Annex I, II, or V of the Convention, and is—

(i) the exclusive economic zone of the United States;

(ii) the navigable waters of the United States; or

(iii) an emission control area designated under section 4; or

(iv) any other area that the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary and each State in which any part of the area is located, has designated by order as being an area from which emissions from ships are of concern with respect to protection of public health, welfare, or the environment; and

(v) any other area referred to in clause (iv), to the extent that, and in the same manner as, such ship may be bounded by the Secretary to implement or enforce any other law of the United States or Annex III, or any other law of the United States or Annex I, II, or V of the Convention, and is—

(i) the exclusive economic zone of the United States;

(ii) the navigable waters of the United States; or

(iii) an emission control area designated under section 4; or

(iv) any other area referred to in clause (iv), to the extent that, and in the same manner as, such ship may be bounded by the Secretary to implement or enforce any other law of the United States or Annex III, or any other law of the United States or Annex I, II, or V of the Convention, and is—

(i) the exclusive economic zone of the United States;
that some or all of the requirements under this Act shall apply to one or more classes of public vessels or any combination of public vessels, the Administrator shall have no effect unless the head of the Department or agency under which the vessel is subject to regulation certifies that this Act is applicable to the vessel.

This paragraph does not apply during time of war or during a declared national emergency.

(b) by striking "or Federal authority" and inserting "or any Federal authority or any person or Federal authority with respect to emissions from tank vessels subject to regulation 15 of Annex VI to the Convention, shall be effective until 5 months after the date of notification to the International Maritime Organization by the Secretary.

SEC. 6. CERTIFICATIONS

Section 3 (33 U.S.C. 1904) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "The Secretary and inserting "Except as provided in this section (b)(1!);"

(2) by striking "Secretary under the authority of the MARPOL protocol and inserting "Secretary under the authority of the MARPOL protocol, or regulations prescribed under such Act which is not discretionary, or"

(3) in subsection (c) by striking "environmental and public health and welfare.".

SEC. 7. RECEPTION FACILITIES

Section 6 (33 U.S.C. 1906) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) The Secretary and the Administrator, after consulting with appropriate Federal agencies, shall jointly prescribe regulations setting criteria for determining the adequacy of reception facilities for receiving ozone depleting substances, equipment containing such substances, and exhaust gas cleaning residues from ships are adequate;"

(2) in subsection (b) by striking "or the Administrator" and inserting "Secretary;"

(3) in subsection (c) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) The Secretary may inspect a ship to which this Act applies as provided under section 3(a)(5), to verify that the ship is in compliance with Annex VI to the Convention and this Act.

(3) If an inspection under this subsection or any other information indicates that a violation of this Act has occurred, the Secretary, or the Administrator in a matter referred by the Secretary, may undertake enforcement action under this section.

(4) Notwithstanding subsection (b) and paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Administrator shall have all of the powers of the Secretary, as specified in subsection (b) of this section, for the purpose of enforcing regulations 17 and 18 of Annex VI to the Convention.

(5) In prescribing any regulations under this section, the Administrator shall consult with each other, and with respect to regulation 19, with the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of Transportation.

(6) At the end of subsection (c), as redesignated, by redesignating paragraph (2) as (3), and inserting the following:

"(2) by adding at the end of subsection (c), as redesignated, the following:

"(5) In prescribing any regulations under this section, the Administrator shall consult with each other, and with respect to regulation 19, with the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of Transportation;"

SEC. 8. INSPECTIONS

Section 8(f) (33 U.S.C. 1907f) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The Secretary may inspect a ship to which this Act applies as provided under section 3(a)(5), to verify that the ship is in compliance with Annex VI to the Convention and this Act.

(2) If an inspection under this subsection or any other information indicates that a violation of this Act has occurred, the Secretary, or the Administrator in a matter referred by the Secretary, may undertake enforcement action under this section.

(3) Notwithstanding subsection (b) and paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Administrator shall have all of the powers of the Secretary, as specified in subsection (b) of this section, for the purpose of enforcing regulations 17 and 18 of Annex VI to the Convention.

(4) In prescribing any regulations under this section, the Administrator shall consult with each other, and with respect to regulation 19, with the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of Transportation;"

SEC. 9. AMENDMENTS TO THE PROTOCOL

Section 10(b) (33 U.S.C. 1909(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking "Annex I, II, or III" and inserting "Annex I, II, or III";

(2) by striking "or the Administrator as provided for in this Act," after "Secretary," and inserting the following:

"(A) by inserting "or the Administrator as provided for in this Act," after "Secretary," the first place it appears;"

SEC. 10. PENALTIES

Section 9 (33 U.S.C. 1908) is amended—

(1) by striking "Protocol," each place it appears and inserting "Protocol and Annex I, II, or III;"

(2) in subsection (b) —

(A) by inserting "or the Administrator as provided for in this Act," after "Secretary," the first place it appears;"

(3) by striking paragraph (2)—

(1) by inserting "or the Administrator as provided for in this Act," after "Secretary," the first place it appears; and

(2) by inserting "or the Administrator as provided for in this Act," after "Secretary," the second and third places it appears;

(3) by striking "Secretary" each place it appears; and

(4) in subsection (b), by inserting "or the Administrator as provided for in this Act" after "Secretary," the first place it appears.

SEC. 11. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS

Section 15 (33 U.S.C. 1911) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 15. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

Section 11 (33 U.S.C. 1910) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) of subsection (a) as paragraph (4) and inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) against the Administrator where there is alleged a failure of the Administration to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary, or;"

(2) by striking "Secretary" and inserting "Secretary or the Administrator;" and

(3) by striking "Secretary" and inserting "Secretary or the Administrator;"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERTH) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LA TOURRE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

I smile because I’d be a delight to call the gentleman Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of H.R. 802, as amended, the Maritime Pollution Prevention Act of 2008. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and I introduced this legislation at the outset of the 110th Congress to provide the Coast Guard and the Environmental Protection Agency with the legal authority they need to implement Annex VI of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships.

The House passed H.R. 802 on March 26, 2007, by a vote of 359-48. Notwithstanding that overwhelming vote of approval, the bill languished in the place we affectionately call the other body
for more than a year. But recently, they have passed, with minor changes, that legislation. Thus, the House passage today, the bill can go to the President for consideration and for his signature.

Global warming is a critical issue, not just for the United States, but for every Nation, for every person on the planet. The international maritime community has recognized their contribution to global warming and in 1973, the IMO developed an international convention to address air pollutants from diesel ships.

For many years, the International Maritime Organization of the United Nations has been developing international standards to prevent pollution from ships that traverse the oceans. These standards are now embodied in the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, and oil pollution from ships of 1973. The U.S. has implemented these environmental laws by enacting and amending the legislation known as the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships, and oil pollution from ships of 1973. Annex VI of the Convention for Prevention of Pollution from Ships limits the emission of nitrogen oxides from large marine diesel engines; it governs the sulfur content of marine diesel fuel; prohibits the emission of ozone-depleting substances; it regulates the emission of volatile organic compounds in the transfer of cargoes between tankers and terminals. It sets standards for shipboard incinerators and fuel oil on platforms and drill rigs at sea.

The Senate ratified this treaty by unanimous consent in April, 2006. But it does not make effect until we act to implement the legislation. The bill we consider today will implement Annex VI of the Convention. It will provide the Coast Guard and the Environmental Protection Agency the authority necessary to develop U.S. standards and to enforce those standards on the thousands of U.S. and foreign flagged vessels that enter U.S. waters.

Recognizing the challenge that the world faces in combating worldwide climate change and global warming, we have to take every measure possible to combat it. One of the measures is to reduce the warming that takes place on this planet, and particularly the oceans that are deep reservoirs of oxygen but also reservoirs of carbon and of the acid that we are pouring into the atmosphere. And that combination of absorbing heat, acid, and carbon is a deleterious effect on the planet. There was a very enlightening program on this devastation of the coral reefs on the Science Channel just the other evening.

It is something that I witnessed myself when I lived in Haiti and I’d snorkel and explore the coral reefs. This was in the 1950s. You could see the dead reefs on the one side, and the vibrant, growing coral reefs and the abundant marine life on the other side. I’m filtering out deleterious elements in the ocean water. But on the other side, the dead reef and a testament to the effects of pollution in our waters. And that was 50 years ago.

So the Senate amendments do not affect the application of MARPOL VI to the thousands of vessels that enter our ports. Their amendment clarifies that the United States can enforce MARPOL VI on vessels that are registered in countries which are not party to the convention when those vessels are in our 200 mile economic zone if the Coast Guard is on board of the vessel to enforce other annexes to the convention and to the extent that this enforcement does not violate international law.

In addition, the Senate amendment clarifies that an individual, a person, may bring a suit for enforcement. Administrator of EPA has failed to perform any act or duty not discretionary under the act, and that is similar to civil action that may be brought under other provisions of law on application of other annexes to the convention.

The delay by the Senate, I regret, may contribute to the unfortunate consequences for the United States in the IMO negotiations that will take place this coming October to reduce emissions from ships. Under the terms of the convention, only parties to the convention may vote on those reduction measures, and a nation is not party to the convention until 90 days after its instruments of ratification have been deposited with the IMO. The Senate delay necessarily may not meet the deadline and the U.S. may not be able to vote to improve increased standards, even though delegates represent the U.S., unless the working group that met in 1993 is negotiating these new, more rigorous standards.

So, given the importance of completing action on this legislation, I asked our majority leader, Mr. HOYER, to schedule this bill as quickly as possible immediately upon the House’s return today. I thank the majority leader for his consideration, and I am hopeful we get the bill to the President’s desk without delay.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank our chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, Mr. CUMMINGS, who has devoted a great deal of energy to the work of the full committee and to this particular issue in developing this legislation, and to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. MICA, the ranking member of our committee, for help in bringing me in my commitment to vote on the bill last year and expediting today’s action considering the bill, and to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LAUROUETTE, over the thoughtful, concerned and legal minded committee. I am grateful for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in support today of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2072, the Maritime Prevention Pollution Act of 2008. I want to give credit and pay tribute to the chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, and the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. CUMMINGS of Maryland, for their diligence in working this bill and working the will of the committee and today the will of the House. I join Mr. OBERSTAR in expressing my regret that the other body has not acted in as prompt a fashion, and therefore we may be too late with this legislation. Hopefully that isn’t the case.

This type of legislation is exactly what our committee should be about. Those of us, as the current occupant of the chair who hails from the Great Lakes region, does the chairman of the full committee, I saw the great work that has gone into the restoration of the Great Lakes over many, many years. I am reminded as I listened to the chairman talk about the action or inaction of the other body that Johnny Carson, before the restoration of Lake Erie in particular was in full swing, used to joke that Lake Erie was a place where fish went to die. I think it is appropriate to say that at this moment in time, the Senate, regardless of who is in charge, is a place where bills go to die.

This bill will implement international requirements to reduce air emissions from ships for purposes of U.S. law and will establish more stringent standards for the emissions of air pollutants from ships as well as the sulfur content of fuel oil used in United States waters.

As I remember, the House first passed this bill in March of 2007, again thanks to the splendid leadership of Chairman OBERSTAR and Chairman CUMMINGS, with a broad bipartisan majority. Since that time, the bill has languished in the other body, to the point where we may well be prevented from voting on proposed amendments to the underlying convention at the next meeting of the International Maritime Organization. As a result, our ability to push for strengthened measures have been significantly weakened.

Nonetheless, this is important legislation. I am pleased we will be sending it to the President as a first step to improve environmental conditions in our port and along our coasts, I hope all Members to join me in supporting this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as he may consume to the Chair of the Coast Guard and Maritime
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Affairs Subcommittee, my good friend, the able and distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS). Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank Chairman OBESTAR for yielding and for his tremendous leadership of our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and for bringing this bill to the floor and his cochairmanship. I also want to thank Mr. LATOURETTE for his leadership, and certainly our ranking member of our overall committee, Mr. McGovern. At the beginning of the 110th Congress, Mr. Speaker, Chairman OBESTAR laid out an agenda for the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee focusing on three critical objectives: Ensuring the safety and security of transportation and infrastructure; supporting expanded investment; and combating global warming.

The measure before us today, the Maritime Pollution Prevention Act of 2008, H.R. 802, represents yet another step towards the achievement of this agenda, and I applaud Chairman OBESTAR for his focused leadership on one of the most urgent transportation issues confronting our Nation.

At the request of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, I rose in strong support of H.R. 802, which would institute the legal changes needed to bring the United States into compliance with Annex VI of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution From Ships, known as MARPOL.

This legislation passed the House of Representatives on March 26, 2007, by a vote of 359-48. The bill finally passed the Senate with a minor amendment at the end of last month, and that amended bill now returns to the House for our consideration.

MARPOL is a treaty negotiated by the members of the International Maritime Organization, the United Nations body responsible for developing the treaties that are essentially the sole international regulations for ocean shipping.

The MARPOL convention currently has six annexes limiting various forms of pollution from ships. Annex VI was negotiated to control air pollution and has been in force internationally since 2005. With the enactment of H.R. 802, the United States would finally align our Nation’s laws to comply with this annex. Among other measures, Annex VI imposes limits on the sulfur content of the fuel utilized by ships, limits the emission of nitrogen oxides from ships’ engines, and prohibits the deliberate release of substances that deplete atmospheric ozone.

In the United States, ships are essentially the last major non-regulated source of ozone-depleting emissions and are a growing threat to the world’s air quality. In fact, some estimates suggest that the emissions of sulfur oxide from ships may now exceed the amount emitted from all the cars, trucks and buses in the world.

Unfortunately, the missions standards imposed by Annex VI are still very moderate. As a result, the United States has been actively working with our international partners to strengthen the annex’s emissions controls through the development of new amendments. Among other changes, these proposed amendments which are now under consideration by the IMO would reduce allowable sulfur content in fuel from the current 4.5 percent to 3.5 percent in 2012, and require subsequent reductions to 0.3 percent by 2020.

A vote is scheduled on these new amendments by the current parties to Annex VI in October of this year. Critically, if the United States has not deposited with IMO its instrument of ratification of Annex VI at least 3 months prior to that vote, the United States will not be allowed to vote for the strengthened emission controls that we have worked to craft.

Mr. Speaker, implementation of the United States MARPOL Annex VI offers us the first opportunity to limit emissions from ships. By joining this treaty now, we ensure that the United States can continue to lead the effort to achieve additional reductions in polluting emissions from oceangoing vessels.

I urge my colleagues to adopt H.R. 802 today, and I urge the President to sign this measure as quickly as possible.

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

Mr. Speaker, I know that it will come as a surprise to the Speaker that I spend just a couple of minutes talking about energy today, and I want to talk about it in the context of our committee.

I think the chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBESTAR, can probably cite the statistic, but every year I have been here, and this is my 14th year in the United States Congress, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I think under both Republican and Democratic leadership, has distingushed itself through an efficient and effective way in which we craft our legislation and actually get something done, when the other body is willing and when the chief executive is willing to sign it.

I thought I heard before our July 4th recess Mr. OBESTAR talk about the many numbers of bills that we have actually moved through the House, many through the Senate, that have been signed into law, and it far exceeds a lot of the work that some of the other more contentious committees in this body, by their nature, no criticism intended, can compile, and I think it is in direct correlation to and as a direct result of the respect that we have for each other, moving both the aisle on that committee, and now the stem but fair leadership of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBESTAR).

That brings me to a frustration that I found and encountered over the Fourth of July recess. I was talking to Mr. OBESTAR. I didn’t quite have the adulation poured upon me at parades that he had in his district in Minnesota. There were some people that thought that the $4.10 was a little bit much to be paying at the pump.

But the message that I got pretty loud and clear is that they want us to respect them. If you pull into the gas station, there isn’t any Republican pump and there isn’t any independent pump, there is just gas that costs a lot of money today, and someone making $3 hour in Ohio for a $320 per week gross paycheck is struggling, with $60, $70 filling up the tank to go to and from work.

There are a lot of opinions, and I will get into those in just a second, but I was reminded for the 12 years we were in the majority I happened to be supportive of something known as Davis-Bacon, which is the Federal prevailing wage law, and I recall being making $8.25 an hour as Mr. Kelly of New York, that that issue would prevail, and much to the dismay of Members in the then majority party, that happened to be a majority but were a minority of the House, if that vote were permitted to have taken place. That was a frustrating thing, and, sadly, I think we find ourselves there again on this energy question.

There are Members in this House who advocate additional exploration and drilling in the United States, both on and off shore, in the West, in Alaska, off the east coast and the west coast.

There are some who say no. There are some who advocate a replenishment into our coastal and in renewable, wind and solar. The governor of Minnesota is an expert on photovoltaic electricity, and certainly he has passed legislation that would be supportive of increased research and development of that type of energy generation.

There are those who believe like the French we should add nuclear power back into our portfolio. France, I believe, generates about 80 percent of its power through nuclear power. We haven’t had a nuclear power program in this country for a number of years.

There are those in this House who object to that and don’t think that that is a good idea as well.

But the point is that I think that at $4, $4.10, $4.11, we have reached the price point where the American public, who has to get up and buy food, send their kids to school, pay their bills, pay their taxes and fill up their gas tanks, don’t really want to hear why we disagree and what we can’t agree on.
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Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 802, the Marine Debris Prevention Act of 2008. I also echo the comments of the ranking member in praise of the bipartisan nature of this legislation. I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR and Mr. CUMMINGS for their leadership in bringing this very important bill to the floor of the House.

H.R. 802 authorizes the EPA and the Coast Guard to issue enforcement regulations for the MARPOL Treaty Annex VI, which was approved by the Senate 2 years ago, with the goal to reduce harmful emissions from large ocean-going ships.

Implementation of this treaty amendment is an important first step for the protection of the health of our citizens in coastal areas of the United States. We know, for example, that large ocean-going ships are a major source of soot, sulfur dioxide, and smog-forming pollution, strongly associated with urban hospital visits, and asthma attacks. The emission from these ships can cause serious heart and lung problems, and can contribute to an increased risk of lung cancer.

This is clearly important in my congressional district along California’s South Central Coast. In 2005, more than 7,000 ocean-going vessels made port calls along our coastline. As these ships come through the Santa Barbara channel, heading to the ports of Hueneeme, Los Angeles, and Long Beach, it is the case that the prevailing wind conditions blow most of the air pollution onshore.

Currently, these vessels emit over 45 percent of all the emissions of nitrogen oxides in Santa Barbara County, more than all the road vehicles combined. If left unregulated, these ships will contribute almost 75 percent of the county’s nitrogen oxides emissions by 2020. This forecasted increase in air pollution from large ships could wipe out the hard won air quality improvements achieved in the last 30 years on California’s central coast.

It is very clear that action must be taken to reduce these emissions which are impacting the lives of thousands of people living in my district every single day. And as I address this situation so harmful to this particular part of the coastline, I am aware that every coastal district in this Nation, the Pacific Coast, Atlantic, Gulf, and the Great Lakes would be affected perhaps in similar ways. So would the people who wish to visit these beautiful coastal areas.

The IMO, Mr. Speaker, is considering adopting new, more effective emission standards for large ships, but the U.S. will only have influence on these new standards if our country completes ratification of the MARPOL Annex VI Treaty via this implementing legislation. So I certainly hope we can seize this opportunity to provide beneficial industry, ports, environmental organizations, and regulatory agencies are

aligned in moving forward to reduce emissions from this very large source of pollution.

Again, I want to thank the chairman for bringing this legislation to the floor of the House today which means so much to my constituents. I urge its swift passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LAUTROUETTE) has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUTROUETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consider.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that I nominated the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) as sort of the energy czar of the United States Congress is exactly the reasons that he indicated. If you look at the legislation that has effectively dealt in part with the difficulties we find ourselves in, the gentleman’s transit legislation certainly gets people into mass transit and out of their automobiles and saves fuel.

The gentleman’s Amtrak legislation is historic, and in the short run a tremendous boon for America in terms of jobs and moving people to and from work. I think I saw something on the news where they were tracking what has happened to people’s behaviors since the price of gas has gone up, and I believe Amtrak has seen a 13 percent ridership increase since gas has increased, a testament to Amtrak, and also a testament to the gentleman’s bill that made sure that Amtrak isn’t operating hand to mouth as we move through this process.

Similarly, the gentleman’s vision for intercity rail in this country is again something where we lag far behind our friends in Asia and Europe, and he has for the first time, at least since I have been here, put real money, $550 million a year for 5 years, into the funding of high-speed intercity rail connections principally in the Midwest of the United States. But all of us recognize that that piece at least is some years away in terms of being viable alternative and impacting the cost of gasoline.

So, again, I would make the suggestion that there are good ideas on both sides of this aisle. There are many gifted Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats. We should have a national debate. And, for the sake of the people that I represent and others represent, we should get something done and we should get them some relief today.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking to Mr. Rayfield and we were trying to remember whether it was General William Tecumseh Sherman who said: If asked, I will not run. If nominated, I will not serve. If elected, I will not serve.

I think that is what the gentleman from Minnesota said to my suggestion and I hope he in fact reconsiders that, because if all of the people in this body, he commands tremendous respect.
on both sides of the aisle. He has dem-
strated again and again not only as the
chairman of our committee but as the
member of Congress that he can put together
the best ideas of both sides, and not
only move forward ideas that he firmly
believes in, but he can also actually get
debate floor into law. So I hope the gentle-
man, unlike my fellow Ohioan, General Sherman, re-
comes back.
I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gen-
tleman is recognized for 3 minutes.
Mr. OBERSTAR. And I thank the
gentleman again for his ever thought-
ful remarks, Mr. Speaker. If handed
such a challenge, I would undertake it
with vigor and with resolute purpose.
But I haven’t been handed to me, al-
though I appreciate the gentleman’s
offer.
I think our committee has been able
very successfully to attack these issues
of short-term as well as long-term im-
portance to the Nation, and we intend to
continue using the best interests of the
country in the legislation we move from
this committee, and to incor-
porate the good ideas from all mem-
bers of the committee regardless of their
political standing or standing.
I recall those during T-21, the shap-
ing of the surface transportation leg-
lislation, Mr. SHUSTER, then the chair-
man, and I traveled the country to
major points of congestion throughout
America to advocate for more robust
investment in surface transportation.
And at one point, I believe it was in At-
lanta at a news conference, the last
question was, well, Mr. OBERSTAR, why
are you traveling and participating in
this news conference, you a Democrat,
with Mr. SHUSTER, a Republican? And I
said, you know, I have never seen a
Democratic bridge or a Republican
road; but if we work together, we can
build all-American roads and all-Ameri-
can processes.
The reporter then turned to Chair-
man Shuster and said: Why are you
traveling with Mr. OBERSTAR? And he
said, Because JIM OBERSTAR and I are
joined at the hip.
And I think if we could carry that
spirit with vigor and honesty and with
resoluteness of purpose, we can accom-
plish great things for this country and
for this Congress. And I for that reason
enjoy the participation of the gen-
tleman from Ohio (Mr. LTUROUETTE),
the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA),
and in the current context Mr. CUMMINGS of Maryland, because there is
a real sense of doing what is good for
America and putting the country first and
over our own personal agendas.
I yield back the balance of my time.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The ques-
tion is on the motion offered by the
gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Ol-
son) that the House suspend the
rules and concur in the Senate amend-
ment to the bill, H.R. 802.
The question was taken; and (two-
thirds being in the affirmative) the
rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was con-
considered in turn.
A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.
CPL. JOHN P. SIGSBEE POST OFFICE
Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I
move to suspend the rules and pass the
bill (H.R. 5975) to designate the facility of
the United States Postal Service located at
101 West Main Street in Waterville, New
York, as the "Cpl. John P. Sigbee Post Office".
The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:
H.R. 5975
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of
Representatives of the United States of America in
Congress assembled,
SECTION 1. CPL. JOHN P. SIGSBEE POST OFFICE.
(a) Designation.—The facility of the
United States Postal Service located at 101
West Main Street in Waterville, New
York, shall be known and designated as the "Cpl.
John P. Sigbee Post Office".
(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a
law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other
record of the United States to the facility
referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be
a reference to the "Cpl. John P. Sigbee Post Office".
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursu-
ant to the rule, the gentleman from Illi-
nois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) each will con-
nor 20 minutes.
The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.
GENERAL LEAVE
Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I
ask unanimous consent that all Mem-
bers may have 5 legislative days within
which to revise and extend their re-
marks.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
there objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Illinois?
There was no objection.
Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker,
it is my pleasure to yield such time as
I might consume to the author of this
legislation, Representative ARCURI of
New York.
Mr. ARCURI. I thank the gentleman.
Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong
support of H.R. 5975, to rename the post
office in Waterville, New York in mem-
ory of Corporal John P. Sigbee.
Mr. Speaker, it is with both incred-
ible pride and sadness that I address
the House today to speak on this bill
that pays tribute to the life and sac-
fifice of one of this Nation’s fallen sol-
diers, U.S. Army Corporal John P.
Sigbee.
On January 16, 2008, Corporal Sigbee
of Waterville, New York was killed in
action 56 miles north of Baghdad dur-
ing his second tour of duty in Iraq.
\begin{equation}
\text{January 16, 2008}
\end{equation}
The family had only a few minutes to
receive his second Military Purple Heart on his he-
half. Corporal Sigbee was only 21
years old when his life was taken in service of our
country.
Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues
today to support this legislation ren-
naming the Waterville, New York, Post
Office after and in honor of Corporal