

Nussle	Roa-Lehtinen	Stump
Oxley	Roukema	Sundquist
Packard	Royce	Talent
Paxon	Saxton	Taylor (MS)
Petri	Schaefer	Taylor (NC)
Porter	Schiff	Thomas (CA)
Portman	Schroeder	Torkildsen
Fryoe (OH)	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Quillen	Shaw	Vucanovich
Quinn	Shays	Walker
Ramstad	Shuster	Walsh
Ravenel	Skeen	Waldon
Regula	Smith (MI)	Wolf
Ridge	Smith (OR)	Young (AK)
Roberts	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)
Rogers	Solomon	Zelliff
Rohrabacher	Stearns	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—33

Bishop	Goodling	Rahall
Brown (CA)	Henry	Rangel
Castle	Huffington	Rowland
Clay	Hunter	Smith (IA)
Collins (GA)	Johnson (CT)	Spence
Cunningham	Johnson (GA)	Swett
DeFazio	Livingston	Thomas (WV)
DeLay	Machtley	Thompson
Edwards (TX)	McDermott	Tucker
Ford (MI)	Minge	Washington
Gilchrest	Payne (NJ)	Wyden

□ 1227

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LINDER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND TIM STOREY

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

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, we welcome and thank the Reverend Tim Storey of Whittier, CA. The work of Tim Storey Ministries and the Champions International is making a significant difference in the United States and, indeed, the world. Thank you, Reverend Storey, for offering the prayer of the day.

PARTY LOYALTY

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

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, as the Democrats decide how to best punish those who voted against history's largest tax increase, Republicans have decided to support and encourage those who oppose tax-and-spend policies. This is just one more example of the clear difference between many Democrats in this House and Republicans. We believe that when party loyalty su-

persedes loyalty to the American people as a whole, then party loyalty must be abandoned. That was clearly the case for those who opposed President Clinton's tax plan last week.

Eleven Democratic subcommittee chairmen voted against the President's tax increase, and now some of the more diehard taxers in the Democrat caucus want to punish those chairmen for not exhibiting enough loyalty to the Democratic Party. I have questions for those tax raisers. What about loyalty to the American taxpayer? Do they not deserve some loyalty, too? Do they not already pay enough taxes to a government that knows only how to spend?

Mr. Speaker, if these chairmen and others in the Democratic Party feel too much heat from the tax raisers, they should come to the Republican Party. We never oppose those who place loyalty to the American people above their party.

□ 1230

DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IS FREEST PARTY IN COUNTRY

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

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, I take the well because, unfortunately though understandably, the gentleman from Alabama who has just left it is remarkably uninformed about the Democratic caucus and its policies, as well as about its attitudes toward its members and its responsibility to the country.

We have just left a Democratic caucus in which the overwhelming decision was to take no action against any member of the caucus, subcommittee chairmen or other, for any vote that he or she casts on the floor of the House. This action is a clear reflection of its belief that Members of this House, on the Democratic side particularly are the agents of their constituents, of the people who sent them here, of the people who entrust to them the great responsibility and honor of representing them in their districts and in the Halls of this Chamber.

Twenty years ago, I had the opportunity as a member of the caucus to be instrumental in the removal from the caucus rules of the Democratic Party rule R7 which presumed to say that by a two-thirds vote the Democratic caucus could direct the vote of Members on the floor. I take pride in the fact that that antique provision was removed by overwhelming majority 20 years ago. From that time to this day, no Democrat has ever been asked to vote on any matter before this House under threat of retribution, retaliation, or punishment. It remains true, however, that in many State legislatures, there is a dally caucus to decide how members are to vote on the floor. Every member who has served in a Republican legislature knows that. It is

also true of Democrats in State legislatures.

The Democratic Party in the House of Representatives, however, is the freest party in this country in terms of voting one's conscience and judgment on matters of public concern. So let us end this false suggestion that Democrats are being asked to vote under threat of penalty or anything but their judgment and conscience in the service of their constituents.

We get a majority the old-fashioned way. We prevail upon the conscience and judgment of Members to vote for the legislation, and we do not punish those who have other opinions.

REALITY OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY POLITICS

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished Speaker for a cheerful and wonderful version of reality which has little resemblance to the truth as we know it here on the floor.

I would suggest to him that if we would bring back our good friend, Senator PHIL GRAMM, a former colleague, and have him come and visit and explain to us what it was like to have his committee position stripped from him, that he would be glad to talk. I would suggest to him that there are other former Democrats that we could bring in that would be glad to talk. But, of course, it is in the spirit of cordity and last night's picnic to enjoy life, to say things in broad and baroque fashion.

For anyone who believes that no arms were twisted, no threats were made, it is an interesting fantasy, but one I fear does not resemble the brute reality of the House or the legislative process here. I would suggest that any Member or citizen who doubts me to call Senator PHIL GRAMM and ask him what it was like.

TIME FOR A REALITY CHECK

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

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, it is time for a reality check.

Critics on the other side of the aisle say they want something done about the deficit and yet every time the Clinton administration comes up with a new approach, they unite in blind, lockstep opposition.

The reality is that we have a new President who is trying very hard to come to grips with an enormous deficit he inherited from his predecessors.

He has offered a variety of approaches and has shown flexibility in meeting objections raised by members of his own party and by the opposition party. He has established a clear set of principles—we must reduce the deficit

by \$500 billion over the next 5 years and we must do it in a way that does not harm the poor and that encourages investment in our future.

President Clinton has called for a mix of spending cuts and tax increases that achieve this goal. He has demonstrated that he is willing to listen to the critics of his specific approaches and to make accommodations that will increase the amount of spending cuts and make his program fairer to farmers and the middle class. All we hear from the other side of the aisle is blind, mindless opposition.

Madam Speaker, I am proud that we have a President who is working hard to devise a package of read deficit reduction. Let us all keep working with him. The country needs our help.

FREE THE BONIOR FOUR

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

Mr. PAXON. Madam Speaker, this is in response and discussion of the Speaker's comments.

On May 30, just after the House vote on the Clinton tax bill, the Associated Press carried this story:

By the time the vote was over, Bonior said there were four other unidentified lawmakers prepared to vote "yes" who were freed to vote "no" because they were not needed.

"Four in the hole, as we say," Bonior said. My colleagues, American taxpayers deserve to know the truth about the majority whip's comments.

Which of the 38 Democrats who voted "no" were "in the hole," in the pocket of Mr. BONIOR, Majority Leader GARHARDT, and Speaker PAXON?

Which of the Democrats, who voted "no", were committed in secret to vote "yes"?

And, on the most important taxation vote ever, did those Democrats who committed in secret to vote "yes" then issue press releases extolling their independence and courage for opposing the very Clinton taxes they were pledged to support?

Until we know the names of the Bonior four, constituents of all 38 Democrats who voted "no" will wonder.

So, Republicans will keep pressing.
Free the Bonior four.

RECONCILIATION

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, let us make it plain what happened 10 days ago. The Democrats had 38 Members who were willing to vote their districts whereas on the Republican side of the aisle they obviously did not have the freedom to vote their districts because they voted lockstep for continued gridlock.

Over the past couple of weeks, we have been working on the most important bill to come before this Congress this year. That bill is the Reconciliation Act of 1993. As a freshman and as a Representative of an energy State such as Texas the issue of the Btu tax has caused this to be one of the most difficult decisions I have made during my short time in Washington.

However, during these past few weeks, the President has made a great effort to answer some of my concerns with this bill. I am confident that my concerns have been heard by President Clinton and will be addressed during Senate deliberations. The administration has made a good faith effort to eliminate some of the effects of the Btu tax and maybe the tax itself. With these changes in place I will continue to support the President in his efforts to reduce the deficit and create a more equitable tax structure.

Let me mention some favorable items in the bill.

It reduces the deficit by \$500 billion over 5 years.

It contains 200 specific cuts that result in \$100 billion in savings.

Seventy-five percent of all new taxes are paid by the wealthy.

People whose incomes are over \$100,000.

It helps small business by allowing a \$25,000 deduction for the purchase of new equipment.

It increases the earned income tax credit so a person who works 40 hours a week and has a child will not live in poverty.

It reinstates the targeted jobs tax credit which helps hard-to-employ persons get jobs.

It eliminates tax deductions for lobbyists.

The real estate market in Texas has continued to remain in a slump since the mid-1980's. The economic plan contains passive loss real estate provisions that will help our sagging real estate markets.

It increases funding for childhood immunization by \$2.1 billion.

It caps deductibility on executive compensation at \$1 million.

JOB CREATION AND BILL CLINTON

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Madam Speaker, according to the latest Department of Labor statistics, the unemployment rate dropped to 6.9 percent last month. That is not great, but it is an improvement.

I urge President Bill Clinton and the Democratic majority to take steps to ensure that this recovery continues.

Don't do anything that will hurt this recovery. Let the private sector work for all Americans.

Don't levy the largest tax increase in history, and stifle future economic growth.

Don't pass more Government regulations and unfunded mandates which will slowly but surely strangle private enterprise and small business. Don't pass stricter replacement legislation which will replace job creation with strikes, and hurt our competitiveness.

Don't spend more money, which will only increase our national debt and spur inflation.

In other words, don't set on your Big Government agenda, which will stall our recovery and kill jobs. Don't kill our economic recovery.

EL 1249

CLOSE DOWN THE HIV PRISON CAMP

(Mrs. MEEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK. Madam Speaker, I applaud the decision of U.S. District Court Judge Sterling Johnson to order the release of more than 150 Haitians who are imprisoned at Guantanamo Bay. Their only crime is to be infected with AIDS. They deserve our compassion, but their reception was cold and callous. They sought freedom from persecution, but only found a prison.

Even a former commander of the camp expressed the view that these people, who include pregnant women and children, should be allowed to come to the United States. It is an absurd policy that forces us to expend considerable resources in keeping these people at Guantanamo.

I have written to President Clinton and to Attorney General Reno urging them not to appeal Judge Johnson's ruling. Many of these Haitians have relatives in the United States and they should be allowed to join their families.

Let us close down what Judge Johnson called the "HIV prison camp." It is a disgrace that we who pride ourselves on justice, compassion, and freedom should turn away persons who have demonstrated a credible fear of persecution merely because they are ill.

Madam Speaker, I appeal to the President and the Attorney General. We all are God's children.

AN INVITATION TO THE DEMOCRATS

(Mr. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it appears that Democrats in the House have adopted a new motto for their party, "Don't get mad, get even."

At least that is the impression I get from reports that House Democrats were seeking ways to punish those members who had the courage to buck their party leadership and vote for their districts and against the largest tax increase in history.

It is outrageous that the party founded by Thomas Jefferson would stoop to strong-arm tactics that are more properly identified with the old Soviet Union, where party leaders really knew how to deal with uncooperative members.

For my part, I have never been prouder to be a Republican, a party in which members can vote their conscience without fear of blacklisting reprisals.

It must be hard to be a Democrat these days. So let me extend an invitation to all my colleagues on the other side who cast a vote for fiscal sanity and are now unwelcome as leaders in their own party: to leave the Democrat's pup tent and come join us Republicans in our big tent. Everyone is welcome to represent the true interest of their constituents.

IMMIGRATION COMMISSIONER NEEDED

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Madam Speaker, the Nation is facing many aggravating and painful problems concerning immigration and asylum. There is massive illegal entry into the Nation across the southern border. There is massive effort to smuggle people into the country, and most recently we have seen it in the form of the Chinese nationals who came in by ship into New York Harbor and San Francisco Bay.

There are hundreds of thousands of pending cases seeking asylum, some of which, many of which, are unfounded and invalid, and yet they clog up the court system and the administrative process denying court time and administrative time to people with valid claims of asylum.

Despite the fact that we are 5 months into the administration and despite the aggravating and persistent problems we have, we still do not have a Commissioner for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I have communicated with the Attorney General urging her to quickly assign someone that very difficult job.

I would hope that that Commissioner could be nominated and confirmed soon by the Senate. It is important to set good national policy in the immigration field, and for that we need an Immigration Commissioner.

THANKS BUT NO THANKS

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, well, after asking, begging, cajoling, and threatening his way to House passage of the largest tax increase in history, President Bill Clinton has backed away from his Btu tax.

Basically, he is saying to his House allies: "Thanks, but no thanks."

You have to wonder if this President ever means what he says.

I can only say to those who voted against history's largest tax increase: Do not worry. Be happy.

Do not worry, because you vote against the President may turn out to be a vote for the President once he finishes shifting his position.

Be happy, because voting against the largest tax increase in history is the right thing to do.

And if you are having difficulty with your own caucus because of your vote, let me say this: The Republican Party does not punish those who oppose tax increases. And we accept all who are unhappy with Bill Clinton's tax and spend economic program.

SUPPORT THE 1994 BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, as the 1994 budget resolution awaits passage in the Senate, I urge my colleagues and their constituents to be mindful of its benefits and not the rhetoric of its detractors.

I stand before you today seeking maximum support and consideration of those who stand to gain the most by the passage of the President's economic proposal and not those who gain headlines by opposing it.

We must remember the millions of children who go hungry each day and whose health is at risk due to lack of proper immunization.

We must remember those who want to work but lack the opportunity and training to do so.

We must remember that a fair tax system is one which works for all and not just for a chosen few.

Mr. Speaker, we must never forget that if we are to see long-term economic growth we must be willing to accept the short-term consequences of redirecting our spending priorities.

CUT SPENDING FIRST

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased to hear this morning that President Clinton has abandoned the Btu tax. This hidden tax off energy would have hit my constituents in Michigan particularly hard. Estimates of its annual cost to Michigan families ranged from \$219 to over \$400.

The President should now take the next step and make clear that the tax is replaced with spending cuts, not a new tax. This can and should be done. This is what the American people want.

The Btu tax was slated to raise just over \$70 billion in revenues over 5 years. If the earned income tax credit increase—which was designed to offset the impact of the Btu on the poor—is removed from the plan, only \$40 billion in spending cuts is needed. This is approximately \$8 billion more in cuts in each of the next 5 years, considerably less than 1 percent of the spending that is scheduled to occur in the current budget plan.

This is an excellent opportunity for the president to show he is truly moving back to the political center. As my constituents put it "cut spending first."

OUR HISTORIC BUDGET PACKAGE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives recently passed a historic budget package that will cut the national debt by half a trillion dollars in the next 5 years. This package represents a bold restructuring of our economy to make economic growth possible after 12 years of policies that sapped our economic strength.

Few people now remember that in 1981, former President Ronald Reagan promised to eliminate the country's annual budget deficit by 1984.

But instead, during 12 years of Reagan-Bush policies, the national debt climbed from \$1.1 trillion to \$4 trillion. Interest payments on this debt alone cost the Nation nearly \$300 billion a year—about 13 percent of total yearly Federal spending.

When this House passed a budget package, we voted to take \$250 billion in Federal spending cuts and \$250 billion in new revenues and apply them toward the deficit over the next 5 years—reducing it by \$500 billion. We have started on the road to fiscal responsibility.

The Clinton economic package is a tough-minded approach to the economy and cutting the deficit. The result will be a stronger economy, more opportunity for job creation and investment, and a far brighter future for our children.

LIMIT JUDICIAL INTERFERENCE IN PRISONS

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

Mr. CANADY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Prison Litigation Relief Act of 1993.

This legislation is designed to diminish the role of the Federal courts in prisons and jails.

In the name of inmate rights—the courts have imposed burdensome requirements on prisons in 40 States, the

District of Columbia, and two territories.

They have mandated population caps on facilities, forcing the early release of dangerous criminals.

Such releases are contrary to both justice and deterrence.

Law-abiding citizens have the right to have criminals serve the full prison terms to which they have been sentenced.

Courts should not shorten those sentences by capping prison populations.

And, courts should not prohibit prisons from using reasonable housing alternatives such as tents and prefabricated structures for housing inmates.

If such accommodations are good enough for our soldiers, then they are certainly good enough for convicted criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support the Prison Litigation Relief Act of 1993.

OUR CONSTITUENTS AND OUR COUNTRY MUST COME FIRST

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, when a Member of Congress would have to look over their shoulder when they cast a vote, our great democracy will certainly be in danger. In fact, when any American walks into a jury room or a ballot box, no one shall either try to influence, intimidate, or coerce that vote.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a subcommittee chairman who voted "no" on that tax bill, because I believed it was bad for the country. Our first loyalty in Congress should be to our country, and in my opinion, if the bill was bad for America, none of us would help our young President by casting a vote for it.

Let me remind the Members of Congress: If you do not have the guts and courage to vote "no" when it is necessary, your "yes" vote means nothing, and that is what is wrong with our country.

I support the President, but I did not support that bill, and I am not going to vote on any bill that I believe is bad for the country.

When it is a choice between the Democrat Party and what is good for my constituents and the country, the party is going to lose every damn time.

□ 1250

PRESIDENT CLINTON WOULD TAX MORE OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, America's senior citizens will soon realize that President Clinton's tax package has a

\$29 billion tax increase on Social Security.

That is right, \$29 billion which our senior citizens will have to pay. But get this: This huge tax increase is not called a tax increase, President Clinton is calling it a spending cut.

President Clinton said that senior citizens' Social Security will have to be taxed to as much as 85 percent of their benefits.

The President says, "Where else can we cut?" Yesterday in our Committee on Foreign Affairs we looked at the State Department. The State Department is bloated, bloated, bloated. They have as many as 100 senior people with no duties, only huge salaries.

Yesterday I had an amendment to cut funding on the State Department by 10 percent. But the Democrats said "No." Why? Because the Democrats will tax Social Security but they will not cut the bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, the American people's message to Congress must continue to be, "Cut spending first."

SUNS WAGER TO THE CHICAGO DELEGATION

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

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention a very important event beginning this evening. The Phoenix Suns, in their first NBA finals appearance since 1976, face off at home tonight against the Chicago Bulls. On the eve of Phoenix's first-ever NBA championship, I challenge my good friends from the Cook County delegation to a wager. If the Bulls win, the Arizona members of Congress will treat the Chicago delegation to an authentic, delicious dinner from Arizona's Mexican restaurant, Oaxaca. When, as expected, Phoenix Suns and Charles Barkley scorch the Bulls, my good friends from the State of Illinois can treat the Arizona delegation to a juicy steak dinner from Morton's Steakhouse of Chicago.

It is only fair to warn you, before you take up my offer, that the Suns boast a dazzling lineup including all-star Dan Majerle and the league's most valuable player, Charles Barkley. In the seventh game of the Western finals, Sir Charles scored 44 points with 24 rebounds. The Suns also have the best season record in the NBA and lead the league in postseason scoring. But I welcome the challenge from my Chicago colleagues, if you are up to it.

The fans of Phoenix and the great State of Arizona are revved up and ready to cheer their team to victory. My good friends from the State of Illinois, I hope you are ready to hand over our steak dinner. I am sorry to say there is no three-peat in store for Chicago.

PASS FEDERAL FOOD INSURANCE REFORMS BEFORE THE NEXT HURRICANE DISASTER

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to issue a hurricane warning here this morning. While I address all the House I want to focus my remarks to those Members who come from Atlantic and Gulf Coast States.

We have had bad hurricanes lately. Andrew, the one that hit Charleston. But in reality we have been told by scientists that we have been at a lull. Now next year, according to a well-known atmospheric scientist who has a good track record, we can expect 11 hurricanes in the United States. Seven will be sufficiently intense that they can be named.

The bad news, Members, is we have \$36 million in the National Flood Insurance Program. An average intense hurricane can wipe out half a billion dollars in funds. FEMA estimates that we have, as of March, \$200 million and they are going to have to borrow money from the Federal Government to pay for floods in May in the Southwestern and Plains States.

Last year this Member along with Congressmen Erdreich and Carper brought a flood insurance reform bill to this floor. It passed here 388 to 18. Senator KERRY of the other body did an excellent job trying to bring that legislation, or its counterpart, to the other body. But it was blocked by one man.

I warn my colleagues we are going to have to take this reform because we are paying for unnecessary expensive replacement of structures all up and down our coasts. We have got a problem and we ought to face up to it now. I ask my colleagues on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs to move the legislation.

According to the scientific community, the coastal States are likely to experience many more storms, of the same magnitude as 1992's Hurricane Andrew, over the next 25 years. This prediction has also been made by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

During the last Congress, the House passed a flood insurance reform bill by an overwhelming vote of 388-18. Despite the many efforts by Senator JOHN KERRY of Massachusetts, the Senate failed to pass a similar bill.

This Member urges, even warns, his colleagues on the House Banking Committee and his counterparts in the other body to take action in this Congress and put reforms in place before the next hurricane wreaks havoc on our coastlines and depletes the National Flood Insurance Fund.

Thank you.

DING DONG THE BTU TAX IS DEAD

(Mr. TAUZIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. **TAUZIN**. Mr. Speaker, ding dong the tax is dead; which old tax? The Btu. Ding dong the Btu is dead.

There will be real celebration among many areas of this country to know that Secretary Bontsen declared last night about midnight that the Btu tax is officially dead and there are many in this House who are grateful for that declaration.

We are not yet certain what the Senate will produce in its place, but at least this first step toward improving the President's economic plan is apparently accomplished. At least this bad idea of a Btu tax has finally been put to sleep.

CLINTON'S TAX BILL: WHERE IS CLINTON'S TAX CUT?

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

Mr. **BAKER** of California. Mr. Speaker, "I have a plan to get this economy moving and it starts with a middle class tax cut." These were the refreshing words of candidate Bill Clinton on the campaign trail, the candidate who believed that tax cuts led to economic growth.

This statement reflects an understanding of economics and the responsiveness to public opinion.

However, now that he is in office President Clinton has forgotten what got him elected and is breaking his promises in order to pay for more big spending programs. Just when the economy is emerging from a recession caused in part by high taxes the President proposes to slam the brakes on the recovery with his tax bill. This tax package will reduce productivity and consumption, which will slow down a gradually recovering economy and cause another recession.

Last Saturday voters in Texas overwhelmingly supported **KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON**, rejecting **BOB KREUGER** and the tax and spend policies he represented. Yesterday in the city of Los Angeles where Democrats outnumber Republicans 61 percent to 25 percent, the Republican candidate won by 10 percent. As Democrat candidates try to distance themselves from a job-killing energy tax, a levy on seniors' Social Security benefits, and a hefty increase in income taxes, the voice of the people is being heard.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Senate to protect our constituents from the largest tax increase in the history of our country, President Clinton's tax plan. Let us cut Government spending further and give middle-class Americans the break that candidate Clinton promised them.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. **MAZZOLI**). The Chair would take this moment to announce that under House rules Members of the House should not urge nor ask for action in the other body.

PEOPLE HAVE BAD MOTIVES WHEN THEY HAVE GUNS: THEY KILL

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

Mr. **SCHUMER**. Mr. Speaker, the National Rifle Association, the NRA, proclaims "Guns don't kill, people do."

Let me mention and share with you two incidents that occurred in my city that show the speciousness of the NRA's claim.

In one a 42-year-old schoolteacher was riding his bicycle in the park. Four young thugs tried to take the bicycle away from him. He resisted and as he rode away they shot him in the back, dead. He leaves a wife and two children as our whole community mourns.

In the second incident a young man in the other part of town, a 16-year-old, cried out as some thugs approached him "Don't kill me, don't kill me." The youth, **Andre Sarvis**, cried out as he was about to be shot, an eyewitness said, "But they shot him."

In each case, Mr. Speaker, there were bad people around. If the four youths in Prospect Park did not have guns the teacher would have rode away safely. If the young people, the young punks who shot this young man did not have guns, there might have been a black eye, perhaps even a broken nose, not a weeping family.

I would say to the NRA: People have bad motives, when they have guns they kill.

□ 1300

CONGRATULATIONS TO NEW YORK'S WESTHILL, A "BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL"

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

Mr. **WALSH**. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the educators, administrators, students, and parents from the Westhill School District who have recently been honored by the U.S. Department of Education as a "Blue Ribbon School."

Not only is Westhill in my 25th District of New York, it is the school district in which I live. My son goes to Westhill Senior High School and my wife Dede and I have been very impressed with the attitude of the teaching team at Westhill. We and our neighbors are not surprised to learn of this tremendous recognition.

This honor, for outstanding excellence in a variety of areas, comes on the heels of another honor for Westhill. Last year it was named by Redbook magazine as one of the top 140 high schools in the country.

Asked for a response by a local newspaper, Principal **Richard Cavallaro** properly gave credit to the students and faculty at Westhill who have established a team attitude that works. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating everyone at Westhill for this important and significant achievement.

I am very proud to represent these champions of education.

HEALTH CARE REFORM POLICY IN PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. **DE LUGO**. Mr. Speaker, my office has been told by the White House that health care reform policy advisors at the highest levels are recommending to the President that the U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico and the territories not be fully included in the national proposal because of the cost of Puerto Rico. They tell me the insular areas would have to meet employer mandates on health insurance, requiring every employer and employee to pay into the system, but would not be fully eligible for subsidies under the national program for the poor, unemployed, and the lower income.

What kind of policy is this? Puerto Rico and the territories are in, but they are out? Resident aliens on the mainland will have more rights and more benefits than the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other U.S. territories.

Why? Because Puerto Rico costs too much. Is this how we set health care policy? Is this how we treat American citizens in our Nation's territories?

As chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the insular areas, I hope the President and the First Lady will not listen to advisors who say discriminate against medically needy U.S. citizens because it is just too much trouble to treat them fairly.

TIME FOR PARTISAN HAGGLING TO STOP

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

Mr. **HOKE**. Mr. Speaker, I was very concerned to find recently that certain Democratic Members of the Congress who refused to support the President's economic program due to excessive tax increases and a lack of spending cuts might be punished, have been threatened with punishment by the House Democratic leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the partisan haggling to stop. The American people did not elect us to be Democrats first or Republicans first, but to be Americans first. They want us to put partisan politics aside and work on a bipartisan basis to build a brighter future for America.

Threatening subcommittee chairmen by the Democratic leadership in this Congress because they happened to vote their conscience for their districts in a way that was consistent with their own beliefs is not the way to put partisan bickering aside.

In sending Mr. Clinton to the White House, the American people endorsed a self-proclaimed new Democrat who sought to reduce Government spending, create jobs, decrease the tax burden on working Americans and support a balanced budget amendment.

As the President has abandoned these central themes of his campaign, his popularity has plummeted. Americans no longer have confidence in his ability to stimulate the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, in order to regain the support and the confidence of the American people, the President has to return to the principles of his campaign, the themes that he was elected on. As he moves to reduce the tax burden faced by working Americans, implement a balanced budget amendment and reduce Government spending, my colleagues and I pledge to fully support him.

Mr. Speaker, let us work together to create hope and opportunity for working Americans.

LYME DISEASE AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this week is Lyme Disease Awareness Week. It is part of a national effort to educate people about how they can protect themselves against this tragic disease. It also underscores the urgent need for increased funding to develop a more reliable test for diagnosis, a more effective treatment, and—eventually—a cure.

Last year, nearly 10,000 people were diagnosed with Lyme disease—many of them in my home State of New Jersey. Nationwide this is an increase of 2.2 percent from 1991. And the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) estimates that this number may be deceptively low because so many cases go unreported or misdiagnosed each year.

Lyme disease is more than physically debilitating; it leaves its victims and loved ones emotionally drained as well. I represent the two most highly endemic counties in New Jersey and I have witnessed the devastating effects of this illness. During its active stages, individuals suffering with Lyme disease literally cannot function. They are crippled by extreme fatigue and disabling headaches.

Some of the most heartbreaking accounts that I have witnessed are of the young people stricken with Lyme. In Jackson Township, for instance, 170 students were diagnosed with Lyme disease last year—100 of them in the township middle school. Several of these children were so ill that they required home instruction. It takes little to recognize the staggering impact that such an illness makes on a young person's life.

To add insult to injury, this disease is enormously expensive. In addition to the numerous prescription drugs required—some of which cost up to \$550, patients require frequent lab tests and medical examinations by rheumatologists, neurologists, and general practitioners. IV therapy—recommended by many doctors as the most effective treatment—often leaves Lyme patients with thousands of dollars in medical bills.

Too often, insurance companies—operating on a strict policy of no more than 4 weeks of IV therapy—dump these bills right into the laps of the Lyme patients. In New Jersey, where we commemorated Lyme Disease Awareness Month in May, legislation is moving through the legislature to end this narrow-minded policy by requiring insurers to provide benefits for care deemed medically necessary by the attending physician. I highly commend this effort.

Lyme disease, which was early on believed to be a regionalized and low-key illness, has now spread to every State but Alaska and Montana. Nearly 50,000 cases of Lyme disease have been reported to the CDC since 1982, when the CDC began to record such data. New Jersey remains ranked highly on the list of those States most affected. Over the past year, I have held meetings, and facilitated public meetings with top researchers from the NIH and CDC as well as community activists and New Jersey officials in an effort to get the word out on Lyme disease and keep the gears moving smoothly toward an eventual cure.

Mr. Speaker, we must do more to educate people about Lyme disease, to expand preventative measures and tick control, and to increase research for Lyme disease. Yet, funding for Lyme research remains static and scattered among several Federal agencies. The consensus in the medical and research communities is that better methods are needed for diagnosis, treatment, and prevention—it is up to us to act on this recommendation.

ARE THE DEMOCRATS LISTENING?

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, the polls are closed. The ballots have been counted and the whole State of Texas is speaking.

Are the liberal Democrats who control both Houses of Congress listening? Is the White House listening?

The election of a novice Republican businessman as mayor of Los Angeles, the 2 to 1 victory of the Republican candidate for the Senate in Texas are symbolic of a revolution sweeping our country.

The American people do not want any more taxes taken out of their take-home pay. They do not want to be taxed at the gas pump. They do not want to have taxes passed on to them hidden in the price of everything they buy as a result of supposedly taxing big business.

No new taxes. Read their lips. They mean it.

Ignore the voters at your own peril.

IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT TO CUT 25 PERCENT FROM CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, the voice of the American people slowly but surely is penetrating the walls of this Congress of ours.

Today we read that the White House is apparently throwing in the towel on the Btu tax. It appears that the people's message is sinking in. Cut spending first.

I believe Americans see things pretty accurately in this historic budget debate. They see they are not undertaxed. They see that spending can be cut and cut boldly, and they see that right now Congress is not leading the way.

Instead, some in the Congress of this United States want to punish those who are not voting for big tax increases.

Well, this week we have a chance to show the American people that the U.S. House of Representatives is willing and able to lead by example and make bold cuts in our own overgrown bureaucracy.

We can do this by passing an amendment to cut 25 percent from congressional committee budgets.

We should cut spending first, Mr. Speaker, and we should first cut spending here in the Congress.

INTRODUCTION OF CAMPAIGN REFORM BILL

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced legislation to reform certain activities in Congress and the way this House conducts its campaigns. A major goal of this measure is to change the way candidates raise money.

My bill treats PAC's exactly the same as individuals, projects the same limits. It requires that 90 percent of

candidates' contributions from within the candidate's State and 60 percent from the district which the candidate seeks to represent.

To remove the overwhelming incumbent advantage, and occasional abuse of free mail, my bill cuts franking budgets by 50 percent and prohibits bulk mailing within 180 days of an election.

Other provisions include banning soft money, denying tax deductions for lobbying activities, and prohibiting lobbyist paid travel for members and staff.

Last but not least, the bill includes term limitation language * * * unquestionably the most popular campaign reform idea in America today.

These provisions add up to real campaign reform that removes the undue influence of special interests, gives campaigns back to the voters a candidate has to face who he wishes to represent. It levels the playing field.

It will be a real Fourth of July present for America. I urge support.

NO RIGHT WAY TO DO THE WRONG THING

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no right way to do the wrong thing.

Not long ago this House passed by a margin of 219 to 218 a provision that would provide the biggest tax increase in the history of our country. That bill went over to the Senate and on to the President. The President and the Senate started to look for other ways to do it, because they say they want to get it right.

This morning in the Washington Post I read about a B-Be tax. I guess that stands for broad-based energy tax.

We hear from time to time about a VAT tax.

We hear from time to time about increasing income taxes even more than was proposed here on the floor.

Whether you do an increase in the income tax, a VAT tax, a B-Be tax, call it what you will, there simply is no right way to do the wrong thing.

□ 1230

BTU MEANS BILL'S TAXES, UNLIMITED

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, Btu stands for Bill's Taxes, Unlimited. My colleagues, perhaps we should have some type of a game show called "Tax of the Week," or "Tax of the Day" or "Name That Tax," and they could open up screen No. 1, and they could have this tax; screen No. 2, this tax; and screen No. 3, that tax, and the grand prize of all is the biggest tax.

And now we have the biggest taxers saying, "I'm not really going to suggest what type of tax the Democratic majority comes up with, just my broad-based plan, and the Democrats can choose what type of tax they will give to the American taxpayer."

Mr. Speaker, the people back home are saying they have had enough taxes, they have had enough arm twisting set forth in the Washington Post, and they want their taxes decreased, they do not want them increased.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MAYOR-ELECT RICHARD RIORDAN

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I take the well this afternoon to extend congratulations to the newly elected mayor of the city of Los Angeles, Richard Riordan. Mr. Riordan is a very successful businessman who was elected in large part on his commitment to bring a businesslike sense to the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that over the past several years Los Angeles has been one of the most troubled cities in our country due to racial problems, outbacks in the defense and aerospace industries, and a wide range of other things. We need to have a new direction, and it seems to me that in the acceptance speech which he gave last night Mr. Riordan clearly stated where it is we want to go.

Mr. Speaker, he said:

Together we can deal with the problems of crime and drug trafficking. Together we can deal with the economic problems that we face in southern California. Together we can deal with the problems of education. There are a wide range of things that need to be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I wish mayor-elect Riordan well as he takes on a very, very formidable challenge.

REPUBLICANS IN LOCKSTEP WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, one Member of the majority party earlier in the 1-minute suggested that Republicans, because they voted unanimously against the tax increase, were forced into that position.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that that Member is not familiar with the facts and spoke only in emotion because the fact is I am the guy who counts heads on the Republican side, and I can assure that Member that absolutely no one on the Republican side was forced to vote against the tax increase.

In fact, the Republicans recognized that we were on the same wave length with the American people, and every Republican realized that what they were doing was voting in lockstep with

the American people, and so there was no attempt to force them to vote in lockstep with the Republican leadership. We were in lockstep with where the American people were, and Republicans proudly voted against the tax increase because they recognized that Americans are already taxed too much.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SHANNON GRAY

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment this morning to congratulate a very courageous young woman in my district who has taken on considerable odds to stand up for what she believes in.

This afternoon, Shannon Gray of Wolfson High School in Jacksonville, FL, will participate in her high school class graduation. She has stood up for the right of school children across this country to exercise their constitutional freedom of speech and choose to have a voluntary prayer as part of their graduation ceremony.

As a result of her initiative and the vote of a clear majority of her classmates, the graduating class of 1993 will be able to acknowledge the role that faith has played in their achievement. For them, the ceremony will be complete.

On Monday, the Supreme Court ruled that nonsectarian, student-initiated prayer could be included as part of public school graduation ceremonies. This was a welcome recognition by the Court that freedom of religion, not from religion, should be the standard for church-state relations.

Shannon Gray, her classmates, and students like her throughout this country have moved our Nation closer to a recognition of the appropriate role of religion in our society. I congratulate them on their graduation and this special achievement.

\$459,000 DOWN THE DRAIN

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times reported today that the U.S. Public Health Service has spent over \$4 million in the last 5 years sending its employees to the International AIDS Conference.

This week, 131 employees are attending at an average cost of \$3,500 per person.

These conferences really have been little more than taxpayer-funded vacations for bureaucrats.

The conferences have taken place in Montreal, San Francisco, Florence, Italy, Amsterdam, and now Berlin.

This week the Public Health Service is sending \$459,000 down the drain on this meeting.

The leading British scientific journal Nature said this week that "the AIDS conferences have outlived their usefulness" and "should be stopped."

In the same magazine, Dr. John Moore, of the Aaron Diamond AIDS Research Center in New York, wrote:

The International AIDS meeting has long since shot its bolt as a worthwhile forum for debate—it is far too large, unfocused, and glibly . . .

All over this country people want us to stop wasting so much tax money.

Yet many Federal bureaucrats know they are so protected by the civil service system that they can do anything they please, no matter how much it costs.

Four or five people could have easily represented the United States at this conference and brought back any worthwhile information.

This is a ridiculous waste of taxpayer funds. But next year we will spend hundreds of thousands more on this annual holiday. Next year it will be a junket to Japan.

PASSENGER VESSEL SAFETY ACT OF 1993

The **SPEAKER pro tempore** (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to House Resolution 172 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill; H.R. 1159.

□ 1316

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1159) to revise, clarify, and improve certain marine safety laws of the United States, and for other purposes, with Mr. TORRICELLI (chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The **CHAIRMAN pro tempore**. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, May 24, 1993, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered as read. The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:
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 "Passenger Vessel Safety Act of 1993".

The **CHAIRMAN pro tempore**. Are there any amendments to section 1?

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text under the rule be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The **CHAIRMAN pro tempore**. In their objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection. The text of the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

SEC. 2. PASSENGER.
Section 2101(21) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(21) 'passenger'—
"(A) means an individual carried on the vessel except—

"(i) the owner or an individual representative of the owner or in the case of a vessel under charter, an individual charterer or individual representative of the charterer;

"(ii) the master; or

"(iii) a member of the crew engaged in the business of the vessel who has not contributed consideration for carriage and who is paid for on board services.

"(B) on an offshore supply vessel, means an individual carried on the vessel except—

"(i) an individual included in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph;

"(ii) an employee of the owner, or of a subcontractor to the owner, engaged in the business of the owner;

"(iii) an employee of the charterer, or of a subcontractor to the charterer, engaged in the business of the charterer; or

"(iv) an individual employed in a phase of exploration, exploitation, or production of offshore mineral or energy resources served by the vessel.

"(C) on a fishing vessel, fish processing vessel, or fish tender vessel, means an individual carried on the vessel except—

"(i) an individual included in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph;

"(ii) a managing operator;

"(iii) an employee of the owner, or of a subcontractor to the owner, engaged in the business of the owner; or

"(iv) an employee of the charterer, or of a subcontractor to the charterer, engaged in the business of the charterer.

"(D) on a sailing school vessel, means an individual carried on the vessel except—

"(i) an individual included in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph;

"(ii) an employee of the owner of the vessel engaged in the business of the owner, except when the vessel is operating under a demise charter;

"(iii) an employee of the demise charterer of the vessel engaged in the business of the demise charterer; or

"(iv) a sailing school instructor or sailing school student."

SEC. 3. PASSENGER VESSEL.
Section 2101(22) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(22) 'passenger vessel' means a vessel of at least 100 gross tons—

"(A) carrying more than 12 passengers, including at least one passenger for hire;

"(B) that is chartered and carrying more than 12 passengers; or

"(C) that is a submersible vessel carrying at least one passenger for hire."

SEC. 4. SMALL PASSENGER VESSEL.
Section 2101(35) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(35) 'small passenger vessel' means a vessel of less than 100 gross tons—

"(A) carrying more than 6 passengers, including at least one passenger for hire;

"(B) that is chartered with the crew provided or specified by the owner or the owner's representative and carrying more than 6 passengers;

"(C) that is chartered with no crew provided or specified by the owner or the owner's representative and carrying more than 12 passengers; or

"(D) that is a submersible vessel carrying at least one passenger for hire."

SEC. 5. UNINSPECTED PASSENGER VESSEL.
Section 2101(42) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(42) 'uninspected passenger vessel' means an uninspected vessel—

"(A) of at least 100 gross tons—

"(i) carrying not more than 12 passengers, including at least one passenger for hire; or

"(ii) that is chartered with the crew provided or specified by the owner or the owner's representative and carrying not more than 12 passengers; and

"(B) of less than 100 gross tons—

"(i) carrying not more than 6 passengers, including at least one passenger for hire; or

"(ii) that is chartered with the crew provided or specified by the owner or the owner's representative and carrying not more than 6 passengers."

SEC. 6. PASSENGER FOR HIRE.
Section 2101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting between paragraphs (21) and (22) a new paragraph (21a) to read as follows:

"(21a) 'passenger for hire' means a passenger for whom consideration is contribution as a condition of carriage on the vessel, whether directly or indirectly flowing to the owner, charterer, operator, agent, or any other person having an interest in the vessel."

SEC. 7. CONSIDERATION.
Section 2101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting between paragraphs (5) and (6) a new paragraph (5a) to read as follows:

"(5a) 'consideration' means an economic benefit, inducement, right, or profit including pecuniary payment accruing to an individual, person, or entity; but not including a voluntary sharing of the actual expenses of the voyage, by monetary contribution or donation of fuel, food, beverage, or other supplies."

SEC. 8. OFFSHORE SUPPLY VESSEL.
Section 2101(19) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting "individuals in addition to the crew," immediately after "supplies," and by striking everything after "resources" to the period of the end.

SEC. 9. SAILING SCHOOL VESSEL.
Section 2101(36) of title 46, United States Code, is amended in subparagraph (B) by striking "at least 6" and substituting "more than 6".

SEC. 10. SUBMERSIBLE VESSEL.
Section 2101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting between paragraphs (37) and (38) a new paragraph (37a) to read as follows:

"(37a) 'submersible vessel' means a vessel that is capable of operating below the surface of the water."

SEC. 11. GENERAL PROVISIONS.
(a) Section 2113 of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2113. Authority to exempt certain vessels
"If the Secretary decides that the application of a provision of part B, C, F, or G of this subtitle is not necessary in performing the mission of the vessel engaged in excursions or an oceanographic research vessel, or not necessary for the safe operation of certain passenger vessels, the Secretary by regulation may—

"(1) for an excursion vessel, issue a special permit specifying the conditions of operation and equipment;

"(2) exempt an oceanographic research vessel from that provision under conditions the Secretary may specify; and

"(3) establish different operating and equipment requirements for vessels defined in section 2101(42)(A) of this title."

(b) Section 4105 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" before the text; and

(2) by adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Section 4105 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" before the text; and

(2) by adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Section 4105 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" before the text; and

(2) by adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows: