

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 unrelated 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

402(b) and 409(b) of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the "Act"). I have determined that Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine are in full compliance with subsections 402(a) and 409(a) of the Act. As required by title IV, I will provide the Congress with periodic reports regarding the compliance of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine with these emigration standards.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 3, 1997.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REASONABLENESS IN SPENDING TAXPAYER DOLLARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, you know we are at the starting gate of a new era, I think, in the U.S. Congress of trying to look at what is reasonable and what is practical on the way we pay/spend taxpayers' dollars. We have just finished a debate and both sides have agreed that somehow Government is taking too much of the hard-earned money out of working families' pockets, so we are in a new attitude saying that too big a Government and too much taxes is bad for the people and it is bad for the economy.

I think as we look over some of the weaknesses of this budget agreement, I suspect a couple of the areas that I would put at the top of the list are the way we have dealt and tried to figure out solutions for the reduction in spending of entitlement programs.

Entitlement programs next year will use up 53 percent of the total Federal budget, and you know for a Congress that was developed and given the responsibility of not only deciding how much money was going to be spent and how it would be spent to evolve in today's situation where Congress really only has control of about 17 percent of the budget; if you consider that the 17 percent that goes into defense spending is almost on automatic pilot, because there is seldom a disagreement of more than a plus or minus 10 percent deviation between the hawks and the doves and the Republicans and the Democrats, we are left with discretionary spending that represents just under 17 percent of the Federal budget.

Entitlement programs I think can be defined as anybody that is eligible for that money will automatically be paid those sums. Of course, the large spending items are Social Security taking 23 percent of the Federal budget now, Medicare, Medicaid, the welfare programs, the food stamp programs, the agricultural programs; all on automatic pilot, if you will, that Congress has lost control of and a majority in Congress can no longer adjust those spendings without the consent of the President.

You know, I think a lot of people misunderstood what happened 2 years ago when Republicans said that we are going to take this discretionary spending and use it as leverage to try to change and slow down some of the increases in discretionary spending.

Now, the Government closed down first 2 days, and then in December 1995, 3 days, and then it came to March 1996, last year, and Republicans said, look, we are going to draw a line in the sand and we are not going to pass this discretionary spending bill that in effect runs the Federal Government unless the President agrees to submit a balanced budget.

The President though, does whatever he does to make those decisions, decided, yes, I am going to do that. Now the whole world of Congress has changed, and everybody is saying yes, we want to balance the budget.

I mean that is the good news, that is the great news, and now we are saying let us let people keep some of that hard-earned money in their pockets and start reducing taxes. That means reducing the size of this overwhelming huge Government that is now out of control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

IN SUPPORT OF FULL FUNDING FOR SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to focus on the need to sustain, expand, and fully support our Nation's youth through the federally funded Summer Youth Employment Program.

I am strongly committed to the Summer Youth Employment Program and would like to insure that it serves all of the needs for summer employment for our Nation's disadvantaged youth.

Prior to my election to the U.S. House of Representatives, I worked to create an expanded Summer Youth Employment Program that would serve the entire city of Houston.

That resulting effort continues to be successfully managed by Houston Works, a not-for-profit organization based in Houston, TX.

I know from personal experience that a summer job for those young people enrolled into the Job Training Partnership Act's Summer Youth Employment Program sponsored projects around this country is more than just an opportunity to have money for the next school year, it is an opportunity to learn, live, and experience the work environment and culture.

In 1997, Houston Works Summer Youth Program plans to serve 6,500 young people between the ages of 14 and 21, with a projected budget of \$8.9 million. This funding would only allow 3 percent of those who would qualify to be included in the program. The potential number of applications for this important jobs program is 43,000 young people which reflects the total number of disadvantaged youth in the area served by Houston Works. Nationwide, there are 4 million youths who would qualify for this summer jobs program if funds were available.

Last year Houston Works provided 5,177 jobs to youth ages 14 through 21 years, with a budget of \$6.5 million.

This program has made a significant difference in the lives and fortunes of Houston's young people who were fortunate enough to have their applications accepted.

One young lady in particular that comes to mind when I think of the real impact of our summer jobs program has on the lives of our Nation's young people is Ms. LaQuista L. Stewart.

Ms. Stewart is a remarkable young woman who worked 4 years with the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program during the summers of 1991 through 1994. Her placement included 2 years as a clerical assistant at Smiley High School; 1 year at Texas Children's Hospital as medical assistant to the supervisor of the pulmonary laboratory technician in the Diagnostic Center, and 1 year as clerical assistant to Houston City Councilmember Felix Fraga.

Ms. Stewart's uniqueness is not that she did very well in her job placements, but that she, like majority of youth served by this critical program, had to overcome obstacles to meet the challenges and succeed in the program.

At the age of 2, she and her family were involved in a car wreck that left her stepfather permanently disabled and LaQuista lost her spleen and left kidney. Her family has gone through great difficulty, both financial and personally, as they learned to cope with their physical and economic limitations after the accident.

Ms. Stewart used the income provided by her youth employment to assist her family financially and for college expenses.

Despite her setbacks, Ms. Stewart was able to participate in the National Honor Society, became her Class Parliamentarian, worked with Future Business Leaders of America, and was ranked 40th in a class of 365 students.

Ms. Stewart credits Houston Works Program which is funded by the Summer Youth Employment Program for her successful job placement in the office of Houston City Councilmember Michael J. Yarbrough. Councilmember Yarbrough hired Ms. Stewart in a permanent job on July 29, 1994. She currently works 40 hours per week and is enrolled in her third year at the University of Houston.