



Representative Gene Ward (R) District 17
Kalama Valley, Queen's Gate, Hawaii Kai
Office 808-586-6420 Fax 808-586-6421 Cell 781-9931
E-mail: repward@capitol.hawaii.gov

February 27, 2008

Contact: Michele Van Hessen
Minority Research: 586-7033
Direct: 586-7041 Cell: 227-43

Opinion Editorial
By
Representative Gene Ward

"Hawaii's Cruise Industry About to be Sunk by Homeland Security"

The job of Homeland Security is to protect our borders, not to erect barricades around Hawaii's economy. In a protectionist effort to prop up Norwegian Cruise Lines' waning Hawaii cruise business, the Department of Homeland Security's Bureau of Customs and Border Protection proposed "clarifying" the rule governing foreign-flagged vessels which will devastate tourism here in Hawaii and across the country.

This rule change would require all foreign-flagged cruise ships to spend at least 48 hours in a foreign port between stops at U.S. ports. In addition, these stops must amount to more than 50 percent of the total amount of time spent at U.S. ports of call and passengers must be allowed to temporarily go to shore at these foreign ports.

These new restrictions would devastate Hawaii's tourist industry. Under the proposed change, a foreign-flagged ship could no longer travel from Honolulu to Kahului without a 48-hour stop at a foreign port, the closest of which is Fanning Island in the Republic of Kiribati, 850 miles south of the Big Island.

According to Hawaii's Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism, if this change goes into effect, it could deplete sales by \$155 million, decrease labor earnings by \$44.4 million and cost Hawaii 1,500 jobs. It would effectively end inter-island cruises as it would leave only one U.S.-flagged carrier, NCL's *The Pride of America*, able to make inter-island stops.

Despite the effect this new interpretation would have here, our Congressional delegation supports this rule change. We must ask why Inouye, Akaka, Abercrombie, and Hirono would "strongly urge [Bureau of Customs and Border Protection] to move expeditiously to implement [this] interpretive rule."

Every other state that is home to a port city with a viable cruise industry

opposes this change, including Florida, Alaska, Washington, Maine and California. This change would cost jobs and decrease revenue across the country.

For example, Miami, Florida is the world's busiest cruise port. In comments submitted to the Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection, Florida's Governor Charlie Crist stated, "The [cruise] industry generated over 125,000 jobs in 2006, and paid \$5 billion in income." He went on to point out that if the rule change is implemented, "Florida would lose cruise port of calls at Ft. Lauderdale, Miami, and would eliminate all the calls in the Key West." The economic hardship felt by this rule change would ripple beyond all the job losses in the state of Florida alone.

Likewise, in Seattle, Washington, the proposed rule change would have similar consequences. "In 2006," writes Mayor Gregory J. Nickels, "751,000 cruise passengers helped generate \$233 million in Seattle's economy, \$6.2 million in state and local taxes, and 1,950 jobs." Mayor Nickels continues by noting, "The proposed interpretation would also severely impact other local businesses that support the cruise industry, including tourism-related companies, such as travel agencies, airlines, hotels, restaurants, and other maritime industries such as food processors and ship repairs."

California Congresswoman, Susan A. Davis points out that "The Port of San Diego's cruise business is an integral part of [the] city's tourism industry, generating \$300 million into [this] region's economy... [therefore,] implementation of this proposed interpretation will result in enormous economic losses to the Port of San Diego and the surrounding region."

Lastly, Alaska's Congressman Don Young urged the Customs and Border Protection to reconsider its interpretation of this rule, "I cannot understate the detrimental impact this rule may have upon the State of Alaska, our investments in waterfront infrastructure, our stakeholders, and the future of Alaska's passenger vessel commerce."

As a former Merchant Marine, I understand how vital U.S.-flagged ships are to our security, but I fail to see the logic of protecting this one ship in Hawaii at the expense of our entire cruise industry. To the contrary, this rule change will cost thousands of Americans their jobs and affected states billions in lost revenue.

In Hawaii, we'll feel it the most. Our Republican State Legislators have introduced a resolution calling for the Department of Homeland Security's Bureau of Customs & Border Protection to reconsider their proposed rule change. Whether we like tourism or not, our state's economy has clearly benefited from the cruise industry. Let's not let Homeland Security "deep six" our inter-island cruise industry and negatively affect thousands of Hawaii's citizens and businesses. The Department of Homeland Security should be careful not to indulge in this type of protectionism under the guise of national security.