

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, due to a delay in the flight from my congressional district, I was unavoidably detained and thus was unable to vote on rollcall vote 156. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately my plane was delayed and I missed the vote on H.R. 1420, the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act. Had I been here to vote, I would have supported the bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to return to Washington, DC, today due to a death in my family and missed the following vote:

Rollcall vote No. 156, passage of the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act (H.R. 1420). Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1438

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 1438.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent Resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) "A concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002." and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and appoints Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. LAUTENBERG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XX and at the direction of the Committee on the Budget, I move to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

In an effort to try to move this along, Mr. Speaker, there really is not a reason, I do not believe, to get into any kind of protracted debate or discussion here. This is just no more than an effort to go to a conference, a conference that I have labeled the fait accompli conference.

There is not a whole lot that has to be done. We have an agreement between the administration and the Congress of the United States, and frankly we ought to get about it. We ought to get it done this week, which we will get done this week.

Just in a nutshell, I think we do need to know that this will provide for us the first balanced budget since 1969, since Neal Armstrong walked on the Moon. It will be the largest amount of entitlement savings. It will be the first balanced budget since 1969. It would also contain over the next decade about \$700 billion in savings in mandatory spending, including very significant reforms of Medicare. The Medicare savings will be approximately the same amount of savings that the Republicans proposed in 1995.

It will also have some structural changes. It is not just about dollars. There will be some adjustment between the rural and urban reimbursements as part of the ability to give our senior citizens more choice.

Furthermore, it will now begin to pay the skilled nursing facilities and home health care providers a prospective amount, similar to how the hospitals work, in an effort to try to contain the costs of Medicare. We think these are obviously significant, combined with the fact that the shift of home health care from part A to part B will be kept in the premium, which will mean that beneficiaries in fact will bear a part of the burden, with the poorest beneficiaries continuing to have some relief.

It is a structural change of Medicare with far more yet to come, and we will be unrelenting in the idea of developing ultimately a voucher program for

Medicare that will keep it sound during the period of time when the baby boomers start to retire.

But what is also contained in this budget resolution is an agreement to fundamentally have growth in the non-defense discretionary programs, the programs that operate the agencies and departments of the Federal Government. They will grow at a rate of about half a percent a year, as compared to a 6-percent growth over the last 10 years.

Frankly, I am still checking the numbers, but I believe this will be the smallest level of growth in nondefense discretionary spending that we have seen at least over the last 10 years, and we are going back to find out if it may be the smallest level of growth that we have ever seen; significant progress.

Let me also suggest the economic foundation of this program. It is interesting to note that during the Reagan years, the Reagan economic plan was underlaid by a growth in the economy that forecast somewhere in the vicinity of 4.3 to 4.4 percent. That is a growth rate we dream about today and we would hope to achieve, but not one that has been achieved for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, contained in this agreement is not a 4.4-percent projection of economic growth that would make it somewhat unrealistic. What is contained in this agreement is a 2.1-percent economic growth pattern. As we all know, the economy in this last quarter has grown at about 5.6 percent. Certainly we will not achieve those levels of growth in this agreement, but what is important to note is that 2.1-percent presumes that at some times the economy will grow faster and at other times it will not grow as fast. We believe this is a conservative foundation, a conservative economic forecast, much more conservative than the blue chip estimators across this country.

So what we have, Mr. Speaker, is we have the largest amount of mandatory savings in history, a significant slowdown of the nondefense discretionary, the programs that run the Government to a half a percent a year, conservative economics underlying this program, the first balanced budget since 1969, and, Mr. Speaker, the much desired and fought for tax cuts that we believe will help the American family and will also help to grow this economy.

Let me just make a point. The capital gains tax cut in our judgment is one of the things that can help build an infrastructure for America that will allow this economy to grow faster in the absence of inflation. We think that is very, very significant.

We also believe that a child tax credit is very important because it begins to send the right signals to that institution most under attack in the United States, the American family. We believe it will also restore a little justice in the area of estate relief, so as people work a lifetime to grow a business, they should not have these high levels of taxation.

Mr. Speaker, let me also make it clear that this is not the end of the

road. We clearly have a number of things we want to do in the area of additional entitlement reform. We want to make fundamental changes in the operation of this Government, including the elimination of certain departments.

□ 1745

Let me make it clear that the hallmark of this Congress has been and really the last two Congresses has been the idea that we are going to return people's power, money and influence from this city back home to where the American people live. And that includes tax cuts. That includes letting people have more power in their pocket by letting them keep more of what they earn. So no one should be mistaken that this agreement is somehow the end of the road, but, really, it does represent the fall, the kind of the fall of the Berlin Wall.

I remember when that happened, and many people looked around and said that it was hard to believe that we had actually defeated the Communists when the wall came down. Many found it hard to believe. Frankly, when you take a look at this agreement and you see the fact that we are going to balance the budget, we are going to have entitlement reform, we are going to have tax cuts, that this begins to really cement into place that the era of big government is at an end, and in a manner of speaking the Berlin Wall has fallen in regard to this budget.

It does not mean it is the end of the day, but it means that a tremendous victory has been achieved here in the United States, an agreement underscored by the idea that Government should be smaller, that people should be more powerful. We think this is a giant first step with many more steps to come.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that we would go to conference, complete our work, get this done by the end of this week, and then begin to put into the permanent law the changes that we all seek.

One other final note. Some have looked at this agreement and have wondered whether we get started on the deficit reduction up front. The answer to that of course is yes. With the permanent changes in the entitlement programs being enacted in this year, over time they will obviously accumulate savings. We are very happy with the fact that this, unlike previous agreements, will actually give us tax relief now, will give us savings now, and entitlement savings beginning the minute that this reconciliation bill is signed by the President.

I wanted to thank the President for cooperating with us and his assistants, including Mr. Bowles and Mr. Hilley, Mr. Raines, Mr. Sperling; and I would also like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT for his work and, of course, the gentleman from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes

to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we passed on the House floor before we left here for Memorial Day a historic resolution and we passed it with bipartisan support. Budget resolution House Concurrent Resolution 84 was passed on this side of the aisle on the Democratic side with a vote of 132 to 70, if my recollection is correct, almost a two-to-one margin over here and by an overwhelming margin on the other side. What we do in this budget resolution really pushes the envelope of what we can accomplish in a budget resolution. We have basically incorporated by reference a hard wrought, hard negotiated, bipartisan budget agreement of 1997, achieved over 3 to 4 months of negotiations, among the White House and the congressional leadership and particularly the principals on the Committee on the Budget.

Even though this agreement goes to further lengths than we normally find in a budget resolution, it really does not contain all of the detail we need to see that it is carried out as the parties who negotiated it intended. That is why I say we are pushing the envelope of what we can accomplish with a budget resolution.

It is important that we bring this conference report to conclusion, to closure with as much clarity and distinctness as we can possibly give it, given the vehicle we have got, a budget resolution, because many of us are still concerned that what comes out of the production line, off the production line, out of the authorizing committees and appropriation committees will resemble, identifiably, what we are putting on the production line at the outset in this budget resolution.

So the start of this process, the seeing to it that we get it done right is this conference report, and so I wholly support the idea of going to conference.

We tried an alternative, an expedited alternative that would have involved bringing to the floor of the House and the other body conforming amendments that would have in effect converged the text of both budget resolutions to the same text. But we have failed at that effort. It does not appear we can resolve that soon enough, so this is the conventional device for bringing the House and the Senate together on things we disagree about.

We will offer at the appropriate time, assuming the House approves the motion to going to conference, our motion to instruct conferees that will deal with one particular aspect of this agreement that still concerns Members on my side of the aisle. Some of these Members, our minority leader included, were here in 1981 when the Economic Recovery Tax Act, Kemp-ROTH, was passed. And they feel that we are only now beginning to restore the revenue base of the Federal Government to the point where we are about to get rid of deficits.

They do not want to have us come so far to be so closely within reach of a balanced budget because we have taken steps, among other things, to restrain spending and also to restore the revenue base of the Government, having come so far to enact a tax bill that will so diminish the revenue base of the Government that we will have this problem all over again, a structural problem that will not lead us to a balanced budget or at least will strike a balance, a budget that will strike a balance in 2002 but will not be in true equilibrium. We will not have a problem finally and permanently resolved. That is why they are concerned that we keep within the bounds that we have outlined in this agreement, this budget agreement and the budget resolution, the tax cuts that are authorized and the reconciliation instructions that are put forth to it.

Our motion to instruct conferees will go to the very essence of that particular tax reduction measure that will be part of the reconciliation instruction and the budget conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

I want to commend him, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and all those who worked on this budget agreement. Let me just say at the outset that I think the vote that we will have shortly on this floor this evening could be one of the most important votes that we will have in this Congress. The motion to instruct our conferees to make sure that the tax piece of this budget agreement does not explode in the outyears causing us a replay of 1981, where it took us more than a decade to dig our way out of huge deficits.

It is an important vote. I encourage all of my colleagues to be cognizant of what will be happening here in just a few minutes. It is important because we knew, we know what happened back in 1981. In the past, Republican tax bills, tax breaks for capital gains, IRAs, have favored high income people, and estate tax cuts all exploded outside the budget window. That has been the history in the past when Republicans have controlled or have written the tax bills that have become law.

What we will be suggesting on this floor when we get to it in a few minutes is that we accept the language of the Senate. The language of the Senate basically says this: that they want to keep the \$250 billion cost that we are talking about on the tax bill on a 10-year period. No explosion after 5 years. No 1981's again. And the emphasis will be on helping the poor working Americans and middle-income Americans and it will be helping them with the child tax credit. It will be helping them with the educational tax breaks that we will be putting forward and that have been put forward already in this debate on the budget.

So I urge my colleagues, this is a maintenance budget that we are dealing with here. We brought the American people and we brought this country into a balanced budget in 1993, when we voted for the 1993 budget that brought the deficit down from \$300 billion a year to the present level of about \$65 billion. What we are doing now is trying to maintain and get that extra inch that we need to the goal line.

If we do what we did with trickle-down theory in 1981 and we pass a tax bill that has exploding numbers in the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th year, we will be doing a disservice to this institution, our colleagues who follow us and certainly the American people.

I want to urge all of my colleagues to support the motion this evening to put some fiscal restraint on what we are doing by making sure that the tax benefits get to those who really need them in the area of education and in the area of child tax credits and make sure that we do not create for ourselves a situation in which our children and our children's children will be paying off this exploding debt in the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th years. I urge my colleagues, when the time comes, to support my colleague from South Carolina who will try to rein in these exploding out-year deficits by a runaway tax bill.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT].

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to do something which I cannot see any reason why anybody would not do. And that is to make sure that the tax breaks that are put into this bill do not explode in the outyears. The estimates that we have seen on the proposals that have actually been put on the table by Senator ROTH and others have deficits of \$750 billion in the second 10 years. And if anyone votes against this resolution, they can only do it on one of two bases. One is that they do not care that we are replaying 1981. In 1981 we made decisions in this House, none of us were here, most of us were not, at least, and it took us 15 years to dig ourselves out of it. Now here we are going back in the pit again and doing the same thing again and setting ourselves up unless we instruct our conferees to refuse to put that kind of language in the budget resolution. They must limit the explosion in the out-years.

The only other reason that someone would vote against this resolution or this motion by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is if they simply do not expect to be here.

I understand there are a lot of Members around here who believe in term limits. Maybe they figure in 6 years they will all be gone, but the very Members who are here today saying we must balance the budget always put it in terms of our children. We have to do it for our children. We do not want to sink our children in debt. Yet if we do not limit the tax breaks by the motion

that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is making, we set in motion something that will happen 10 or 12 or 15 years out there.

If you are a baby boomer in this country and you are going to get to 65 in 15 years, just as the baby boom generation gets to taking Medicare and Social Security, this major problem will be back on the doorstep.

□ 1830

Who will be here to fix it? Well, it will be our children. They will have then run for the U.S. Congress, and they will be facing the same problem. They will say to themselves, why did the Congress of 1997 set in motion this mess?

We can almost excuse the Congress of 1981, because they did not know. They were not really paying attention or they did not know what was going to happen. But we have now seen what happens when we give big tax breaks and cut the budget, and so we have no excuse for setting in motion something that will be an enormous problem for our children.

I urge all my colleagues to vote for the motion to instruct the conferees offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, the motion before us is one that ought to be accepted by acclamation, both parties, staying within the spirit of this historic balanced budget agreement.

As a member of the Committee on the Budget, I enthusiastically supported the agreement. I supported it because I felt it represented a compromise, a compromise that provided Americans with a balanced budget, with tax cuts, and yet with essential commitments to programs and national priorities that reflect our basic values.

Now, what is before us tonight in the motion to instruct conferees offered by my colleague from South Carolina is simply to go with the Senate provision 104(b) of the Senate-passed resolution that the 10-year cost of the tax cuts shall be \$250 billion and, second, with section 321 of the Senate-passed resolution that there ought to be a fair distribution of tax cuts as to the \$250 billion.

This is not a figure that has just come up on the floor of the House, thrown into this motion. It was at the heart of the negotiations. It was at the heart of the negotiations because the Senate requires a 10-year look at revenue losses under tax cuts, first of all; and, second, because a balanced budget plan that tried so mightily to reach balance by 2002 would be a sham if it had a provision that exploded the revenue loss under the tax cuts and threw the budget wildly out of balance in the years 2003 through 2007.

This is not about hitting once a balanced budget only to spin wildly out of

control again. This is about getting America on a firm financial foundation with a balanced budget in the year 2002 and in the years that follow that. That is why the 10-year \$250 billion figure is so critical.

Finally, as we get to tax breaks, let us direct those tax breaks to those who really need them, the middle-income, working-income Americans that are stressed so hard trying to make ends meet. That was agreed to by the Senate, a Republican-controlled Senate, with substantial support from both political parties.

This section 321 talks about a substantial majority of tax cuts benefits will go to middle-class working families earning less than approximately \$100,000 per year and will not cause revenue losses to increase significantly in the years after 2007.

So all we are asking is that this balanced budget agreement reflect balance not just in 2002 but in the years after 2002, and that those who benefit from the tax cuts primarily be Americans earning under \$100,000 and less. Quite frankly, we have to make priorities and we have to direct the tax cuts to those who need them the most, working income, middle-income Americans. Please go with the motion to instruct.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Just in response, Mr. Speaker, I would hope we all keep track of some of our goals in this country and what I assume we all want to accomplish, and one thing is more and better jobs.

So the question, as we review tax cuts, is how do we get more and better jobs and keep this economy growing?

So to specify and say that the tax cuts have to be just to a certain income group, I think dismisses the larger question of how can we best accomplish the goals that we all want to achieve, and that is more and better jobs for the American working family.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure what this motion to instruct is. I hope it does not include in here a tax increase, but I am constantly amazed at the fact that people, some people in this House, worry that people are going to get their money back. I cannot quite understand why it is that there is this sense.

We are pulling the folks who for many years fought against the balanced budget and tax cuts a lot of the way, but I guess I am not convinced we have changed their hearts yet. Maybe we will get there. But what I do not understand is what this sense is that somehow the Government will have less and the people will have more. See, I think that is a good thing, if the government has less and the people have more. I think it is a good thing if the Government has less power and the people have more power.

Now, there are all kinds of ways we can give people their power. We can give them a right to send their kids where they want to go to school without the Government trying to tell them where they ought to go.

We could actually let the housing authority in Chicago decide that if they want to check the residents to see if they have got guns in their place, they should be allowed to do that. We ought to set the rules that we want in our housing authorities and the communities we live. I think that is pretty good.

I think we ought to let people have more choice on the kind of health care they want to have. I think they can make that kind of decision.

But aside from even those issues, a much bigger issue than all of that is the fact that people will have more money in their pockets. And when they have more money in their pockets they, by definition, have more power.

So I understand the idea that we do not want to violate the terms of this agreement. That is, I guess, to be adhered to. But, frankly, I wish we had far greater tax cuts in this agreement and second, though, the notion that somehow over the course of this that people are going to actually keep more than what we set out and that we are in this hyperventilated negative state about that is something that is beyond me.

The simple fact of the matter is that if we balance the budget faster, I do not hear anybody saying that we should give people more of their money back. I do not hear anybody saying that we in fact may get to a balanced budget sooner, and as we get to a balanced budget sooner, let us give more tax cuts.

I have to say to my colleagues that the wave of the future is not about the Government having more power. The people of this country are saying they want government to have less power. We better not knock on their door and tell them that we are from the Government and we are here to help. We are not going to get that good a reception from them, in case my colleagues have not noticed.

Our crusade ought to be about giving people their power back, about making this town less important. And that is what we are all about. That is what we are all about starting in this budget agreement: Balanced budget, hope for our children, tax cuts to give people more power, Medicare reform so people can have more options, shrinking the size of the Government that operates the agencies and departments. That is what we are all about in this agreement.

I am just going to argue that the reason we are balancing the budget is because the people want it, and the reason why they ought to have tax cuts and less government is because they want it, and the sooner we get this message the quicker we can end the cynicism and the skepticism people

have about this Capital City of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that, frankly, we could even dispense with this motion to instruct because now we are trying to micromanage who gets the tax cuts. We are starting class warfare again. And then I think we are saying we will have a tax increase. That is what I think this says.

Frankly, I hope it is not going to pass. I predict it is not going to pass. And I think we should get on with this and forget this motion to instruct and I would ask the gentleman from South Carolina to just unoffer this today.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to respond to the gentleman.

I think we all need to bear in mind that basically what we are doing in this budget resolution for the next 5 years is borrowing more money so that we can fund the cost of tax cuts. Bear that in mind.

Second, what we are trying to do in this motion to instruct, which we will offer shortly, is say to the conferees stick to the strict outlines of the budget agreement that we have laid out.

We have decided that we can make room for \$85 billion in net revenue reduction over 5 years in this budget and \$250 billion over the second 5 years. Those are the limits. Please do not stretch the limits because we are concerned not just that we strike balance in the year 2002, but that we put this Government on a basis of equilibrium and we will have a truly balanced budget that will last.

As to the revenues of the Government, here is the administration's design, which is basically incorporated in this package and which is what they sent up with the budget presented by President Clinton in February of this year. The Government of the United States is now spending around 20.3, 20.4 percent of GDP, gross domestic product. We are taking in taxes about 19.1 or 19.2 percent. And there is the deficit, the difference between the intake and the outgo of the Government based upon the percentage measured as a percentage of our GDP.

The goal here, the design of this package, as proposed by the administration, as essentially embraced in this budget resolution, is to have revenues and spending converge at about 19.3 percent of GDP. So spending as a percentage of GDP under this plan will drop, revenues will remain relatively constant, and that is the scheme here. We want to make sure that scheme is achieved, and that is what we are about.

Second, in doing these tax cuts, we want to make sure that the people who really deserve tax relief, middle-income Americans worried about how to pay for college tuition and other such essential things, are not forgotten.

I know there is a lot of zeal to do capital gains tax cuts and estate tax cuts and to rewrite the alternative minimum tax, and in the zeal to do

that we want to make sure that middle-income Americans get remembered too.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, those of us on the Committee on the Budget have worked on this budget resolution, and although there is partisanship in some areas, I think that many of us feel that we have had and would like to have a good working relationship with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and with the other Members who have spoken. I certainly sense from their comments in other contexts that they too feel we should be working on a bipartisan basis to the maximum extent possible.

Now, the comments earlier this afternoon, I think, sort of missed the thrust of what we are really debating. The statements were essentially made "people good, government bad." We are not talking about "people good, government bad"; we are talking about what we need to do to ensure that we balance the budget. What do we need to do to make sure that the tax cuts do not balloon out of the channel that we are trying to construct and flood our efforts or snuff out our efforts to balance the budget.

□ 1815

And all that is being suggested is that we in the House side should accede to the Senate in this respect. I do not believe that the Senate was dominated by radical liberals in the passage of the budget resolution. The Senate has looked at this and has simply said, let us make sure that on a 10-year basis the tax cuts do not exceed \$250 billion. The Senate has also said, let us make sure that these tax cuts do not run away with our efforts to balance the budget after the 10-year period. And the Senate has said, let us make sure that the bulk of the tax cut benefits go to people earning less than \$100,000 a year.

Now, if the Senate has engaged in some sort of destructive and manipulative action with respect to tax cuts, those horrible Republicans in the Senate, or if they have initiated a class warfare strategy, it certainly is a surprise to me and I think almost every Member of the House. I think that what the Senate Republicans have put into the budget resolution on their side reflects nothing more than common sense, and I certainly have found as I have journeyed throughout my congressional district that Republicans and Democrats alike agree that we ought to be about balancing the budget first and then when we know that we have that under control and we have eliminated the deficit, we ought to be cutting taxes and making sure that whatever good programs we have are adequately supported. For this reason, I urge that we all join in supporting the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 17½ minutes remains. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has 11¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a reasonable approach, as the speaker before me said, this was adopted by the Senate, which is controlled by the other party. And I think it is very reasonable. Now, this tax cut deal, which I voted for in the committee and I voted for on the floor, is predicated on stable growth, it is predicated on asset sales. And we have to be honest with ourselves that it may not work and we may end up with severe revenue losses down the road. We ought to take the steps now to ensure that we stay within the confines of the original deal, and that is what the Spratt motion would do.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] was talking about the Reagan years and the GDP assumptions in the Reagan years. And I know we do not want to confuse things with the facts and look at the statistics, but I think it is important that we do. During that period, my colleague mentioned that assumption of 4 percent annual growth was never realized, and of course that is true when you look at the historical statistics. The same could be said about this: I think the gentleman is correct in many respects, we assume some very conservative economic statistics, particularly as it relates to growth rates. But if you look at some other statistics and compare them to historical average, we are using some pretty optimistic assumptions.

For instance, our assumptions for inflation are 200 bases points less than what the recent historical average has been. Our assumption for interest rates is about 300 bases points less than what the recent historical averages have been. And our assumptions for unemployment are 1 percent less. And with respect to spectrum sales, we are assuming more than we have achieved before us. So it is possible that this deal will not work out.

I might also add that the chairman of the committee, who I have a great deal of respect for, talked about the capital gains reduction and how that might create some inflation-free growth. That is quite possible. I have supported capital gains reduction. I have introduced a bill to do so. But I do not think we can ignore the fact that down Constitution Avenue sits the chairman of the Federal Reserve and the current, like his predecessor, tends to have a monitorist bent; and I think we would have to contend with them at some point if they saw increasing inflation-free growth that they might start to take the punch bowl away and put on the brakes, and that would also impact interest rates.

So what this does is to say we will live within the \$250 billion revenue stream over 10 years like the Senate has already done. And I think that makes sense. This is what we would call in the transaction business, belts and suspenders. We are making sure that we are going to follow through and do it the right way and not cause problems down the road for our children.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] for yielding and I rise to support the motion that he is going to offer to instruct conferees, and I would hope that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] would support the motion because, in fact, it is about making sure that there are no tax increases in the future.

As someone who voted for the budget deal, I believe a deal is a deal. But the budget deal is only truly a deal if we balance the budget not merely on the numbers but on the principles. That is why we must use the 10-year outlook on tax revenues. There is nothing magical about hitting a date in 2002 and then returning to deficits because we have planted the seeds of fiscal instability. Ten-year revenue figures are about as honest as we can get. It is very hard, however, to conceal tax expenditures which blossom and proliferate after 5 years if we use the other body's revenue baselines.

The mess we are in today is because of spending binges which began in 1981 when we massively front-loaded defense spending and tax cuts. These two measures created the tidal wave of deficits 6, 7, and 8 years later that is causing the fiscal pain that we are experiencing today.

It was voodoo economics back then, and we should not resort to smoke and mirrors now. The real magic is to keep the budget balanced in 10 years. Let us keep the deal to permanent fiscal responsibility and use the most honest figures, the 10-year estimates. I urge my colleagues to make this an honest deal and vote for the motion to instruct conferees when it is offered.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW].

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, first I would rise to once again to congratulate all parties on both sides of the aisle for putting together this balanced budget agreement, which I was very proud to support. It is not just about numbers, however, it is about protecting our values for our families. And that is the reason why I rise this evening to support the motion to instruct, which I think is incredibly important if we are to maintain the integrity in the outyears of balancing the budget and maintain our values that are outlined in the balanced budget agreement.

I had an opportunity to spend time over the district workweek in my dis-

trict, holding office hours in grocery stores and local restaurants, talking to my constituents about this balanced budget agreement. They told me they liked the fact that education was placed as No. 1 in the priorities for investment. They liked the fact that children's health and health care for working families that do not now have health care was important to the process, as well as protecting the environment and creating jobs. But they expressed one concern, and that was over and over again: Who will receive the tax cuts that are being proposed?

Because in their minds, their history has been for the last 15 to 20 years that they, as working families, middle-class Americans, small businesses, family-owned farms, have not seen the benefits of the bulk of the tax cuts that have been instituted since the 1980's, and they are asking, whether it is a family-owned farmer who has put all of their hard work and sweat into their land, that they be protected in terms of the estate tax, and I very strongly support eliminating the estate tax for those family-owned farmers or family-owned small business, or whether it is a young couple, not so young couple, depending on your perspective, in their forties whose children just went off to college and they need to get a smaller home now but all of their investments are tied up in equity in their house. That is their savings, and they are saying, can we please have capital gains protection for us as working people.

I would urge the committee to make sure that when we are done, tax cuts go to those who need it the most.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, very simply, I rise to support the Spratt amendment to this budget and raise three simple points to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Let me say, because of the work that we have already done, we have a booming economy. I think we should acknowledge that. The numbers suggest that we have the lowest unemployment. One of the things that we need to do, however, is create jobs for many in our community.

On behalf of the 18th Congressional District in Texas, two other points that I think are more far-reaching that we should attest to, and that is that many of our constituents wanted us to balance the budget and they wanted us to bring down the deficit. This particular budget resolution and the motion to instruct conferees on the budget resolution is important, and that is because it instructs that the tax cuts do not exceed the \$250 billion net cuts in the budget agreement.

We do not want to bust the balanced budget. That is key and that is very important. And then I believe that we should have tax cuts but they should

be tax cuts for working Americans, the working Americans that have helped build this country, a child tax credit, an education tax credit, targeted estate tax relief, targeted capital gains.

The real emphasis of this balanced budget should be for those Americans who every day go out and work, every day continue to pay their taxes and build this country. We should create jobs for the graduates in the 1997 class, the 1998 class, the 1999 class and, yes, the year 2000 class. Put our people to work by focusing on the right kind of tax cuts that do not bust the budget, that have a targeted estate tax, a targeted education tax cut, a targeted child credit tax cut, and to make sure that this is truly a balanced budget that works for all Americans.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if a Member could respond from the other side briefly, I am very concerned about this because what we are adopting is a sense of Congress passed by the Senate. And in section 321(2), it says that if revenue starts going down after the year 2007, will increase taxes.

Most of the speakers over there say, look, we want a tax cut, we do want it to go to the American working family. But (2), the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] says, after 2007, if revenues start going down, increase taxes. That is not what we want. And I do not think we should accept that idea that somehow if there is a slump in the economy, what we do and how we instruct conferees is to increase taxes so that they do not have any revenue loss after the year 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has 3¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was reading this week-end an article by Professor William Quirk of the University of South Carolina Law School, and he reminds us that in the year 2002, when the budget is supposed to be balanced, we will owe \$450 billion in interest payments on a \$7 trillion debt; and at that same time, the discussion is how much are we going to give away in tax cuts to individuals.

No more important decision will be made by this Congress for future generations as to whether or not, when we engage in the process of cutting taxes, whether or not we can control ourselves and resist the political instinct to hand out goodies and to hand out tax cuts that are disguised in the first years and then only to explode in the later years and then to cause an explosion of the deficit that this Congress

and this Nation has worked so hard to bring into balance.

We have got to be very clear that tax cuts should go to those who need them the most and tax cuts should be constrained in their growth and that tax cuts should not upset the balance of the budget in the year 2002. Otherwise, we will end up in the situation as was pointed out in the Washington Post this last week that the budget would be balanced only to become instantly unbalanced all over again.

That is not what the American people are asking us to do. They are asking us to bring this budget into balance and to keep it into balance and to force us to choose our priorities and not charge it off to future generations. Just as we should not charge off spending, we should not charge off the tax cuts to future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD the following article by William J. Quirk:

THE EARTH BELONGS TO THE LIVING

(By William J. Quirk)

The President and Congress have both promised us a balanced budget in the year 2002. The debt, at that time, will be somewhere between six and seven trillion dollars, which, assuming a seven percent interest rate, will cost close to \$450 billion a year in interest. Each year, every year, forever. Is it plausible to think the new generation will pick up that perpetual burden? How can the country equitably deal the debt burden?

Debt can only be disposed of in five ways: one, by paying it off; two, by repudiating it; three, by inflation—which is a veiled repudiation; four, by conquering the creditor to cancel the debt or conquering a third party to seize sufficient wealth to pay off the debt; or, five, by large real growth which makes the debt service a smaller share of a growing pie. If large real growth is unlikely, and conquest unpalatable, only the first three methods are available. The classic approach is inflation. The United States, since the Vietnam War, has used consistent inflation, usually around three percent, to reduce our debt. Inflation can be a successful method if no new debt is incurred, but continuing large deficits, and the new borrowing to cover them, have overwhelmed the tactic.

The Founders, other than Hamilton, believed that a perpetual debt was incompatible with self-rule, since the current generation cannot be asked to pay for decisions they did not make. Thomas Jefferson, during his term, reduced the national debt by one-third despite paying cash to Napoleon for Louisiana. "If we go to war now," Jefferson wrote to James Monroe in 1805, "I fear we may renounce forever the hope of seeing an end of our national debt. If we can keep at peace eight years longer, our income, liberated from debt, will be adequate to any war, without new taxes or loans, and our position and increasing strength put us hors d'insulte from any nation." Jefferson, in 1804, listed cutting taxes, cutting expenses, and reducing the national debt as the highest accomplishment of his first term: "To do without a land tax, excise, stamp tax, and the other internal taxes, to supply their places by economies so as still to support the government properly and to apply \$7,300,000 a year steadily to the payment of the public debt." Jefferson foresaw that a debt policy, such as Hamilton fostered, would be complicated and promote the centralization of power. Jefferson wrote James Madison in 1796 that "the accounts of the United States ought to be, and may be,

made as simple as those of a common farmer, and capable of being understood by common farmers." Things did not turn out as Jefferson hoped.

Our economists, unlike Jefferson, fail to distinguish between private borrowing and public borrowing; they think the issue is whether the annual income stream (tax revenues) is able to support the annual interest cost. But the real issue is whether a \$450 billion annual charge—with no return—is socially and politically sustainable. Does anyone think a 20-year-old earning \$10 an hour, or \$20,000 a year, can afford to pay \$4,234 in federal and state income tax and Social Security tax? That amount, invested each year for 45 years at seven percent interest, would give a nest egg of \$1,268,000. The present value of all the Social Security benefits he will receive, starting in 2041, assuming the system still exists, is an unimpressive \$12,400. The present value of health benefits he will receive is \$25,800, and of welfare benefits, \$20,500. The difference between \$59,700—the present value of all the benefits he will ever receive—and \$1,268,000 is a very expensive government for someone making \$10 an hour.

Can a government survive when so many resources are allocated to pay for inherited liabilities? Can a moral, orderly society survive if it does? The debt, because of doubts on both scores, destroys the value of the currency. The fear is that history will probably repeat itself, and the country will stoke up inflation to reduce the effective burden of an unupportable debt. Inflation may stay within bounds, as it has, barely, for the past 20 years. Or it may run out of control and destroy the currency as it did in Weimar Germany in 1923. The Weimar inflation destroyed the middle class, the basis of any democracy, and made way for Hitler. Either way, when the currency's value is unpredictable, individuals can't plan for a child's education, business cannot look very far ahead, and the country is disoriented.

Jefferson, in a September 6, 1789, letter to James Madison, said he thought it self-evident "that the earth belongs in usufruct [trust] to the living, that the dead have neither powers nor rights over it." In 1823, Jefferson wrote to Thomas Earle, "That our Creator made the earth for the use of the living and not of the dead; that those who exist not can have no use nor right in it, no authority or power over it; that one generation of men cannot foreclose or burden its use to another, which comes to it in its own right and by the same divine beneficence; that a preceding generation cannot bind a succeeding one by its laws or contracts." The current generation, in other words, holds the land as a life tenant does; he is entitled to cultivate the land and enjoy the fruits of it, but he can't hurt the interest of those who are to come after. He should turn the land over in the same condition he received it. Each generation is the steward for the earth during its lifetime.

Assume, Jefferson wrote, that Louis XV borrowed so much from the bankers of Genoa that the interest on the debt came to equal the whole annual net profit of France: "Should the present generation of Frenchmen deed their property to the Genoese creditors and leave their homeland? No. They have the same rights over the soil on which they were produced, as the preceding generation had. They derive these rights not from their predecessors, but from nature." No generation, by natural right, can oblige the next generation to pay its debts. If it could, it might, during its own time, "eat up the usufruct of the lands for several generations to come, and then the land would belong to the dead, and not the living."

Jefferson concluded that it would be "wise and just" for the Constitution to declare

that "neither the legislature, nor the nation itself, can validly contract more debt than they may pay within their own age, or within the term of 19 years." Not all borrowing, of course, leads to wasteful spending debt. Debt may be invested in beneficial infrastructure. The 1846 New York Constitutional Convention, applying Jeffersonian principles, provided that the state could contract no debt except by a law approved by a referendum. The debt, however, had to be for a single "work or object" and be accompanied by a new tax sufficient to pay interest and retire the debt within 18 years. Or the debt may be invested to acquire intangible assets—which the society considers beneficial—such as Pitt's Napoleonic Wars and our World War II and Cold War. But, because of the absence of checks, spending is far more likely to be wasteful when borrowing is permitted. If a country runs on a pay-as-you-go basis, whatever mistakes it makes will be paid for by those who made the mistakes.

Moreover, the requirement of immediate payment for government programs acts as an efficient brake on governmental enthusiasm. Debt, since it requires no immediate taxes, removes the fundamental limitation that to fund a program for the benefit of one group, the money has to be taken from a different group. Under pay-as-you-go, the payers must currently pay what the payees will currently receive. The payers are apt to resist—the issue must be discussed—and some compromise reached.

With a borrowing policy, as Jefferson saw, the rules are entirely different. The consent of the governed is not necessary. The executive proposes a program but now he meets no effective opposition, since the legislature is equally happy to spend money today that will have to be repaid by future taxpayers. The viciousness of the borrowing policy is that the taxpayer of tomorrow is not represented by any of the parties at the table. The burden is easily cast upon the unrepresented future. Programs can go forward that the current taxpayers are unwilling to pay for. Unpopular programs—such as the Vietnam War, the Great Society, and the Savings and Loan bailout—can move ahead. Of course, when programs go ahead without the consent of the governed, they are likely to tear the country apart.

Jefferson believed that the debt-making power was too dangerous for the federal government. Since it could not be safely limited, it had to be prohibited. Jefferson wrote to John Taylor, on November 26, 1798: "I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution. I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government of the genuine principles of its Constitution. I mean an additional article, taking from the federal government the power of borrowing." (Emphasis added.)

Jefferson said in 1816 that the people, "not the rich, are our dependence for continued freedom. And to preserve their independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt." If the leaders load us with such debt, we will then be taxed "in our meat and in our drink" till we must, like the English, live on "oatmeal and potatoes; have no time to think, no means of calling the mismanagers to account; but be glad to obtain subsistence by hiring ourselves to rivet their chains on the necks of our fellow-sufferers." We will, at that point, "have no sensibilities left but for sinning and suffering. Then begins, indeed, the war of all against all."

□ 1830

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as we go to conference this evening on the budget resolution, we really should assure the American people they will get a balanced budget as promised. So that means crafting the tax package in a way that makes it possible to provide the promised tax cuts while adequately measuring their cost to assure that the budget will actually balance in 2002.

That means playing fair with the numbers. The numbers cannot be jury-rigged so as to provide only the illusion of a balanced budget. How tragic it would be, Mr. Speaker, if in fact after these tax cuts were promised and the budget were laid out, that we would not have a balanced budget but would have a deficit that we have worked so hard to get rid of.

I think we should all agree on a bipartisan basis that such an outcome is absolutely unacceptable. We will balance the budget, we will give the tax cuts, and we will use fair and honest numbers.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues on the other side, there is a lot of room that we can maneuver in the future. We are looking at a lot of different savings, and I think we can get support from the other side of the aisle.

Let me give a couple of classic examples that I hope in the next budget can go toward more of the savings that we are trying to send back to the American people. The 760 programs we have in education, to take and see, and I think it is fair to ask, which ones are working, which ones are not. The President is asking for \$3 billion in a new literacy program. We today are funding 14 literacy programs. Let us reduce the bureaucracy and see which ones work.

When we take a look at the earned income tax credit, that there is a 26-percent overpayment, so 25 cents out of every dollar. We can have a lot of savings from that and give it back to the American people. We can take a look at when we are getting as little as 50 cents on the dollar back out of our education from the Federal Government, that we can drive it down and bring in a lot of private work for it, with my colleagues from the other side. And take a look at the extension in Somalia, Haiti and Bosnia has cost us over \$15 billion and this new extension that the President is talking about that already is there, and then not pulling our troops, it is going to cost another \$5 billion. I think that there is going to be a lot of room at which we can improve both of the issues on the bills and have more relief for the middle class like we want and like my colleagues on the other side do. I hate the term middle class. It should be middle income, not middle class. I would ask my colleagues on the other side to work with us on this and that it is

something I think for the future of this country, the balanced budget, and making sure that we do help on both sides of what we want in this, that we can go a long way.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SPRATT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on disagreeing votes of the House of Representatives and the Senate on H. Con. Res. 84, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1997 through 2002, be instructed to do everything possible within the scope of the conference (1) to agree to section 104(b) of the Senate-passed resolution, limiting the 10-year net cost of the tax cuts to \$250 billion; (2) agree to section 321 of the Senate-passed resolution, with respect to fair distribution of tax cuts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to explain the purpose of the motion.

As I said at the outset when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman, introduced his motion to go to conference, our purpose here is to see that what comes out of the pipeline resembles in its essential details what we are putting into the pipeline in the form of this budget resolution, and in particular on our side we are concerned that after spending years in restoring the revenue base of the Federal Government to the point where we have got the deficit down to \$107.8 billion last September, projected to be below \$90 billion, well below it, this coming September, we do not want to make the mistake made in 1981 and undo all the progress that has brought us to this point where we can truthfully say we are within reach of a balanced budget.

No. 1, we want to make sure that the tax writing committees, when they undertake to fulfill the reconciliation instructions, will strictly keep to the dictates of this resolution and see to it that the net revenue loss in the first 5 fiscal years from 1998 to 2002 is no more than \$85 billion, and in the years 2003 to 2007 is no more than \$250 billion. That was the agreement. We want to see it observed. Fundamentally, we are

simply reiterating what is the agreement reached among all the parties.

Second, in distributing the tax benefits, the tax cuts, we want to say to the tax writers, as the other body has said in its resolution, be fair to hardworking Americans, see to it that they get at least a significant part of the tax benefit bill that we are about to write. Those are the two fundamental things that we stress here today. We do not see how anybody in this House, Democrat or Republican, could differ or disagree with it. We hope that everybody, seeing the merit of this motion to instruct, will join in supporting it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleasantly surprised that this motion does not call for a tax increase. I have not had a chance to see it. I am now looking at it. I tried to figure out a reason as to why, and I was not hoping to find something that I thought would blow up the agreement, but I wanted to carefully analyze it to make sure that it does not.

In regard to the first part of this, which is that the 10-year net tax cut be limited to \$250 billion, the answer on that is that that is part of the agreement and we are all in agreement that the net tax cut over 10 years, as called for under this agreement, is \$250 billion.

Let us not make any mistake about it. Come the year 2000, if we elect a Republican President, I think we are probably going to see more tax cuts, but all things staying normal here, we are going to have a compliance to the fact that we are going to have \$250 billion worth of tax cuts.

The other provision in here is the fact that the substantial portion of the tax cuts will go to people under \$100,000. That is clearly our intent. In fact, the biggest item in our package is a family tax credit.

Frankly, I do not think this is really a very meaningful motion to instruct, although I say to the authors of it, they have put it together, we will have a vote on it, and it will pass. Let me just suggest that I do not see any language in here that would call for repealing any tax cuts or anything else. Essentially this means that the bulk of the benefits will go to middle-income America, which we agree with, and second that in fact the net tax cut will be \$250 billion.

With that, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, we can all support this motion to instruct.

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

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

I thought the gentleman was calling for a vote by acclamation to endorse this resolution. I did not hear him say anything that disagreed with the motion to instruct conferees. Is that the gentleman's request?

I would like to ask the gentleman, do I correctly understand what the gentleman just said, that he supports this particular motion to instruct conferees, then?

Mr. KASICH. If the gentleman will yield, I have no objection to doing what we intend to do.

Mr. SPRATT. So the gentleman supports the motion to instruct conferees?

Mr. KASICH. I support the idea that we are going to live up to our agreement on \$250 billion in net tax cuts, and would agree with the gentleman that our plan is going to give the bulk of the resources to middle-income, hardworking Americans. We favor that.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion to instruct.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs: KASICH, HOBSON, and SPRATT.

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

PASS A CLEAN SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced tonight H.R. 1755, a clean supplemental which contains the items agreed to by the conference committee to this point on the emergency flood relief supplemental, but which strips the proposal from the unrelated partisan riders which have been insisted on by the Republican leadership of both houses.

I had intended to try to offer a motion this evening to take that bill up today but the majority leadership did not want it cleared. I would simply say that if the leadership insists on putting nonrelated items into the supplemental, it is clear that the President will veto that legislation and we will be here next week doing what we ought to do this week, which is to pass a straight, clean supplemental appropriation bill meeting the needs of the flood victims in the various States in this country.

I would hope that by tomorrow, the House leadership and the Senate leadership would either have changed its mind about insisting on those unrelated riders, or else if they have not, I

hope that they will at some point tomorrow allow the motion which would allow us to bring before the House a stripped-down version of the supplemental so that we do not, in fact, needlessly tie up this legislation for another week. If we do not do this this week, we will certainly be here next week doing next week what we ought to be doing this week, and it makes no sense at all.

□ 1845

We ought to simply see an end to the partisan games, and we ought to move this bill in the stripped-down version on its way to the White House.

REPORT CONCERNING EXTENSION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR ALBANIA, BELARUS, KAZAKSTAN, KYRGYZSTAN, TAJIKISTAN, TURKMENISTAN, AND UZBEKISTAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-91)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BONILLA) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the document referred to in subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the "Act"), with respect to a further 12-month extension of authority to waive subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act. This document constitutes my recommendation to continue in effect this waiver authority for a further 12-month period, and includes my reasons for determining that continuation of the waiver authority and waivers currently in effect for Albania, Belarus, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act. I have submitted a separate report with respect to the People's Republic of China.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 3, 1997.

REPORT CONCERNING EMIGRATION LAWS AND POLICIES OF ARMENIA, AZERBAIJAN, GEORGIA, MOLDOVA, AND UKRAINE (H. DOC. NO. 105-92)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit a report concerning emigration laws and policies of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine as required by subsections