United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 19, 1997 No. 66

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PEASE].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 19, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable EDWARD A. PEASE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, gracious God, that in all our relationships and in our efforts to improve the quality of life for every person, we would be impatient with injustice but patient with each other. Help us never to lose our zeal for righting the wrongs that trouble our land nor weakening our desire to help the neediest among us. While we may differ in our paths to achieving justice, may we never fade in our respect for each other. Unite us, O God, in our common goals so that justice will flow down as waters and righteousness like an everflowing stream. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WOLF 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.

MOST-FAVORED TRADING STATUS FOR CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the body and of all Members an issue with regard to most-favored-nation trading status, and we just got a call from the White House saying that the President in what he called the opening firing shot is expected to announce today that they will renew favorable trade benefits for China, most-favored-nation trading status for China.

Mr. Speaker, over the weekend I happened to have the opportunity, somebody gave me the film that was put out by the Boeing Co. showing their lobbying effort on this whole issue of MFN. After watching the film I was somewhat sickened to see that all the emphasis was on the question of dollars and selling things and no emphasis, not even a little bit, on the question of human rights and religious freedom. So today I am sending a letter, and I am going to read the letter that I am sending to the chairman and chief executive of the Boeing Corp., Mr. Philip Condit with regard to after watching the film that they are promoting around the country in support of MFN, and here is the letter that I am sending to Mr. Condit today.

''Dear Mr. Condit, I recently watched the Boeing video series on China which portrays the long and profitable relationship that your company has developed with the Chinese. As one who has, for years, been concerned about repressed people in countries around the world; from Romania to Russia, China, East Timor and others, urging their governments to adopt a policy of basic regard for human rights and individual freedom, I respectfully wish to comment on what I saw in the video.

''I mean no personal criticism in any of my comments. I strongly believe that you are a good and decent person as are your board members and top management. My purpose is not to condemn but only to present to you a different view of this issue—a look through the eyes of someone with a different perspective.

''As I watched in the video,'' put out by the Boeing Corp., ''some of the meetings and events which included Premier Li Peng, it was hard for me to forget that it was he,'' Li Peng, ''who ordered the 1989 brutal crackdown and arrest of the dissident students at Tiananmen Square, some of whom are imprisoned still today.''

Parenthetically, I visited Beijing Prison No. 1 where I saw 40 Tiananmen Square demonstrators who were arrested by Mr. Peng who are still in jail working on socks which were meant for export to the United States. I wondered if anyone from Boeing thought about that.

As I watched former Secretary of State Kissinger in the film; Mr. Kissinger is speaking to a Chinese group in the film, ''As I watched former Secretary of State Kissinger address the group and observe that America's 'national style' has a missionary aspect of which he did not favor, I thought he was, in a sense, apologizing for or even diminishing our Nation's zeal to secure basic human rights and freedoms for all men and women—to come to the defense of the little guy. Perhaps I misinterpreted his remarks, but that is

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

how they seemed to me. And I wondered if he or others listening remembered the Chinese Government's organ transplant program where prisoners are executed and their healthy organs are harvested for sale even before the bodies have time to cool.

''During the cruise down the Yangtze River,'' in the video again, ''did anyone remember the Catholic bishops and priests imprisoned for decades simply for living their religion? Do you suppose the Chinese Government policy of slamming shut the doors of house churches came to mind? You do know that house churches crop up because free and open worship is banned. People come together to worship in secret because there is no other way.

''Was Harry Wu's name mentioned? Jailed for 17 years for exposing China's terrible human rights record, Mr. Wu was tossed out of the country. Later, as a U.S. citizen traveling on a U.S. passport, he was again jailed on specious charges. Was there concern over how American citizens can be treated by the Chinese Government—much less their own people?''

And watching the video put out by Boeing, I note that there was a note of pride in Boeing's relating its company's efforts working with Li Peng, again who was the butcher of Beijing and his regime in securing 1996 most-favored-nation trading status for China.

''Could one sense a rush of confidence in the air as Boeing's plans for dealing with the new administration and the new Congress to again prevail on the question of 1997 MFN were unveiled.

''I personally,'' Mr. Condit, ''looked in vain for even a hint of embarrassment as your spokesman talked of Boeing, in order to bury those in the China MFN debate who wonder about human rights, again signing on with the same folks who tried to sell assault weapons and even shoulder held missiles to LA street gangs.

''And as Boeing informed the video audience,'' which was quite shocking when they said, and I quote, 737's, ''when their 737's, 747's, 757's and 767's flew to China, they were just 'coming home,' because so much of each plane had been manufactured there, was I the only one who wondered about the American men and women—moms and dads—who no longer have a job and about the additional jobs that are going to be lost in the United States?

''I think it is good that Boeing has developed such a solid and profitable relationship with China. It certainly offers you an opportunity to address the concerns of the American people—indeed the concerns of all freedom loving people around the globe—in your meetings and gatherings with the Chinese. And I wonder, is there not an obligation for those of you who run Boeing to think about these things, and maybe to speak out?

''If, as so many who favor most-favored-nation trading status for China argue, free trade provides a forum for dialog and discussion for them to learn about democracy, self-determination and freedom, who is to conduct the dialog and discussion if not those involved in the trade?''

That is Boeing.

''Reasonable men and women can differ over issues. My wish here has been to present a differing perspective for your consideration.''

And then I close with this request, and, Mr. Condit, ''In our own country,'' Mr. Condit, ''as you drive past a church, I hope you will think about the Chinese Catholic bishops and priests and Protestant pastors who have been in prison and tortured for their faith. When you drive by a mosque, think about the Moslems who are being persecuted in the northwest part of China. When someone speaks of the beauty of Tibet, please think about the Buddhist monks and nuns who have been killed for their faith and their temples destroyed. When you hear of Solzhenitsyn's book, 'Gulag Archipelago,' I hope you will remember the political and human rights activists such as Wei Jingsheng who languish in China's logai because of their desire for freedom and liberty that Thomas Jefferson wrote so eloquently on in our Declaration of Independence.

''Thank you. Best wishes to you, to Boeing and to your employees. Sincerely, Frank R. Wolf.''

I hear all the companies and in the Boeing articles that I read, that I will submit in the RECORD of their major lobbying efforts. In fact, there was an article that I will submit for the RECORD entitled ''New China Lobby Is Big Business.''

No one talks about human rights. In the video you never heard anything about human rights. In order to sensitize the Congress and not the American people because the Members should know that in the latest surveys done, the last two surveys on this issue, 60-some percent of the people of the United States felt that we should take away MFN and that human rights should be important, whereas only 21 percent thought of the other side.

So the American people are where we always know they always have been, standing for freedom of religion and press and all those things. But where does the business community and where does Boeing stand?

This picture here was presented in a testimony to a Senate committee, Foreign Relations, on May 13 of this year of 1997. This is a picture of a nun. Her name is Tsering Lhamo. This is a nun, the person testifying went on to say, who was tortured in Tibet when she was 19 years old. She took part in a nonviolent demonstration for Tibetan human rights in Llasa. She spent 3 years in a prison where she was repeatedly tortured, particularly with electric cattle prods, which are manufactured purely for human torture.

I have seen those that have been smuggled out of Tibet and have held them in my hand, an American cattle prod that might be used by a rancher in the State of Montana, is this large, and this person indicated how large, and it is for whacking the back of a steer. These are about this big, and he again showed the size, and you can see that they are just used to torture human beings.

□ 1415

She was raped with a cattle prod, and she had it shoved in her mouth. She is now dying of the effects of the torture. And then it ends by saying, U.S. humanitarian aid has been brought in to help her and she is doing better.

So when we talk in terms of MFN, which is most-favored-nation trading status for China, will the people of Boeing think in terms of the individuals that are being tortured in Tibet and the monks and the nuns that are being killed in Tibet and how many have been imprisoned? I hope so. I hope so. And I hope President Clinton will also think in terms of them as he makes the feeble argument for granting MFN again.

I now put up another photo, and I would ask people that are supporting MFN to think in terms of this photo. In China, they have an organ donor program, or what they do is they take prisoners, some who have done bad things and others who have not, out and they shoot them. This is a picture of what they do. They tie them up, they shoot them, and after they die, they then take their kidneys out and they sell them for transplants. Doctors are there on the scene. The kidneys are immediately taken out, and we even have one report where kidneys were taken out even before the man died. They are then harvested for transplantation and for sale to those in the West.

So when we think of MFN, most-favored-nation, trading status for China, think in terms of these men who are shot and then their kidneys are taken for sale for sometimes up to $35,000 to $50,000.

This is a picture of a slave camp. I am sure everyone knows, but if they do not, the Members of this body should know that there are more gulags, slave camps in China than there were in the Soviet Union. Now, we all know, as I have referred to in the letter to Mr. Condit, that Solzhenitsyn wrote the book Gulag Archipelago, which is an amazing book that most Americans read, it sensitized to the United States, the people in the West, what was going on.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to one of those gulags, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I visited Perm camp 35 in the foothills of the Ural Mountains during communism where we interviewed Scharansky's cellmate and many other people. It is a very unpleasant place. Well, we should know, all who favor granting MFN, that there are more gulags, slave camps, in China than there were in the Soviet Union. Of course, Ronald Reagan, to his credit,

and a bipartisan group of Republicans and Democrats, did not give MFN to the Soviet Union because of what they were doing, but we are going to give it, some people hope, and I hope we do not, to China. But as we do, it says the slaves, in a chemical processing room of a hide and garment factory, and the chemical eats into their naked bodies.

In fact, as there are people in the West, there are people that are watching this event who are wearing some clothing or have some item, they do not know about it, that has been made by slave labor and people that are in gulags. So as people are anxious to give MFN to China, they ought to think about the thousands, the millions, in the Chinese gulags.

I have a book here that has just been published called ''In The Lion's Den'', a shocking account of the persecution and martyrdom of Christians today by Nina Shea. In it she documents a lot of the activities that are taking place in China. So as we are anxiously awaiting, the Clinton administration at 2:15 today and others in Congress that are going to give MFN to China, think about what this book said and what Nina Shea says. In China today there are more Christians in prison because of religious activities than in any other Nation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, Protestants are arrested and tortured for holding prayer meetings, teaching and distributing Bibles without the state approval. Roman Catholic bishops and priests are in prison for celebrating mass and administrating the sacraments without official authorization.

I would urge that, when Members in our country approach the communion table to take the sacraments, whether it be this Sunday or whatever Sunday it is or whatever opportunity, as they approach the communion table to take the bread and the wine in this country, they think in terms of the men, Catholic priests, Catholic bishops, Protestant pastors who have been in prison for serving holy communion in China; and then say, do we really want to give this country and this government the most-favored-nation trading status. Think of this when approaching the communion table, do we want to do it when there are priests and bishops and ministers in jail for trying to do the same thing that everyone in this country takes for granted.

Nina Shea went on to say, while China's closed penal system makes it difficult to obtain accurate numbers, Freedom House has a list of names of about 200 Christian clergy and church leaders who are in prison or under some form of detention or restrictions in mid-1996 because of religious activities. There are thought to be thousands of Christians now in prison for their faith in China's religious gulag. In several recent dragnet operations, hundreds of Christians were arrested. Some are serving sentences up to 12 years or more for, quote, counterrevolutionary charges. But the fact is, they were incarcerated for practicing their faith.

Many prisoners, she goes on to say, are forced to work in the laogai, that is the gulag, the reform labor camps where prisoners must toil and slave for 12 hours a day, 7 days a week in automotive and chemical factories, brickmaking plants, mines, and on farms. According to American Christians working in China in 1996, 1996, last year, the record that we are basing whether we give MFN to China, according to most Americans, Christians working in China in 1996, it has been, and I quote, the most repressive period for Catholics and Protestants since the late 1970's.

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why. Why would we give most-favored-nation trading status to China when it has been the most repressive period in 1996. It did not say 1976, it said 1996. That was last year. We did not grant it to the Soviet Union; we did not grant it to the Eastern Bloc nations. Ronald Reagan, God bless him, even signed a bill to take it away from Ceausescu in Romania, and the Clinton administration and some in Congress want to give it to China when it has been the most repressive year for Christians.

Nina Shea went on to say, Catholics who choose to stay loyal to the Vatican and Protestant Christians who meet in unauthorized underground or house churches encounter severe persecution, including fines, arrest, and imprisonment. She says, one of the most well-known house churches in the country, that of pastor Allen Yuan, in Beijing was closed in the fall of 1996. The United States-based dissident journal China Focus quotes Pastor Yuan as saying, and I quote, we have only one room and we do not even have any property, but the authorities still look at us as if we are monsters. All they want is to control us.

The popular pastor served 22 years in China's laogai for his faith. The Far Eastern Economic Review reported on June 6, 1996, that police have destroyed at least 15,000 unregistered temples, churches, and tombs between February and June 1996 in Zhejiang Province alone.

Let me just go back so we can think in terms of that, when we all get so excited about MFN and the President rolls out the red carpet for the Chinese butchers who will be visiting the country later on, we will go slowly, now. He says that the police had destroyed at least 15,000 unregistered temples and churches and tombs between February and June 1996 in only one province. What is taking place in the other provinces?

Victims of the crackdown are legion. At least three evangelicals were killed by Chinese authorities during the first quarter of 1996, according to reports from the Voice of America, and Compass Direct. One Zhang Xiuju, a 36-year-old woman, on the night of May 26, 1996, she was dragged out of her home by police in Hunan Province and beaten to death, beaten to death.

Do we think Ronald Reagan would have given the Chinese MFN? I cannot say whether we would have or not, but I do know that Ronald Reagan, who gave the famous speech in Orlando, the Evil Empire speech where he denounced the Soviet Union and talked about spiritual values and stood on behalf of those who were being persecuted in the Soviet Union, those of the Jewish faith and many other faiths and those who were Jewish and wanted to emigrate, Ronald Reagan stood in solidarity for them. He made a difference. So I do not think he would have given MFN to China.

I do know this. While I cannot say that he would not have given MFN to China, I do know that he signed the bill to take away MFN for Ceausescu and the brutal Romanian administration in 1987. So I personally do not think that Ronald Reagan would have.

For those on my side of the aisle, we talk about our values and we talk about what do we want to stand for. The Republican Party ought not only be the party of free trade, and I am a free trader, I voted for NAFTA, the Republican Party not only should be an economic party, but we should be a party that cares about these fundamental values of human rights and religious freedom.

Nina Shea goes on to say on page 62 of the book, In the Lion's Den, another brutal incident occurred in March 1996 when five evangelical women were arrested, it seems like evangelicals can just be the target around the world today. It almost seems that if one is an evangelical or Catholic priest or Catholic bishop, they can be the target and nobody will really care. In fact, I do remember during the debate last year when we extended it, people talked about we need engagement. After they got their MFN, there was no engagement at all, they continued to get their MFN and nobody did anything.

Here are five evangelical women arrested and detained in western Xinjiang Province after a raid on a house church in a predominantly Muslim region. A total of 17 church members were initially arrested, and 12 were released when 5 women accepted responsibility for the gathering. Police severely beat several of the Christians, knocking out one woman's front tooth and poured scalding water on those who resisted orders. The five women were imprisoned.

Catholics too have felt great pressure in 1996. Believers within the Roman Catholic Church are forced to affiliate with the government-sanctioned Catholic Patriotic Church, which does not recognize the ultimate earthly authority of the Pope.

She goes on to say, the Connecticut-based Cardinal Kung Foundation reports that security troops conducted a series of raids in spring 1996 throughout the Baoding Diocese in Hebei Province which has a significant population. Priests, including two bishops, were arrested, churches were forced to register with the Catholic Patriotic Association, and at least 4,000 Catholics were forced to recant their faith publicly.

□ 1430

She goes on, and has a picture here of Bishop Su. The 64-year-old auxiliary bishop of Baoding was arrested in a series of raids against Catholics in Hebei Province in the spring of 1996. Bishop Su had already spent a total of 15 years in prison because of his religious activity.

Once he was beaten by security police until the board they were using was reduced to splinters. Not satisfied, the police then dismantled a wooden door frame in order to continue the beatings, which soon splintered as well. On another occasion the bishop was bound by the wrists and suspended from the ceiling while beaten. His head received numerous blows, causing permanent loss of hearing.

In still another prison episode, and what a man of faith Bishop Su is, he was placed in a closet-sized room filled with water at varying levels, from ankle deep to hip deep. He was left there for several days, unable to sit or sleep. We have films showing that it is a wonderful thing to give the most-favored-nation trading status to China.

Let me read on a little bit more. In January 1996, Reverend Guo Bo Le, a Roman Catholic priest from Shanghai, was sentenced to 2 years of imprisonment at a ''reform through labor'' camp because of his illegal religious activities. He was arrested while celebrating mass on a boat for about 250 fishermen.

Guo's other illegal activities included administering the Sacrament of the Sick, establishing underground evangelical church centers, organizing catechism institutes, teaching Bible classes, and boycotting the Catholic Patriotic Association, the nonrecognized church. Fifty-eight-year-old Guo has already spent 30 years, over half of his life, in a Chinese prison camp because of his faith. Thirty years in a China's prison camp, and the Boeing Corp. cannot even speak out on these issues?

As I maintained in the letter, reasonable men and women can differ on this issue, but those who said they wanted MFN said that this would enable us to engage, constructive engagement was their word, engage the Chinese. Well, would not the Chinese Government really listen to Boeing more than they would listen to me? I am against MFN. Boeing is for MFN. Would not the Chinese Government be more sympathetic to Boeing if Boeing were to speak out on behalf of this Roman Catholic priest?

I just wonder if Boeing has in their files any letters that they have ever sent to Li Peng asking for the release of Catholic priests or the release of Catholic bishops, or the release of Buddhist monks or the release of Buddhist nuns or the release of Protestant pastors.

I will end with the last comment she makes, and there are many, many more in the book, ''In the Lion's Den.'' She said another cause for religious persecution stems from China's draconian one-child-per-family and eugenics-based population control plan. Those defying the population controls, including Christians motivated by conscience, are harshly punished by torture, imprisonment, fines, and forcible abortions and sterilizations.

This really is a pro-life issue, too. When the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I were in China we talked to people and they told the stories of women in China who were tracked down by the Chinese Government officials in those villages and forced to have an abortion because they have the one-child policy. I am sure most people in this country would not want to have the one-child policy. They would be very upset with regard to that.

Mr. Speaker, there is much, much more that I could say today on this issue. I would like to just close by reading a portion of Ronald Reagan's speech that he gave in Orlando, that wonderful speech in 1983. In the speech Ronald Reagan quoted from the famous author, C.S. Lewis. He said the following. He said, ''It was C.S. Lewis who, in his unforgettable Screwtape Letters, wrote 'The greatest evil is not done now in those sordid dens of crime that Dickens loved to paint. It is not even done in concentration camps and labor camps. In those we see its final result. But it is conceived in order and moved and seconded and carried out in clear, carpeted, warm and well-lit offices by quiet men with white collars and cut fingernails and smooth-shaven cheeks who do not need to raise their voices.' ''

He went on to say, ''Because these men do not raise their voices and because they sometimes speak in soothing tones of brotherhood and peace, because, like other dictators before them, they are always making 'their final territorial demand,' some would have us accept them at their word and accommodate ourselves to their aggressive impulses.''

But if history teaches anything, it teaches that ''the simple-minded appeasement or wishful thinking about our adversaries is folly. It means the betrayal of our past and the squandering of our freedom,'' the betrayal of our past and the squandering of our freedom.

What he meant is, when Ronald Reagan was very firm and we were in a bipartisan way on this issue, Ronald Reagan met with Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan met with Brezhnev, but he always raised the cases of the dissidents. Our Secretary of State, Jim Baker and Schultz and others, used to meet with the dissidents in the American Embassy as an act of solidarity, so they knew that we stood with them.

The fact is in the 1980's 250,000 people rallied on the Mall one Sunday because of the persecution of those of the Jewish faith; 250,000 people came from all over the country in solidarity of those who were being persecuted in the Soviet Union.

How times have changed. Who says it does not make a difference who is in political office? Who says it does not make a difference what values they have? Now, after looking at what has taken place in China in 1996, not 1976 but in 1996, we still see those who continue to want to give MFN to the butchers who say that they are going to change or they are going to do this, but we also saw that even when the leaders of China say they are going to change, 1996 was the worst year since the 1970's. We know that when Andre Sakharov was under house arrest and Nathan Scharansky, that hero, so when he was released from Perm Camp 35, through the good effect of the Reagan administration when he came to the Glienicker Bridge in East Berlin to go into West Berlin, the communists told Scharansky to walk straight across the bridge, and Scharansky refused. When he broke loose from the Communist authorities he walked zig-zagged, this way and back, to defy them, to let them know that freedom was important, and he was a free man, that he did not have to do what they do.

We need that same activism today. In fact, Scharansky said if it had not been for Ronald Reagan and the denial of MFN and the pressure that this Congress used to put on, he may never have gotten out of jail.

So many hear the words that we will all hear again repeated over and over as we come to the July 4th period, the Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson from the State of Virginia that I am proud to represent, where Thomas Jefferson said, ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men,'' and women, ''are created equal, endowed by their creator with unalienable rights: Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.''

That was not only for the people in Charlottesville, he wrote it when he was actually in Philadelphia, it was not only for the people of Philadelphia and the United States, it was for all of the people of all the world.

That is why the people in Tiananmen Square had the Statue of Liberty and quoted those words, and now they wonder, now they wonder, have we lost our will in the West? Has the Congress lost its will? Has a Republican Congress lost its will, the Republicans who used to boldly proclaim in the 1980's on these things, have we lost our will?

I had an opportunity with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], when we visited Perm Camp 35, we brought a TV camera in and we interviewed some of these prisoners. Do Members know what they told us? Here we are in the Ural Mountains, under communism, in a brutal camp, they told us that they knew of the actions of the Reagan administration on behalf of human rights and religious freedom. They knew of the activities of the Congress.

I remember hearing that when the Congress denied MFN by a vote in 1987 and we took away MFN from Romania,

peasants in little villages and all through Romania heard of the fact that the people's House, the House of Representatives, had stood firm and had struck a blow for freedom by denying MFN, and they knew that someone in the West cared.

Now what will they hear today? They will hear that Clinton has granted MFN again this year. They will see that maybe the Congress has not done anything, and that we do not really care and we do not really act.

In closing, I would just urge all of my colleagues to be with the American people, be with the American people in the Harris-Teeter poll in the Wall Street Journal on May 1, 1997, which said as follows: that 67 percent said they demand human rights policy changes, and 27 percent said to continue trade relations.

The American people are where they always have been. The question is, will the Congress, will the Congress be with the American people?

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article from the Seattle Times of Monday, May 12, 1997.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Seattle Times, May 12, 1997]

NEW CHINA LOBBY IS BIG BUSINESS

(By Sara Fritz, Los Angeles Times)

WASHINGTON.—Jolinda Resa, owner of Square Tool and Machine in El Monte, Calif., was receptive last year when a Boeing representative showed up at her plant with an unusual request.

The visitor asked Resa, whose company supplies Boeing with machines for its manufacturing plants, if she would assist the giant airplane manufacturer in a drive to urge Congress to renew most-favored-nation trade status for China.

Resa gladly agreed to contact her congressman, Rep. David Dreier, R-Calif., and she arranged for local business leaders to attend a luncheon with a speaker recommended by Boeing. She did it, she says, because she realized that the future of her company depends on Boeing orders from airplane sales to China.

''In order to keep my 70 employees working,'' she explained. ''I felt I should do everything I could.''

Thus was the tiny Square Tool and Machine recruited into what experts call ''the new China lobby''—a broad-based, highly sophisticated army of U.S. corporate executives, lobbyists and consultants who use their considerable economic and political influence to press the U.S. government into maintaining good trade relations with China, whose market is the fastest growing in the world.

$20 MILLION LOBBYING EFFORT

Last year, major U.S. corporations doing business with China spent an estimated $20 million on a state-of-the-art lobbying drive that relied heavily on small-business suppliers such as Resa. Congress ultimately approved another one-year renewal for China for the low tariffs and other preferences for U.S. trading partners who have MFN status.

This year, however, China's reliance on U.S. companies to lobby on its behalf for another one-year MFN extension has taken on a more sinister coloration as a result of allegations that the Chinese may have made illegal donations to the U.S. presidential campaign last year.

Opponents of unfettered U.S.-China trade, including labor unions, human-rights groups and conservative Christians, are demanding to know why China seems to command more loyalty from U.S. business than do other foreign countries.

The Chinese government has made no secret in recent years of its determination to influence U.S. government policy. Among other things, it has established a Politburo-level Working Committee on the U.S. Congress, which monitors actions in Washington and regularly hosts U.S. lawmakers in Beijing.

American companies insist that they are representing their own interests—not those of China—when they lobby for MFN status. They note that the Chinese repeatedly have declared that business with U.S. companies will be halted if MFN status for China is revoked or if Congress makes it contingent on democratic reforms in China.

Cindy Smith, spokeswoman for Boeing, says the Chinese are in no way directing, financing or influencing the pro-MFN lobbying effort by big American companies. Yet she admits that her company knows the Chinese are paying close attention to Boeing's lobbying activities.

''Did (the Chinese) ask us to do it? Never!'' Smith said. ''Are they happy and pleased? Of course.''

CHINA IS THE FUTURE

As Boeing officials explain it, big U.S. corporations believe that their economic future depends on preserving trade with China. Boeing estimates that China will buy 1,900 airplanes valued at $124 billion over the next 20 years—sales that will go to other countries if Congress raises barriers to trade with China.

Many American companies not only depend upon sales to Beijing, but they also have made sizable investments in Chinese plants. Motorola, for example, estimates that it has invested at least $1 billion in China; making it the largest U.S. investor.

American companies are sensitive to criticism of their lobbying expenditures on behalf of China, particularly since the news media began reporting on possible illegal Chinese donations to U.S. political candidates. As a result, these companies refuse to discuss their lobbying activities in detail or to disclose how much money they are spending on it.

Nevertheless, experts say corporate lobbying expenditures on MFN status far surpass the amount spent by business on any other issue.

Groups established to lobby for unrestricted U.S.-China trade include the U.S.-China Business Council, made up of 300 corporations; the Emergency Committee for American Trade, a group of 55 chief executives; the Business Coalition for U.S.-China Trade, an organization of trade associations; and the China Normalization Initiative, a loosely organized state-by-state effort run by a few big companies such as Boeing and Motorola.

MFN REQUEST DUE ON JUNE 3

Although this year's political battle over MFN status may not begin formally until June 3—the date by which President Clinton must request renewal—all these groups are lobbying hard. Top corporate executives have been calling on members of Congress for several weeks, and the ''captains'' of more than 30 state-level MFN campaigns were introduced to their Congress members at a well-attended party on Capitol Hill last week.

By all accounts, the ability of major American corporations to enlist their suppliers as lobbyists was seen as the secret to their victory last year. Members of Congress respond more readily to the concerns of small-business owners in their own districts than to high-pressure pitches from big-business lobbyists.

PR Watch, a small newsletter that covers the lobbying and public relations industries, recently published a secret map that corporations used in last year's MFN campaign. It shows how each big company in the coalition was assigned a state or region of the country where it was expected to recruit small-business people to press for MFN status.

Square Machine and Tool was part of the California campaign, which the map shows to be the primary responsibility of executives from IBM and TRW. Resa was one of 1,200 Boeing suppliers across the nation who got involved in the campaign, according to the company. For her effort, she received a large framed photo of a Boeing 737 taking off in a scenic area of China.

Critics see problems with the corporate tactics.

By enlisting small businesses to participate in the MFN lobbying campaign, says Representative Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., the big companies create a false appearance of ''grass-roots'' support for MFN status when in fact the support is more like ''Astroturf—the kind of grass that you buy.''

Pelosi and Fiedler, among others, demand that members of the new China lobby disclose more details of their legislative strategies and their sources of income.

Registered foreign agents must file regular public reports. But many of the high-profile companies and professional consultants who represent Chinese interests in Washington—including former secretaries of State Henry Kissinger and Alexander Haig—escape the requirement because they work for companies that do business in China, not for the Chinese government itself.

Fiedler says some of the lobbyists have ''crossed the line'' between representing their own business interests and propagandizing on behalf of the Chinese government.

KISSINGER AND BOEING

He cites a half-hour video titled ''China and Boeing Working Together'' that the company distributes to the news media. The video, replete with misty Chinese scenery and sentimental music, records a speech in Beijing by Kissinger defending the policies of the Chinese government and condemning Americans who want to use trade sanctions to force changes in China.

Fiedler and other critics say these consultants are intellectual hostages of the Beijing regime and speak out favorably for China, to arrange meetings for their clients with top leaders in Beijing.

''There is a direct quid pro quo in terms of access,'' Pelosi said. ''They get access in exchange for speaking out.''

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2009

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOSS) at 8 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, THE BALANCED BUDGET AGREEMENT OF 1997

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–102) on the resolution (H. Res. 152) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget of the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WOLF) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, on May 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLF) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FORBES.
Mr. GEKAS.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Mr. RADANOVICH.
Mr. TAUZIN.
Mrs. FOWLER.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. PAYNE.
Mr. ROGAN.
Mr. SHUSTER in two instances.
Mr. QUINN.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. MARTINEZ.
Mr. SANDLIN.
Mr. MOAKLEY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 20, 1997, at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3358. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Maintenance of and Access to Records Pertaining to Individuals [49 CFR Part 10] (RIN: 2105–AC57) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3359. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Species; Threatened Status for Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) of Coho Salmon and Withdrawal of Proposed Rule to List Oregon Coast Coho Salmon ESU [Docket No. 950407093–6298–03; I.D. 012595A] received May 9, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3360. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Inspection and Copying of Department of Transportation Opinions, Orders, and Records and Implementation of the Consumer Credit Protection Act With Respect to Air Carriers and Foreign Air Carriers [14 CFR Part 310 and 374] (RIN: 2105–AC64) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3361. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Inflatable Liferafts (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD 85–205] (RIN: 2115–AC51) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3362. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Qualifications for Tankermen and for Persons in Charge of Transfers of Dangerous Liquids and Liquefied Gases (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD 79–116] (RIN: 2115–AA03) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3363. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Memphis in May Sunset Symphony Lower Mississippi River Mile 735.0—736.0, Memphis, TN (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD08–97–015] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3364. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Annapolis, Maryland, Severn River, Weems Creek (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD05–97–010] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3365. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97–NM–12–AD; Amdt. 39–10027; AD 96–26–52R1] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3366. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Changes in Accounting Periods and In Methods of Accounting [Rev. Proc. 97–27] received May 9, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3367. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Extension of Test of Employment Tax Early Referral Procedures for Appeals [Announcement 97–52] received May 9, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on May 16, 1997, the following report was filed on May 18, 1997]

Mr. KASICH: Committee on the Budget. House Concurrent Resolution 84. Resolution 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 (Rept. 105–100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 911. A bill to encourage the States to enact legislation to grant immunity from personal civil liability, under certain circumstances, to volunteers working on behalf of nonprofit organizations and governmental entities; with an amendment (Rept. 105–101 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SOLOMON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 152. Resolution providing for consideration of 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 (Rept. 105–102). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 911. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than May 21, 1997.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under Clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. CRANE (for himself and Mr. MATSUI) introduced a bill (H.R. 1660) to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to extend the Generalized System of Preferences until May 31, 2007; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 165: Mr. MICA, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.
H.R. 195: Mr. GOODE and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 450: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 475: Mr. MANTON and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 491: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 551: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 805: Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 956: Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1126: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. GEPHARDT,
H.R. 1161: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 1162: Mr. WICKER.
H.R. 1285: Mr. KLINK.
H.R. 1327: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1375: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1377: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 1432: Mr. FLAKE and Mr. DIXON.
H.R. 1492: Mr. ARCHER and Mr. BONO.
H.R. 1496: Mr. RADANOVICH and Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 1515: Mr. STUMP, Mr. COOK, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1539: Mr. WAMP, Mr. JONES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H. Con. Res. 47: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. FURSE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 138: Mr. ACKERMAN.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H. CON. RES. 84

OFFERED BY: MS. WATERS

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:
Fiscal year 1998: $1,241,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,295,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,358,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,421,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,466,331,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:
Fiscal year 1998: $36,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $44,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $54,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $60,198,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $45,352,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:
Fiscal year 1998: $1,390,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,460,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,505,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,544,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,591,266,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 1998: $1,377,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,445,118,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,495,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,517,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,564,726,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:
Fiscal year 1998: $135,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $147,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $137,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $95,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $98,395,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 1998: $5,556,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,803,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,037,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,241,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,466,700,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:
Fiscal year 1998: $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $33,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $34,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $37,099,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:
Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $336,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $237,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $245,233,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $233,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $233,746,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $233,861,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $232,174,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $235,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $227,453,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $224,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,137,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $21,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,726,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $12,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $17,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,510,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $18,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,376,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $18,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,166,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,001,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,217,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,042,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,745,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,314,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,271,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,291,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $2,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,731,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $2,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,822,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $2,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,484,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,312,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,174,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,352,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $30,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $22,214,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,550,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $21,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,780,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $21,974,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,362,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,767,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,757,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,465,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,543,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,069,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,937,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,720,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,660,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,724,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $828,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $245,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,357,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,887,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $253,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,820,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,238,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $255,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,264,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,574,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $257,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,481,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,680,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $259,897,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $43,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,261,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $45,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,652,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $45,422,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,640,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $46,698,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,022,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $48,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,665,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,567,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,803,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,352,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,606,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,165,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,415,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $87,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,799,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $91,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,488,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,032,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $95,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,114,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $95,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,114,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $99,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,336,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,676,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $138,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,347,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $85,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $152,463,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,307,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $112,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $162,025,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $172,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $172,314,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $184,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $183,955,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $205,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $205,808,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $225,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $224,825,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $241,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $245,382,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $261,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $256,765,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $283,933,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $283,140,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $245,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,468,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $260,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,255,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $277,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,066,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $284,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,127,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $298,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,014,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,547,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,231,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,918,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,116,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,513,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $41,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,885,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $42,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,184,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $42,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,312,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $42,855,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,105,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $43,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,361,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,129,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $26,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,009,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $26,161,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,378,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $25,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,541,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $25,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,042,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,451,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,040,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,639,001,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,490,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,625,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,405,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,122,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,060,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $295,593,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,593,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $301,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $301,972,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $300,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $300,590,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $297,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,107,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $295,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,816,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$11,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,369,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,734,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,672,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,244,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,858,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,516,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,845,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,331,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than August 1, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $396,058,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $592,292,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,724,790,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,268,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $535,924,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,692,944,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues as follows: by $36,142,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, by $45,352,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and by $240,895,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

H. CON. RES. 84

OFFERED BY: MR. DOOLITTLE

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,198,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,241,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,285,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,343,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,407,564,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: −$11,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$25,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$43,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$56,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$55,900,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,378,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,430,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,475,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,509,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,530,100,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,368,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,409,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,446,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,468,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,480,100,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $172,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $182,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $183,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $157,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $108,500,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $5,592,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,834,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,081,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,298,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,474,400,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $33,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $34,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $37,099,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $335,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $268,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,978,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $270,784,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,771,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $274,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,418,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $281,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,110,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $289,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,571,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,826,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,217,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000. (same)
(B) Outlays, $15,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $4,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,171,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $21,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $21,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $23,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,872,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,660,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $245,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,000,000.000.
(B) Outlays, $4,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,887,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $253,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,238,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $255,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,574,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $257,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,680,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $259,897,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $46,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $50,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $53,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $55,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $54,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $9,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,475,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $56,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $57,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,092,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $56,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $61,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $62,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,676,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $136,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $85,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $143,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $143,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $151,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $151,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $162,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $173,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $171,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $201,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $201,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $212,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $211,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $225,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $239,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $251,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $251,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $238,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $244,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $251,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $264,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $271,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $286,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $39,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $39,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $38,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $40,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $43,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,129,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $24,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $25,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $23,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $296,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,549,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $304,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,567,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $304,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,867,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $303,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,659,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $303,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,754,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$12,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$16,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$48,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$48,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$44,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$44,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$46,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$46,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$50,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$50,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$64,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$64,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for two separate reconciliation bills: the first for entitlement reforms and the second for tax relief. In the event Senate procedures preclude the consideration of two separate bills, this section would permit the consideration of one omnibus reconciliation bill.

(b) SUBMISSIONS.—

(1) ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—Not later than June 12, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (c) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—Not later than June 13, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (d) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(c) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $393,770,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $507,315,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,619,820,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $214,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,483,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,845,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $140,197,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,463,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: $1,168,336,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,346,679,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,384,496,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(d) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—(A) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $393,770,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $507,315,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,619,820,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $214,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,483,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,845,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $140,197,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,463,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: $1,160,936,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,326,179,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,299,496,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(e) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(f) FLEXIBILITY IN CARRYING OUT CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE.—If the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means report recommendations pursuant to their reconciliation instructions that provide an initiative for children's health that would increase the deficit by more than $2.3 billion for fiscal year 1998, by more than $3.9 billion for fiscal year 2002, and by more than $16 billion for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002, the committees shall be deemed to not have complied with their reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to adjust the appropriate budgetary levels to accommodate legislation increasing spending from the highway trust fund on surface transportation and highway safety above the levels assumed in this resolution if such legislation is deficit neutral.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) In order to receive the adjustments specified

in subsection (c), a bill reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that provides new budget authority above the levels assumed in this resolution for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be deficit neutral.

(2) A deficit-neutral bill must meet the following conditions:

(A) The amount of new budget authority provided for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be in excess of $25.949 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 1998, $25.464 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 2002, and $127.973 billion in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority set forth in subparagraph (A) must be offset for fiscal year 1998, fiscal year 2002, and for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002. For the sole purpose of estimating the amount of outlays flowing from excess new budget authority under this section, it shall be assumed that such excess new budget authority would have an obligation limitation sufficient to accommodate that new budget authority.

(C) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority must be offset by (i) other direct spending or revenue provisions within that transportation bill, (ii) the net reduction in other direct spending and revenue legislation that is enacted during this Congress after the date of adoption of this resolution and before such transportation bill is reported (in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution), or (iii) a combination of the offsets specified in clauses (i) and (ii).

(D) As used in this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) REVISED LEVELS.—(1) When the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill (or when a conference report thereon is filed) meeting the conditions set forth in subsection (b)(2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation of new budget authority to that committee by the amount of new budget authority provided in that bill (and that is above the levels set forth in subsection (b)(2)(A)) for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund.

(2) After the enactment of the transportation bill described in paragraph (1) and upon the reporting of a general, supplemental or continuing resolution making appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) establishing an obligation limitation above the levels specified in subsection (b)(2)(A) (at a level sufficient to obligate some or all of the budget authority specified in paragraph (1)), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation and aggregate levels of outlays to that committee for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 by the appropriate amount.

(d) REVISIONS.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this section shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(e) REVERSALS.—If any legislation referred to in this section is not enacted into law, then the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall, as soon as practicable, reverse adjustments made under this section for such legislation and have such adjustments published in the Congressional Record.

(f) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

(g) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''highway trust fund'' refers to the following budget accounts (or any successor accounts):

(1) 69–8083–0–7–401 (Federal-Aid Highways).

(2) 69-8191–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Capital Fund).

(3) 69-8350–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Formula Grants).

(4) 69–8016–0–7–401 (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration-Operations and Research).

(5) 69–8020–0–7–401 (Highway Traffic Safety Grants).

(6) 69–8048–0–7–401 (National Motor Carrier Safety Program).

SEC. 302. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of any concurrent resolution on the budget and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, no amounts realized from the sale of an asset shall be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues if such sale would cause an increase in the deficit as calculated pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) CALCULATION OF NET PRESENT VALUE.—The deficit estimate of an asset sale shall be the net present value of the cash flow from—

(A) proceeds from the asset sale;

(B) future receipts that would be expected from continued ownership of the asset by the Government; and

(C) expected future spending by the Government at a level necessary to continue to operate and maintain the asset to generate the receipts estimated pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''sale of an asset'' shall have the same meaning as under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) TREATMENT OF LOAN ASSETS.—For the purposes of this section, the sale of loan assets or the prepayment of a loan shall be governed by the terms of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

(d) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 303. ENVIRONMENTAL RESERVE FUND.

(a) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—In the House, after the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure report a bill (or a conference report thereon is filed) to reform the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of hazardous waste sites, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall submit revised allocations and budget aggregates to carry out this section by an amount not to exceed the excess subject to the limitation. These revisions shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments made under this section shall not exceed—

(1) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(2) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(3) $1 billion in budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(c) READJUSTMENTS.—In the House, any adjustments made under this section for any appropriation measure may be readjusted if that measure is not enacted into law.

SEC. 304. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES.

(a) ALLOCATION BY CHAIRMAN.—In the House, upon the reporting of a bill by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) providing up to $165 million in outlays for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority Federal land exchanges for fiscal year 1998 (assuming $700 million in outlays over 5 fiscal years, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall allocate that amount of outlays and the corresponding amount of budget authority.

(b) TREATMENT OF ALLOCATIONS IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, allocations made under subsection (a) shall be deemed to be made pursuant to section 602(a)(1) of that Act and shall be deemed to be a separate suballocation for purposes of the application of section 302(f) of that Act as modified by section 602(c) of that Act.

SEC. 305. BALANCED BUDGET REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget (or amendment or motion thereto, or conference report thereon) or any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause—

(1) total outlays for fiscal year 2002 or any fiscal year thereafter to exceed total receipts for that fiscal year, unless three-fifths of the whole number of each House of Congress provide for a specific excess of outlays over receipts by a rollcall vote;

(2) an increase in the limit on the debt of the United States held by the public, unless three-fifths of the whole number of each House provide for such an increase by a rollcall vote; or

(3) an increase in revenues unless approved by a majority of the whole number of each House by a rollcall vote.

(b) WAIVER.—The Congress may waive the provisions of this section for any fiscal year in which a declaration of war is in effect. The provisions of this section may be waived for any fiscal year in which the United States is engaged in military conflict which causes an imminent and serious military threat to national security and is so declared by a joint resolution, adopted by a majority of the whole number of each House, which becomes law.

(c) DEFINITION.—Total receipts shall include all receipts of the United States Government except those derived from borrowing. Total outlays shall include all outlays of the United States Government except for those for repayment of debt principal.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Baselines are projections of future spending if existing policies remain unchanged.

(2) Under baseline assumptions, spending automatically rises with inflation even if such increases are not mandated under existing law.

(3) Baseline budgeting is inherently biased against policies that would reduce the projected growth in spending because such policies are portrayed as spending reductions from an increasing baseline.

(4) The baseline concept has encouraged Congress to abdicate its constitutional obligation to control the public purse for those programs which are automatically funded.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that baseline budgeting should be replaced with a budgetary model that requires justification of aggregate funding levels and maximizes congressional and executive accountability for Federal spending.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The Congress and the President should enact a law which creates a regimen for paying off the Federal debt within 30 years.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESIDENT'S SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The President's annual budget submission to Congress should include a plan for repayment of Federal debt beyond the year 2002, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The plan should specifically explain how the President would cap spending growth at a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues.

(3) If spending growth were held to a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues, then the Federal debt could be repaid within 30 years.

SEC. 403. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMISSION ON LONG-TERM BUDGETARY PROBLEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) achieving a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 is only the first step necessary to restore our Nation's economic prosperity;

(2) the imminent retirement of the baby-boom generation will greatly increase the demand for government services;

(3) the burden will be borne by a relatively smaller work force resulting in an unprecedented intergovernmental transfer of financial resources;

(4) the rising demand for retirement and medical benefits will quickly jeopardize the solvency of the medicare, social security, and Federal retirement trust funds; and

(5) the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that marginal tax rates would have to increase by 50 percent over the next 5 years to cover the long-term projected costs of retirement and health benefits.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to create a commission to assess long-term budgetary problems. Their implications for both the baby-boom generation and tomorrow's workforce, and make such recommendation as it deems appropriate to ensure our Nation's future prosperity.

H. CON. RES. 84

OFFERED BY: MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,206,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,251,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,303,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,361,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2202: $1,421,072,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $10,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $15,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $16,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $16,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $18,133,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,392,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,448,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,500,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,535,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,582,693,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,358,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,422,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,480,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,495,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,544,270,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $142,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $155,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $159,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $116,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $105,065,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $5,686,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,954,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,230,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,488,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,752,800,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $35,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $34,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $36,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $38,249,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $39,415,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $335,141,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $262,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $259,255,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $262,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,353,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $262,505,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,423,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $262,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,287,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $262,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $259,471,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $18,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,207,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $12,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $15,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,795,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $16,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,343,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $16,603,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,991,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,826,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $16,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,073,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,217,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $17,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,587,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $18,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,147,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $19,281,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,713,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $20,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,687,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $21,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,715,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $3,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,468,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $3,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,543,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,814,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,857,000,000.
Outlays, $2,916,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $4,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,097,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,174,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $23,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,899,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $30,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $23,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,604,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $23,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,253,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $23,449,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,518,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $23,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,527,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,990,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $13,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays $11,516,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays $10,978,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,899,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,630,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,660,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $245,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,507,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,410,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $253,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays $10,092,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,112,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $255,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,364,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,784,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $257,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,942,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,781,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,996,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $259,897,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New Budget authority, $50,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,962,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $54,715,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,317,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $56,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,600,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $57,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,552,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $58,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,130,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,269,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,417,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,997,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $8,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,670,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,717,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,845,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,475,000,000
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $60,011,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,273,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,665,000,000
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $61,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,848,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,092,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $21,899,000,000
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $62,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,352,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $23,263,000,000
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $64,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,780,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $24,517,000,000
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $65,603,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,401,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,676,000,000
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $135,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,055,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $85,000,000
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $144,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $143,871,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $154,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,938,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $165,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,816,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $177,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $176,816,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $205,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $200,350,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $219,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $212,640,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $232,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,857,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $249,027,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $234,765,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $265,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,365,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $236,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $246,922,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $254,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,304,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $270,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,008,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $277,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $276,973,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $290,973,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,943,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,179,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,179,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,865,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,865,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $9,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,622,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,879,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,879,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,272,000.
(C) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $40,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,112,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $41,918,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $42,055,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $42,385,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,220,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $42,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,076,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $43,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,349,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,129,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750);
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $22,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,620,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $22,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,834,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,058,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $25,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,656,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,322,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,151,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $13,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,108,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,036,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $295,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,741,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $302,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,183,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $301,113,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $301,113,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $298,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $298,020,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $296,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,583,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,244,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$232,858,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,516,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,143,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,327,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,327,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 4. INVESTMENTS.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for Federal investments for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050)—for subfunction 051 for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $35,934,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $36,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $35,044,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $35,152,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $35,044,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $34,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $35,044,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $34,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $35,044,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $34,950,000,000.

(2) General Science, Space, and Technology (250)—for subfunctions 251 and 252 for General Science, Space and Technology programs:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,460,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $17,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $18,333,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $17,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,250,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays $18,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,213,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $19,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $21,223,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $20,534,000,000.

(3) Energy (270)—for subfunction 271 for Energy Supply Research and Development, and subfunction 272 for Energy Conservation—
Fiscal year 1998:
(A)New budget authority, $3,937,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $4,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $4,134,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $4,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $4,340,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $4,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $4,557,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $4,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $4,785,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $4,655,000,000.

(4) Natural Resources and Environment (300)—for subfunction 304 for Regulatory, Enforcement, and Research Programs and Hazardous Substance Superfund, and subfunction 306 Other Natural Resources:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $10,538,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $9,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $10,742,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $10,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,816,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $10,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,859,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $10,825,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,943,000,000.
(B) Budget outlays, $10,889,000,000.

(5) Agriculture (350)—for subfunction 352 for Research Programs:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $1,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,351,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $1,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $1,627,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,603,000,000.

(6) Commerce and Housing Credit (370)—for subfunction 376 for Science and Technology:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $680,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $851,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $818,000,000.

(7) Transportation (400)—for subfunction 401 Ground Transportation, subfunction 402 for Air Transportation, and subfunction 403 for Water Transportation:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $44,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $48,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $48,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $49,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,078,000,000.

(8) Community and Regional Development (450)—for subfunction 452 for Rural Development and Economic Development Assistance:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $1,279,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $1,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $1,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,258,000,000.

(9) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500)—for subfunctions 501, 502, 503, 504, and 506 National Service Initiative, Rehabilitation Services, and Children and Families Services Program:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $44,059,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $45,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $46,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $47,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,206,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $48,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,196,000,000.

(10) Health (550)—for subfunction 552 for Health Research and Training:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,771,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,628,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,409,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,783,000,000.

(11) Income Security (600)—for subfunction 605 for Food and Nutrition Assistance:
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $4,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $4,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $4,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $4,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $4,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,940,000,000.

SEC. 5. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—No later than June 30, 1997, the House committees named in subsections (b) and (c) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) HOUSE COMMITTEES.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays as follows: $7,900,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $36,500,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $115,700,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays as follows:

$7,900,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $36,500,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $115,700,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is increased by: $10,419,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $18,133,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $77,160,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(c) INVESTMENT TRUST FUND.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide for the establishment of a separate account in the Treasury known as the ''Investment Trust Fund'' into which shall be transferred revenues realized by the acution of spectrum allocations by the Federal Communications Commission and, further, provide that amounts in that fund shall be used exclusively for programs assumed under section 4.

(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 6. COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.

Upon the adoption of this resolution, the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall each make separate allocations to the appropriate committees of its House of Congress of total new budget authority and total budget outlays for each fiscal year covered by this resolution to carry out section 4. For all purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, those allocations shall be deemed to be made pursuant to section 302(a) and section 602(a) of that Act, as applicable.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BUDGET TRENDS.

It is the sense of Congress that the increasing portion of the Federal budget absorbed by interest payments and consumption programs, particularly health spending, has led to a declining level of domestically financed investment and may adversely impact the ability of the economy to grow at the levels needed to provide for future generations.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NEED TO MAINTAIN FEDERAL INVESTMENTS.

It is the sense of Congress that a balanced program to improve the economy should be based on the concurrent goals of eliminating the deficit and maintaining Federal investment in programs that enhance long-term productivity such as research and development, education and training, and physical infrastructure improvements.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE TREATMENT OF FEDERAL INVESTMENTS WITHIN THE BUDGET.

It is the sense of Congress that the current budget structure focuses primarily on short-term spending and does not highlight for decision making purposes the differences between Federal spending for long-term investment and that for current consumption. In order to restructure Federal budget to make such a distinction, it is necessary to identify an investment component in the Federal budget and establish specific budgetary targets for such investments.

H. CON. RES. 84,

OFFERED BY: MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,206,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,252,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,307,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,366,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,427,435,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $0.
Fiscal year 1999: $0.
Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: $0.
Fiscal year 2002: $0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,399,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,447,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,495,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,526,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,552,378,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,383,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,440,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,489,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,516,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,535,000,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $177,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $187,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $181,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $150,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $107,565,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $5,596,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,844,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,088,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,298,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,474,034,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $33,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $34,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $37,099,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $335,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $266,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $266,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $267,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $267,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $267,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,400,000,0000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,558,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $12,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,569,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,981,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,751,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,826,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,812,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,217,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,082,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,147,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,213,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,062,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $15,804,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,868,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $3,123,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,247,000,000

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $3,469,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,446,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $3,186,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,293,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $2,939,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,048,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $2,846,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,867,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,171,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $23,877,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,405,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $23,227,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,702,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $22,570,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,963,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $22,151,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,720,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $22,086,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,313,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $13,133,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,892,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,620,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,365,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $12,790,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,294,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,436,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $12,215,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,664,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,509,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $10,978,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,494,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,583,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $10,670,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,108,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,660,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $6,607,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−920,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $245,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $11,082,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,299,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,887,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $253,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $15,183,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,821,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,238,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $255,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $16,078,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,133,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,574,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $257,989,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $16,678,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,541,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,689,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $259,897,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $46,402,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $43,933,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $* * * To Be Supplied.

(B) Outlays, $* * * To Be Supplied.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $* * * To Be Supplied.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $* * * To Be Supplied.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $* * * To Be Supplied.

(B) Outlays, $* * * To Be Supplied.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $* * * To Be Supplied.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $* * * To Be Supplied.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $* * * To Be Supplied.

(B) Outlays, $* * * To Be Supplied.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $* * * To Be Supplied.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $* * * To Be Supplied.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $49,184,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $44,247,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $9,068,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,687,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,385,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $8,839,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,252,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,406,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $8,210,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,386,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,429,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $8,214,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,452,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $8,290,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,929,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,475,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, $46,556,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $44,256,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $47,114,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $44,357,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $48,135,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $44,303,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $67,320,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $58,362,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,665,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $63,750,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $63,885,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,092,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,899,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $65,903,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $66,178,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $67,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,981,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $68,739,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,966,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,676,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $140,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $140,567,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $85,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $149,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,394,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $159,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,747,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $170,662,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,385,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $181,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $181,127,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $203,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $203,964,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $214,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $214,148,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $229,340,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $229,337,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $244,036,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $243,181,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $256,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,769,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $240,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,861,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $255,375,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $259,346,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $271,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,669,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $276,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,007,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $288,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $287,221,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,524,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,196,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,866,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,043,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,398,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $40,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,371,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $41,745,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,979,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $42,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,223,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $42,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,540,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $42,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,783,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,129,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $25,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,209,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,476,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $25,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,840,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $25,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,701,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,879,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,959,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,363,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,131,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $296,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,672,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $304,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,932,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $305,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,512,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $304,037,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $304,037,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $303,796,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,796,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $41,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,841,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,949,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,937,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,151,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$51,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$51,124,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than August 1, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $395,150,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $513,615,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,638,120,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $0 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,483,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $22,478,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $25,192,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $141,497,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $399,663,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $511,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,639,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to decrease revenues as follows: by $8,000,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, by $16,000,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and by $60,000,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(C) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues as follows: by $8,000,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, by $16,000,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and by $60,000,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE.—If the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means report recommendations pursuant to their reconciliation instructions that, combined, provide an initiative for children's health that would increase the deficit by more than $4.6 billion for fiscal year 1998, by more than $8.0 billion for fiscal year 2002, and by more than $32 billion for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002, the committees shall be deemed to not have complied with their reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MIDDLE INCOME TAX RELIEF.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Tax reductions in tax bills enacted in the 1980's predominately benefited Americans with higher incomes.

(2) Increases in the social security payroll tax over this period has resulted in a net increase in the tax burden on middle income Americans.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should enact legislation providing targeted tax relief, with an emphasis on alleviating the tax burden on middle income Americans, by enacting the following provisions:

(1) Higher education initiatives, including the President's $1,500 HOPE scholarship tax credit and deductibility of up to $10,000 for higher education tuition and fees.

(2) Expansion of the child care tax credit, with increases in the amount of allowable expenses, the percentage of allowable expenses, and the income phase-down levels.

(3) Homeownership provisions, including up to a $500,000 capital gains exclusion for home sales, and permitting tax and penalty-free borrowing from an IRA account or a parent's IRA account for a down payment on a first-time home purchase.

(4) Savings provisions, including an increase in the annual limit for deductible IRA contributions from $2,000 to $2,500 per year.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Small businesses are the source of most new jobs created in this country.

(2) Small businesses have a more difficult time than large corporations in raising capital covering health care costs for employees, and coping with estate taxes.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should enact legislation providing tax incentives and tax relief for small businesses, including:

(1) Incentives for long-term investments in small businesses, including capital gains relief, deferral of gains on any small business investments rolled over into another small business investment, and a tripling of the amount of declarable losses on investments in small businesses.

(2) Estate tax relief for family-owned small businesses and farms, and an increase in small businesses eligibility for 10-year installment payments of estate taxes.

(3) 100 percent deductibility of health care costs for the self-employed.

(4) Extension of the 5 percent Foreign Sales Credit (FSC) to software exporters.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON REVENUE NEUTRALITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Large tax cuts in the 1980's led to an unprecedented explosion in the level of debt owed by American taxpayers.

(2) Tax cuts without revenue offsets increase the level of spending cuts required to balance the budget, in vital areas like education, health care, transportation, and research and development.

(3) It is a priority to balance the budget first, and to defer tax cuts which reduce revenues until the budget is actually in balance.

(4) Targeted tax cuts for higher education, child care, homeownership, increased savings, and small businesses can be enacted without reducing the net level of revenues.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that all tax cuts should be fully offset by revenue increases, through reinstatement of expiring excise taxes and the closing of corporate tax loopholes.

SEC. 304. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CHILDREN'S HEALTH.

It is the sense of Congress that sufficient funding be provided to insure all currently uninsured children in America, through health care grants to the States and an expansion of medicaid in a total amount of at least $32,000,000,000 over the next 5 years.

SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Medicare Part A Trust Fund will go bankrupt by the year 2000 without congressional action.

(2) Some 40,000,000 senior citizens rely on medicare for affordable, quality health care.

(3) Many low-income senior citizens are unable to afford projected increases in medicare premiums.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should enact legislation to extend the solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund for the next 10 years, using policies which:

(1) Maintain part B premiums at 25 percent, with a phase-in of home health care changes.

(2) Provide new preventive and other health care benefits, including expanded mammography coverage, coverage for colorectal screenings, coverage for diabetes screening, 72 hours of respite care of Alzheimers patients, bone mass measurements for osteoporosis care, prostate cancer screening, cancer clinic benefits, and immunosuppressant drugs.

(3) Include sustainable reductions in reimbursements for hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, and other health care providers.

(4) Provide full funding for teaching hospitals through the Graduate Medical Education program.

(5) Increase health care choices among seniors, without restricting access to fee-for-service health care.

SEC. 306. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MEDICAID.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Hospitals and other health care providers are already seriously underreimbursed for the actual cost of providing medicaid services.

(2) Medicaid is the primary source of health care coverage for the uninsured, including poor children, indigent mothers, and low-income senior citizens in nursing homes.

(3) Medicaid provides critical funding for medicare premiums for low-income seniors.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that medicaid legislation should increase coverage for low-income adults and seniors, and uninsured children, by providing that:

(1) Any reductions in medicaid reimbursements to health care providers should be used to expand coverage for children's health care, legal immigrants, and low-income Americans.

(2) Spending reductions should not include either a block grant or a per capita cap.

(3) Medicaid should extend its program to pay medicare premiums for low-income senior citizens, protecting them from increases caused by home health care shifts.

(4) States should be given more flexibility in managing the medicaid program, through managed care options, and elimination of unnecessary regulations, while fully protecting the quality and availability of health care for medicaid recipients.

SEC. 307. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DOMESTIC DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

It is the sense of Congress that sufficient funding be provided for domestic discretionary spending to allow for full inflationary increases over the period from 1998 through 2002, to fully fund priority areas like education, health care, transportation, research and development, community development, crime, and housing.

SEC. 308. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PELL GRANT LIMITS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The spiraling cost of higher education tuition and fees threatens to put the cost of college out of reach for millions of Americans.

(2) Pell Grants are an effective way to make college affordable for low-income students.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should increase the annual limit on Pell Grants from $2,700 to $3,700.

SEC. 309. SENSE OF CONGRESS IN SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Children cannot achieve their full educational potential, if the school buildings they are educated in are falling apart.

(2) The General Accounting Office (GAO) has determined that it will require $112,000,000,000 to repair and improve our Nation's schools.

(3) Many communities are unable to afford the full cost of making such needed repairs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should enact the President's school construction initiative, to provide $5,000,000,000 to leverage the repair and construction of elementary and secondary schools.

SEC. 310. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EDUCATION.

It is the sense of Congress that funding should be substantially increased in a number of programs which increase educational opportunities, including:

(1) Title I grants, to help the disadvantaged develop basic educational skills.

(2) The Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, to provide computers, software, and technology training to elementary and secondary schools.

(3) Special education IDEA grants, to provide services to children with disabilities.

(4) Adult education grants, to provide adult literacy and other educational programs.

(5) The Federal work study program, to provide needy students with part-time work.

SEC. 311. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Our continued economic growth is dependent on maintaining and expanding our basic infrastructure, especially with respect to roads and bridges.

(2) In many sections of our country, our transportation infrastructure suffers from a lack of adequate funding and neglect of maintenance.

(3) For many years, Congress has failed to use funds collected under the Federal gas tax to pay for essential road and related transportation needs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that all new funds collected in the transportation trust fund should be fully spent on transportation improvements.

SEC. 312. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Adequate nutrition, quality health care, educational opportunities, and high quality child care for children between birth and the age of 3 are scientifically shown to play a critical role in later childhood and adult development.

(2) Public spending on health, nutrition, education, and child care at the stage of early childhood development has proven to be a sound long-term investment in human resources.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that sufficient funding should be provided in the following programs to meet the needs of infants and toddlers:

(1) WIC (the supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children).

(2) Head Start.

(3) Healthy Start.

(4) Programs for infants and toddlers with disabilities under part H of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

(5) Programs under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act.

SEC. 313. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HEALTH RESEARCH.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The National Institutes of Health (NIH) is the world's leading biomedical research institution.

(2) The National Institutes of Health accomplishes its mission of discovering new medical knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone through supervising, funding, and conducting biomedical and behavioral research to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability in humans.

(3) The Federal investment in the National Institutes of Health should be sufficient to keep up with the pace of biomedical inflation and public health needs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that funding for the National Institutes of Health should be at least equal to the Institute's annual professional judgment, which is the best and most reliable estimate of the minimum level of funding needed to sustain the high standard of scientific achievement attained by the National Institutes of Health.

SEC. 314. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Federal support of research and development has led to numerous advances in science and technology that have greatly enhanced the lives of all Americans.

(2) Technological innovation has spurred almost half of the economic development of the past century.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that full funding should be provided

for Federal research and development programs, including the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the solar and renewable energies programs of the Department of Energy.

SEC. 315. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CRIME.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Crime continues to threaten residential and commercial neighborhoods through the Nation.

(2) Juvenile crime continues to grow at a faster rate than other categories of crime in this Nation.

(3) Intervention and prevention programs have been shown to successfully turn the tide of violent crime.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that funding for crime intervention, prevention, and domestic violence programs should be increased over current levels.

SEC. 316. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON VETERANS.

It is the sense of Congress that funding should not be cut for veterans' COLA or for housing benefits.

SEC. 317. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HOUSING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 13,000,000 Americans have ''acute housing needs''.

(2) Current funding for rental housing assistance for the elderly, disabled, working poor, and mothers making the transition from welfare to work is inadequate.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that funding for housing assistance should be increased by providing—

(1) full funding for operating subsidies for public housing authorities, as determined by the Performance Funding System;

(2) additional funding for capital grants for public housing authorities, to repair and maintain existing public housing units; and

(3) sufficient funding to create 50,000 new section 8 vouchers each year for the next 5 years.

SEC. 318. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DEFENSE.

It is the sense of Congress that defense spending should be maintained at current levels, and that priority should be given to defense readiness and full funding for personnel salaries and supplies, as opposed to continued expansions of large weapons systems.

H. CON. RES. 84

OFFERED BY: MR. SHUSTER

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,198,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,241,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,285,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,343,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,407,564,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: −$7,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$11,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$21,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$22,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$19,871,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,386,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,439,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,486,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,520,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,551,563,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,371,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,424,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,468,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,500,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,516,024,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $172,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $182,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $183,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $157,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $108,460,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $5,593,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,836,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,082,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,301,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,473,200,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $33,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $34,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $37,099,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $335,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $268,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,978,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $270,784,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,771,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $274,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,418,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $281,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,110,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $289,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,571,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $15,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,558,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $12,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $14,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,569,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $15,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,981,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $16,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,751,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,826,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $16,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,812,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $14,217,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $16,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,882,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $16,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,528,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $15,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,013,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,862,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $15,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,668,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $3,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $3,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,446,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $3,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,293,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $2,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,048,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,867,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,174,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $23,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,405,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $30,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $23,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,702,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,963,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,720,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,313,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,892,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,294,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,664,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,494,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,108,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,660,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$920,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $245,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,299,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,887,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $253,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,821,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,238,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $255,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,133,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,574,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $257,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,541,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,680,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $259,897,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $46,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,933,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $46,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,256,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $47,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,357,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $48,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,303,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,387,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,902,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,986,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $7,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,350,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $7,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,429,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,475,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $60,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,062,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $60,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,335,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,092,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $61,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $62,959,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,931,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $63,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,316,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,676,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $137,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,767,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $85,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $144,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,944,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $154,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,947,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $163,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,135,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $172,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $171,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $201,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $201,764,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $212,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $211,548,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $225,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,537,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $239,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,781,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $251,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,769,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $239,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,758,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $254,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,064,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $269,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,161,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $275,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,264,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $286,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,239,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,524,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,196,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,866,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,043,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,398,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $40,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,337,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $41,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $41,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,908,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $42,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,215,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $42,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,436,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,129,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $24,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,609,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,476,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,240,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,901,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,879,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,959,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,363,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,131,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $296,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,547,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $304,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,558,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $305,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,075,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $303,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,833,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $303,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, -$41,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$41,841,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, -$36,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$36,949,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, -$36,937,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -$36,937,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, -$39,151,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -$39,151,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, -$51,124,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -$51,124,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for two separate reconciliation bills: the first for entitlement reforms and the second for tax relief. In the event Senate procedures preclude the consideration of two separate bills, this section would permit the consideration of one omnibus reconciliation bill.

(b) SUBMISSIONS.—

(1) ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—Not later than June 12, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (c) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—Not later than June 13, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (d) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(c) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: −$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, −$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and −$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $393,533,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,791,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,617,528,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $17,222,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,673,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $103,109,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $0 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $18,087,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,283,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,563,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $139,134,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,546,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,442,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,578,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: $1,176,253,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,386,546,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,517,939,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(d) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: −$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, −$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and −$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $393,533,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,791,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,617,528,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $17,222,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,673,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $103,109,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $0 in fiscal year 1998 $621,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $18,087,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,283,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,563,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $139,134,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,546,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,442,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,578,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: $1,168,853,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,366,046,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,432,939,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(e) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(f) CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE.—If the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means report recommendations pursuant to their reconciliation instructions that, combined, provide an initiative for children's health that would increase the deficit by more than $2.3 billion for fiscal year 1998, by more than $3.9 billion for fiscal year 2002, and by more than $16 billion for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002, the committees shall be deemed to not have complied with their reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to adjust the appropriate budgetary levels to accommodate legislation increasing

spending from the highway trust fund on surface transportation and highway safety above the levels assumed in this resolution if such legislation is deficit neutral.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) In order to receive the adjustments specified in subsection (c), a bill reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that provides new budget authority above the levels assumed in this resolution for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be deficit neutral.

(2) A deficit-neutral bill must meet the following conditions:

(A) The amount of new budget authority provided for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be in excess of $25.949 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 1998, $25.464 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 2002, and $127.973 billion in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority set forth in subparagraph (A) must be offset for fiscal year 1998, fiscal year 2002, and for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002. For the sole purpose of estimating the amount of outlays flowing from excess new budget authority under this section, it shall be assumed that such excess new budget authority would have an obligation limitation sufficient to accommodate that new budget authority.

(C) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority must be offset by (i) other direct spending or revenue provisions within that transportation bill, (ii) the net reduction in other direct spending and revenue legislation that is enacted during this Congress after the date of adoption of this resolution and before such transportation bill is reported (in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution), or (iii) a combination of the offsets specified in clauses (i) and (ii).

(D) As used in this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) REVISED LEVELS.—(1) When the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill (or when a conference report thereon is filed) meeting the conditions set forth in subsection (b)(2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation of new budget authority to that committee by the amount of new budget authority provided in that bill (and that is above the levels set forth in subsection (b)(2)(A)) for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund.

(2) After the enactment of the transportation bill described in paragraph (1) and upon the reporting of a general, supplemental or continuing resolution making appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) establishing an obligation limitation above the levels specified in subsection (b)(2)(A) (at a level sufficient to obligate some or all of the budget authority specified in paragraph (1)), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation and aggregate levels of outlays to that committee for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 by the appropriate amount.

(d) REVISIONS.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this section shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(e) REVERSALS.—If any legislation referred to in this section is not enacted into law, then the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall, as soon as practicable, reverse adjustments made under this section for such legislation and have such adjustments published in the Congressional Record.

(f) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

(g) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''highway trust fund'' refers to the following budget accounts (or any successor accounts):

(1) 69–8083–0–7–401 (Federal-Aid Highways).

(2) 69–8191–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Capital Fund).

(3) 69–8350–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Formula Grants).

(4) 69-8016-0-7-401 (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration-Operations and Research).

(5) 69-8020-0-7-401 (Highway Traffic Safety Grants).

(6) 69-8048-0-7-401 (National Motor Carrier Safety Program).

SEC. 302. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of any concurrent resolution on the budget and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, no amounts realized from the sale of an asset shall be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues if such sale would cause an increase in the deficit as calculated pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) CALCULATION OF NET PRESENT VALUE.—The deficit estimate of an asset sale shall be the net present value of the cash flow from—

(A) proceeds from the asset sale;

(B) future receipts that would be expected from continued ownership of the asset by the Government; and

(C) expected future spending by the Government at a level necessary to continue to operate and maintain the asset to generate the receipts estimated pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''sale of an asset'' shall have the same meaning as under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) TREATMENT OF LOAN ASSETS.—For the purposes of this section, the sale of loan assets or the prepayment of a loan shall be governed by the terms of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

(d) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 303. ENVIRONMENTAL RESERVE FUND.

(a) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—In the House, after the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure report a bill (or a conference report thereon is filed) to reform the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of hazardous waste sites, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall submit revised allocations and budget aggregates to carry out this section by an amount not to exceed the excess subject to the limitation. These revisions shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments made under this section shall not exceed—

(1) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(2) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(3) $1 billion in budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(c) READJUSTMENTS.—In the House, any adjustments made under this section for any appropriation measure may be readjusted if that measure is not enacted into law.

SEC. 304. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES.

(a) ALLOCATION BY CHAIRMAN.—In the House, upon the reporting of a bill by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) providing $700 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority Federal land exchanges, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall allocate that amount of budget authority and the corresponding amount of outlays.

(b) TREATMENT OF ALLOCATIONS IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, allocations made under subsection (a) shall be deemed to be made pursuant to section 602(a)(1) of that Act and shall be deemed to be a separate suballocation for purposes of the application of section 302(f) of that Act as modified by section 602(c) of that Act.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Baselines are projections of future spending if existing policies remain unchanged.

(2) Under baseline assumptions, spending automatically rises with inflation even if such increases are not mandated under existing law.

(3) Baseline budgeting is inherently biased against policies that would reduce the projected growth in spending because such policies are portrayed as spending reductions from an increasing baseline.

(4) The baseline concept has encouraged Congress to abdicate its constitutional obligation to control the public purse for those programs which are automatically funded.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that baseline budgeting should be replaced with a budgetary model that requires justification of aggregate funding levels and maximizes congressional and executive accountability for Federal spending.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The Congress and the President should enact a law which creates a regimen for paying off the Federal debt within 30 years.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESIDENT'S SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The President's annual budget submission to Congress should include a plan for repayment of Federal debt beyond the year 2002, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The plan should specifically explain how the President would cap spending growth at a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues.

(3) If spending growth were held to a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues, then the Federal debt could be repaid within 30 years.

SEC. 403. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMISSION ON LONG-TERM BUDGETARY PROBLEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) achieving a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 is only the first step necessary to restore our Nation's economic prosperity;

(2) the imminent retirement of the baby-boom generation will greatly increase the demand for government services;

(3) this burden will be borne by a relatively smaller work force resulting in an unprecedented intergenerational transfer of financial resources;

(4) the rising demand for retirement and medical benefits will quickly jeopardize the solvency of the medicare, social security, and Federal retirement trust funds; and

(5) the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that marginal tax rates would have to increase by 50 percent over the next 5 years to cover the long-term projected costs of retirement and health benefits.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to create a commission to assess long-term budgetary problems, their implications for both the baby-boom generation and tomorrow's workforce, and make such recommendations as it deems appropriate to ensure our Nation's future prosperity.

SEC. 404. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CORPORATE WELFARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the functional levels and aggregates in this budget resolution assume that—

(1) the Federal Government supports profit-making enterprises and industries through billions of dollars in payments, benefits, and programs;

(2) many of these subsidies do not serve a clear and compelling public interest;

(3) corporate subsidies frequently provide unfair competitive advantages to certain industries and industry segments; and

(4) at a time when millions of Americans are being asked to sacrifice in order to balance the budget, the corporate sector should bear its share of the burden.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to—

(1) eliminate the most egregious corporate subsidies; and

(2) create a commission to recommend the elimination of Federal payments, benefits, and programs which predominantly benefit a particular industry or segment of an industry, rather than provide a clear and compelling public benefit, and include a fast-track process for the consideration of those recommendations.

SEC. 405. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FAMILY VIOLENCE OPTION CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Domestic violence is the leading cause of physical injury to women. The Department of Justice estimates that over 1,000,000 violent crimes against women are committed by intimate partners annually.

(2) Domestic violence dramatically affects the victim's ability to participate in the workforce. A University of Minnesota survey reported that one quarter of battered women surveyed had lost a job partly because of being abused and that over half of these women had been harassed by their abuser at work.

(3) Domestic violence is often intensified as women seek to gain economic independence through attending school or training programs. Batterers have been reported to prevent women from attending these programs or sabotage their efforts at self-improvement.

(4) Nationwide surveys of service providers prepared by the Taylor Institute of Chicago, Illinois, document, for the first time, the interrelationship between domestic violence and welfare by showing that from 34 percent to 65 percent of AFDC recipients are current or past victims of domestic violence.

(5) Over half of the women surveyed stayed with their batterers because they lacked the resources to support themselves and their children. The surveys also found that the availability of economic support is a critical factor in poor women's ability to leave abusive situations that threaten them and their children.

(6) The restructuring of the welfare programs may impact the availability of the economic support and the safety net necessary to enable poor women to flee abuse without risking homelessness and starvation for their families.

(7) In recognition of this finding, the House Committee on the Budget unanimously passed a sense of Congress amendment on domestic violence and Federal assistance to the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution. Subsequently, Congress passed the family violence option amendment to last year's welfare reform reconciliation bill.

(8) The family violence option gives States the flexibility to grant temporary waivers from time limits and work requirements for domestic violence victims who would suffer extreme hardship from the application of these provisions. These waivers were not intended to be included as part of the permanent 20 percent hardship exemption.

(9) The Department of Health and Human Services has been slow to issue regulations regarding this provision. As a result, States are hesitant to fully implement the family violence option fearing it will interfere with the 20 percent hardship exemption.

(10) Currently 15 States have opted to include the family violence option in their welfare plans, and 13 other States have included some type of domestic violence provisions in their plans.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) States should not be subject to any numerical limits in granting domestic violence good cause waivers to individuals receiving assistance for all requirements where compliance with such requirements would make it more difficult for individuals receiving assistance to escape domestic violence; and

(2) any individuals granted a domestic violence good cause waiver by States should not be included in the States' 20 percent hardship exemption.

TITLE V—TRANSPORTATION REVENUES USED SOLELY FOR TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 501. READJUSTMENTS.

(a) INCREASE IN FUNCTION 400.—Levels of new budget authority and outlays set forth in function 400 in section 102 shall be increased as follows:

(1) for fiscal year 1998, by $0 in outlays and by $0 in new budget authority;

(2) for fiscal year 1999, by $770,000,000 in outlays and by $3,600,000,000 in new budget authority;

(3) for fiscal year 2000, by $2,575,000,000 in outlays and by $4,796,000,000 in new budget authority;

(4) for fiscal year 2001, by $3,765,000,000 in outlays and by $5,363,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(5) for fiscal year 2002, by $4,488,000,000 in outlays and by $5,619,000,000 in new budget authority.

(b) OFFSETS.—(1)(A) The total budget outlays for each fiscal year set forth in each functional category in section 102 shall be reduced by an amount determined through a pro rata reduction of discretionary outlays within each function necessary to achieve the following outlay reductions:

(i) for fiscal year 1998, by $0 in outlays;

(ii) for fiscal year 1999, by $746,000,000 in outlays;

(iii) for fiscal year 2000, by $2,422,000,000 in outlays;

(iv) for fiscal year 2001, by $3,532,000,000 in outlays; and

(v) for fiscal year 2002, by $4,242,000,000 in outlays;

and corresponding reductions in new budget authority shall be made in each function consistent with such pro rata reductions in outlays. Reductions in new budget authority shall be made to section 101(2) consistent with this subparagraph and subsection (a).

(B) These reductions shall not be made to the mandatory outlay portion of any function, including (but not limited to) Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. For purposes of the application of this paragraph to function 400, the pro rata share shall be determined by using the amounts provided for function 400 prior to any adjustment made by subparagraph (A).

(2) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed as set forth in section 101(1)(B) are reduced as follows:

(A) for fiscal year 1998, by $0;

(B) for fiscal year 1999, by $24,000,000;

(C) for fiscal year 2000, by $153,000,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2001, by $233,000,000; and

(E) for fiscal year 2002, by $246,000,000.

(3) The amounts by which to appropriate levels of total budget outlays in section 101(3) are increased as follows:

(A) for fiscal year 1998, by $0;

(B) for fiscal year 1999, by $24,000,000;

(C) for fiscal year 2000, by $153,000,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2001, by $233,000,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2002, by $246,000,000.

(4) The reconciliation directives to the Committee on Ways and Means in sections 201(c)(8)(B) and 201(d)(8)(B) shall be adjusted accordingly.

SEC. 502. HIGHWAY TRUST FUND ALLOCATIONS.

(a) ALLOCATED AMOUNTS.—Of the amounts of outlays allocated to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate by the joint explanatory statement accompanying this resolution pursuant to sections 302 and 602 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the following amounts shall be used for contract authority spending out of the Highway Trust Fund—

(1) for fiscal year 1998, $22,256,000,000 in outlays;

(2) for fiscal year 1999, $24,063,000,000 in outlays;

(3) for fiscal year 2000, $26,092,000,000 in outlays;

(4) for fiscal year 2001, $27,400,000,000 in outlays; and

(5) for fiscal year 2002, $28,344,000,000 in outlays.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—Determinations regarding points of order made under section 302(f) or 602(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall take into account subsection (a).

(c) STATUTORY IMPLEMENTATION.—As part of reauthorization of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, provisions shall be included to enact this section into permanent law.

SEC. 503. PRIORITY FOR RESTORATION OF CUTS.

Any outlays that would have been allocated for surface transportation pursuant to section 301 shall first be used to restore any cuts to discretionary spending made as a result of section 501. The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall implement section 301 consistent with this section.

SEC. 504. MATHEMATICAL CONSISTENCY.

The Chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may make technical changes consistent with this title to ensure mathematical consistency.

H. CON. RES. 84

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998

is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,609,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,690,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,766,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,845,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,928,400,000.000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $−42,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $−53,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $−55,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $−59,198,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $−61,352,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,805,208,700,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,805,198,500,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,887,279,700,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,962,159,300,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $2,051,324,800,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,688,663,700,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,779,573,500,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,868,268,700,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,930,431,300,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $2,024,323,800,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $84,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $76,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $66,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $17,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $−6,063,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $5,587,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,823,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,066,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,265,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,467,900,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $37,523,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $36,806,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $40,500,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $40,906,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $41,676,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $158,942,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $157,111,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $158,682,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $160,237,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $162,324,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $246,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $246,217,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $250,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $239,872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $233,943,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $238,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $232,198,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $239,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $227,457,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $232,860,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,137,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $800,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,467,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $12,059,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $17,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,665,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,191,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $18,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,019,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,162,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,736,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $18,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,191,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,013,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,702,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,712,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,023,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,000,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,962,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,639,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,665,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,234,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,194,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,215,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $4,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,079,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,093,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $4,971,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,106,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,731,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $4,856,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,904,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,663,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $4,702,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,712,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,814,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $4,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,577,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,682,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $21,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,502,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $38,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $22,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,168,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $37,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $23,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,073,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $37,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $23,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,026,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $39,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,788,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $40,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $4,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,152,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,670,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $8,075,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $4,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,103,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,573,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $7,988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $4,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,006,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,294,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $7,974,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,941,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,670,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $7,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,913,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,159,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $7,969,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,087,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,973,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $161,613,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,390,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,682,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $161,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $4,676,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,634,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,928,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $163,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,272,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,258,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $166,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,782,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,405,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $169,216,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,890,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $591,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $477,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $15,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,772,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $791,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,636,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $863,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,780,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $879,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,019,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $879,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $477,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $9,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,224,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,460,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,157,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,908,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,014,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,118,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,137,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,210,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,329,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,143,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,022,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $55,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,811,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,536,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $61,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,465,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $17,636,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,548,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $60,569,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,149,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $20,162,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $58,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,137,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,736,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $58,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,482,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $23,076,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $22,872,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $25,983,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,304,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $105,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $27,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,494,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $27,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,125,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $28,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,895,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $29,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,682,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $2,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,743,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $2,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,665,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $2,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,732,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $2,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $35,627,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,573,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $73,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $17,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $39,835,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,228,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $34,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $41,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $40,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $44,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,132,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $40,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $45,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,580,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,378,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,376,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,306,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,269,000,000
(B) Outlays, $3,251,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,272,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,189,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $28,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $18,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,307,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,273,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,607,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,287,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,357,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,269,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,059,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $25,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,170,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $26,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,493,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $26,649,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,297,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $27,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,874,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority,, $25,662,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,285,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,965,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,349,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,560,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,171,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,827,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $249,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $249,859,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $251,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $251,843,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $248,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,203,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $244,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $244,963,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $238,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,762,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than August 1, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues as follows: by $42,088,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, by by $61,352,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and by $272,841,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

H. CON. RES. 84

OFFERED BY: MR. DOGGETT

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of the concurrent resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. . PROTECTION OF BALANCED BUDGET.

It is the sense of the Congress that, to assure that neither the tax cuts nor the spending increases in this resolution explode in cost, endangering the balanced budget promised by 2002 or the ability to maintain balance thereafter, any provision of law affecting revenues or authorizing spending for new entitlement initiatives assumed in this resolution should sunset and cease to be effective within five years, unless subsequently reauthorized by law.

H. CON. RES. 84

OFFERED BY MR. MINGE OF MINNESOTA

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,198,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,241,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,285,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,343,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,407,564,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: −$7,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$11,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$21,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$22,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$19,871,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,385,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,440,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,486,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,520,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,551,837,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,371,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,424,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,468,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,500,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,516,298,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $172,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $182,372,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $183,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $157,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $108,734,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $5,592,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,834,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,081,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,298,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,474,400,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $33,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $34,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $37,099,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $335,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $268,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,978,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $270,784,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,771,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $274,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,418,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $281,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,110,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $289,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,571,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,588,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,569,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,981,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,751,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,826,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,812,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,217,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,882,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,528,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,013,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,862,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,668,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,446,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,293,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $2,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,048,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,867,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,171,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $23,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,405,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $23,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,702,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,963,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,720,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,313,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $13,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,892,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,294,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,664,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,494,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,108,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,660,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $920,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $245,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,299,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,887,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $253,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,821,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,238,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $255,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,133,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,574,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $257,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,541,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,680,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $259,897,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $44,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,933,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $46,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,256,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $47,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,357,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $48,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,303,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,387,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,902,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,986,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $7,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,350,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $7,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,429,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,475,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $60,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,062,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $60,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,335,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,092,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $61,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $62,959,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,931,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $63,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,316,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,676,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $137,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,804,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $85,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $144,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,915,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $154,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,898,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $163,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,136,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $172,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $171,692,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $201,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $201,764,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $212,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $211,548,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $225,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,537,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $239,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,781,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $251,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,769,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $239,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,758,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $254,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,064,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $269,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,161,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $275,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,264,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $286,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,239,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,524,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,196,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,866,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,043,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,398,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $40,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,337,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $41,715,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,949,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $42,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,168,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $42,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,486,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $42,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,719,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,129,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $24,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,609,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,476,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $25,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,240,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,901,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,879,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,959,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,363,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,131,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $296,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,549,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $304,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,567,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $304,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,867,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $303,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,659,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $303,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,754,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,841,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,949,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,937,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,151,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$51,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$51,124,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for two separate reconciliation bills: the first for entitlement reforms and the second for tax relief. In the event Senate procedures preclude the consideration of two separate bills, this section would permit the consideration of one omnibus reconciliation bill.

(b) SUBMISSIONS.—

(1) ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—Not later than June 12, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (c) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—Not later than June 13, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (d) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(c) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: −$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, −$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and −$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $393,770,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $507,315,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,619,820,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $214,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,483,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,845,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $140,197,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,463,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: $1,172,136,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,382,679,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,493,796,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(d) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—(A) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: −$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, −$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and −$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $393,770,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $507,315,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,619,820,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $214,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 $621,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,483,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,845,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $140,197,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,463,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: $1,164,736,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,362,179,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,408,796,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(e) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(f) FLEXIBILITY IN CARRYING OUT CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE.—If the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means report recommendations pursuant to their reconciliation instructions that, combined, provide an initiative for children's health that would increase the deficit by more than $2.3 billion for fiscal year 1998, by more than $3.9 billion for fiscal year 2002, and by more than $16 billion for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002, the committees shall be deemed to not have complied with their reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to adjust the appropriate budgetary levels to accommodate legislation increasing spending from the highway trust fund on surface transportation and highway safety above the levels assumed in this resolution if such legislation is deficit neutral.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) In order to receive the adjustments specified in subsection (c), a bill reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that provides new budget authority above the levels assumed in this resolution for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be deficit neutral.

(2) A deficit-neutral bill must meet the following conditions:

(A) The amount of new budget authority provided for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be in excess of $25.949 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 1998, $25.464 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 2002, and $127.973 billion in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority set forth in subparagraph (A) must be offset for fiscal year 1998, fiscal year 2002, and for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002. For the sole purpose of estimating the amount of outlays flowing from excess new budget authority under this section, it shall be assumed that such excess new budget authority would have an obligation limitation sufficient to accommodate that new budget authority.

(C) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority must be offset by (i) other direct spending or revenue provisions within that transportation bill, (ii) the net reduction in other direct spending and revenue legislation that is enacted during this Congress after the date of adoption of this resolution and before such transportation bill is reported (in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution), or (iii) a combination of the offsets specified in clauses (i) and (ii).

(D) As used in this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) REVISED LEVELS.—(1) When the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

reports a bill (or when a conference report thereon is filed) meeting the conditions set forth in subsection (b)(2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation of new budget authority to that committee by the amount of new budget authority provided in that bill (and that is within the levels set forth in subsection (b)(2)(A)) for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund.

(2) After the enactment of the transportation bill described in paragraph (1) and upon the reporting of a general, supplemental or continuing resolution making appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) establishing an obligation limitation above the levels specified in subsection (b)(2)(A) (at a level sufficient to obligate some or all of the budget authority specified in paragraph (1)), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation and aggregate levels of outlays to that committee for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 by the appropriate amount.

(d) REVISIONS.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this section shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(e) REVERSALS.—If any legislation referred to in this section is not enacted into law, then the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall, as soon as practicable, reverse adjustments made under this section for such legislation and have such adjustments published in the Congressional Record.

(f) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

(g) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''highway trust fund'' refers to the following budget accounts (or any successor accounts):

(1) 69–8083–0–7–401 (Federal-Aid Highways).

(2) 69–8191–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Capital Fund).

(3) 69–8350–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Formula Grants).

(4) 69-8016-0-7-401 (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration-Operations and Research).

(5) 69-8020-0-7-401 (Highway Traffic Safety Grants).

(6) 69-8048-0-7-401 (National Motor Carrier Safety Program).

SEC. 302. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of any concurrent resolution on the budget and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, no amounts realized from the sale of an asset shall be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues if such sale would cause an increase in the deficit as calculated pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) CALCULATION OF NET PRESENT VALUE.—The deficit estimate of an asset sale shall be the net present value of the cash flow from—

(A) proceeds from the asset sale;

(B) future receipts that would be expected from continued ownership of the asset by the Government; and

(C) expected future spending by the Government at a level necessary to continue to operate and maintain the asset to generate the receipts estimated pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''sale of an asset'' shall have the same meaning as under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) TREATMENT OF LOAN ASSETS.—For the purposes of this section, the sale of loan assets or the prepayment of a loan shall be governed by the terms of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

(d) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 303. ENVIRONMENTAL RESERVE FUND.

(a) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—In the House, after the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure report a bill (or a conference report thereon is filed) to reform the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of hazardous waste sites, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall submit revised allocations and budget aggregates to carry out this section by an amount not to exceed the excess subject to the limitation. These revisions shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments made under this section shall not exceed—

(1) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(2) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(3) $1 billion in budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(c) READJUSTMENTS.—In the House, any adjustments made under this section for any appropriation measure may be readjusted if that measure is not enacted into law.

SEC. 304. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES.

(a) ALLOCATION BY CHAIRMAN.—In the House, upon the reporting of a bill by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) providing $700 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority Federal land exchanges, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall allocate that amount of outlays and the corresponding amount of budget authority.

(b) TREATMENT OF ALLOCATIONS IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, allocations made under subsection (a) shall be deemed to be made pursuant to section 602(a)(1) of that Act and shall be deemed to be a separate suballocation for purposes of the application of section 302(f) of that Act as modified by section 602(c) of that Act.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Baselines are projections of future spending if existing policies remain unchanged.

(2) Under baseline assumptions, spending automatically rises with inflation even if such increases are not mandated under existing law.

(3) Baseline budgeting is inherently biased against policies that would reduce the projected growth in spending because such policies are portrayed as spending reductions from an increasing baseline.

(4) The baseline concept has encouraged Congress to abdicate its constitutional obligation to control the public purse for those programs which are automatically funded.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that baseline budgeting should be replaced with a budgetary model that requires justification of aggregate funding levels and maximizes congressional and executive accountability for Federal spending.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The Congress and the President should enact a law which creates a regimen for paying off the Federal debt within 30 years.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESIDENT'S SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The President's annual budget submission to Congress should include a plan for repayment of Federal debt beyond the year 2002, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The plan should specifically explain how the President would cap spending growth at a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues.

(3) If spending growth were held to a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues, then the Federal debt could be repaid within 30 years.

SEC. 403. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMISSION ON LONG-TERM BUDGETARY PROBLEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) achieving a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 is only the first step necessary to restore our Nation's economic prosperity;

(2) the imminent retirement of the baby-boom generation will greatly increase the demand for government services;

(3) this burden will be borne by a relatively smaller work force resulting in an unprecedented intergenerational transfer of financial resources;

(4) the rising demand for retirement and medical benefits will quickly jeopardize the solvency of the medicare, social security, and Federal retirement trust funds; and

(5) the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that marginal tax rates would have to increase by 50 percent over the next 5 years to cover the long-term projected costs of retirement and health benefits.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to create a commission to assess long-term budgetary problems, their implications for both the baby-boom generation and tomorrow's workforce, and make such recommendations as it deems appropriate to ensure our Nation's future prosperity.

SEC. 404. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CORPORATE WELFARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the functional levels and aggregates in this budget resolution assume that—

(1) the Federal Government supports profit-making enterprises and industries through billions of dollars in payments, benefits, and programs;

(2) many of these subsidies do not serve a clear and compelling public interest;

(3) corporate subsidies frequently provide unfair competitive advantages to certain industries and industry segments; and

(4) at a time when millions of Americans are being asked to sacrifice in order to balance the budget, the corporate sector should bear its share of the burden.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to—

(1) eliminate the most egregious corporate subsidies; and

(2) create a commission to recommend the elimination of Federal payments, benefits, and programs which predominantly benefit a particular industry or segment of an industry, rather than provide a clear and compelling public benefit, and include a fast-track process for the consideration of those recommendations.

SEC. 405. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING BALANCED BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that reconciliation legislation considered pursuant to this legislation must include enforcement procedures to ensure that the Budget of the United States Government does reach balance by 2002 and remain in balance thereafter. Such language should—

(1) set nominal targets for spending, revenues, and deficits for each year of the next 10 years;

(2) require that the President propose a budget that complies with the spending, revenue, and deficit targets in each year or propose to change the targets, and require that any budget resolution considered by the House of Representatives and the Senate comply with the spending, revenue, and deficit targets in each year or recommend changes to those targets;

(3) include all portions of the budget and apply such enforcement proportionally to the specific parts of the budget that caused the deficit to exceed the target in any year. This should be accomplished through a combination of—

(A) extension of the caps for discretionary spending enforced by sequestration through fiscal year 2002;

(B) global caps for total entitlement spending and specific caps within the global caps for large entitlement programs, with sequestration applied to those programs or categories that caused outlays to exceed the caps;

(C) a requirement that tax cuts be phased in contingent on meeting the revenue targets in the agreement;

(4) allow adjustments to spending caps and revenue and deficit targets for changes in actual economic conditions to avoid forcing policy changes due directly and exclusively to changes in economic conditions;

(5) prevent the use of emergencies to evade the enforcement mechanism by establishing procedures to budget for and control emergency spending; and

(6) if the actual deficit is below the target in any year, lock in such budget savings for deficit and debt reduction.

H. CON. RES. 84

OFFERED BY: MR. MINGE

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,198,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,241,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,285,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,343,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,407,564,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: −$7,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$11,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$21,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$22,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$19,871,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,385,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,440,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,486,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,520,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,551,837,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,371,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,424,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,468,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,500,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,516,298,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $172,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $182,372,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $183,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $157,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $108,734,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $5,592,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,834,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,081,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,298,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,474,400,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $33,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $34,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $37,099,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $335,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $268,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,978,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $270,784,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,771,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $274,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,418,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $281,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,110,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $289,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,571,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,558,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $12,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,569,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,981,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,751,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,826,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,812,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $14,217,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,882,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,528,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,013,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,862,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,668,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,446,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,293,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $2,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,048,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,867,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,171,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $23,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,405,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $23,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,702,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,963,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,720,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,313,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,892,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,294,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,664,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,494,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,108,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,660,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $920,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $245,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,299,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,887,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $253,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,821,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,238,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $255,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,133,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,574,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $257,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,541,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,680,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $259,897,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $44,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,933,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $46,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,256,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $47,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,357,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $48,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,303,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,387,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,902,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,810,000,000X.
(B) Outlays, $10,986,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $7,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,350,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $7,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,429,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $2,475,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $60,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,062,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $20,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $60,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,335,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,092,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $21,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $61,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $23,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $62,959,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,931,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $24,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $63,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,316,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,676,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $137,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,804,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $85,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $144,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,915,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $154,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,898,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $163,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,136,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $172,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $171,692,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $201,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $201,764,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $212,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $211,548,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $225,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,537,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $239,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,781,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $251,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,769,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $239,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,758,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $254,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,064,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $269,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,161,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $275,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,264,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $286,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,239,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,524,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,196,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,866,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,043,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,398,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $40,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,337,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $41,715,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,949,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $42,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,168,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $42,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,486,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $42,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,719,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,129,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $24,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,609,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,476,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $25,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,240,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,901,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,879,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,959,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,363,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,131,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $296,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,549,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $304,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,567,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $304,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,867,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $303,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,659,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $303,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,754,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$0.
(B) Outlays, −$0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, -$41,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$41,841,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, -$36,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$36,949,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, -$36,937,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -$36,937,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, -$39,151,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -$39,151,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, -$51,124,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -$51,124,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for two separate reconciliation bills: the first for entitlement reforms and the second for tax relief. In the event Senate procedures preclude the consideration of two separate bills, this section would permit the consideration of one omnibus reconciliation bill.

(b) SUBMISSIONS.—

(1) ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—Not later than June 12, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (c) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—Not later than June 13, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (d) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(c) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $393,770,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $507,315,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,619,820,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $214,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,483,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,845,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $140,197,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,463,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: $1,172,136,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,382,679,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,493,796,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(d) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—(A) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: −$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, −$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and −$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $393,770,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $507,315,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,619,820,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $17,718,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $18,167,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,050,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $214,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 $621,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $18,287,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,843,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $107,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,845,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $140,197,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,463,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,377,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,195,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: $1,164,736,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,362,179,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,408,796,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(e) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(f) FLEXIBILITY IN CARRYING OUT CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE.—If the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means report recommendations pursuant to their reconciliation instructions that provide an initiative for children's health that would increase the deficit by more than $2.3 billion for fiscal year 1998, by more than $3.9 billion for fiscal year 2002, and by more than $16 billion for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002, the committees shall be deemed to not have complied with their reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to adjust the appropriate budgetary levels to accommodate legislation increasing spending from the highway trust fund on surface transportation and highway safety

above the levels assumed in this resolution if such legislation is deficit neutral.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) In order to receive the adjustments specified in subsection (c), a bill reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that provides new budget authority above the levels assumed in this resolution for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be deficit neutral.

(2) A deficit-neutral bill must meet the following conditions:

(A) The amount of new budget authority provided for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be in excess of $25.949 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 1998, $25.464 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 2002, and $127.973 billion in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority set forth in subparagraph (A) must be offset for fiscal year 1998, fiscal year 2002, and for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002. For the sole purpose of estimating the amount of outlays flowing from excess new budget authority under this section, it shall be assumed that such excess new budget authority would have an obligation limitation sufficient to accommodate that new budget authority.

(C) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority must be offset by (i) other direct spending or revenue provisions within that transportation bill, (ii) the net reduction in other direct spending and revenue legislation that is enacted during this Congress after the date of adoption of this resolution and before such transportation bill is reported (in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution), or (iii) a combination of the offsets specified in clauses (i) and (ii).

(D) As used in this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) REVISED LEVELS.—(1) When the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill (or when a conference report thereon is filed) meeting the conditions set forth in subsection (b)(2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation of new budget authority to that committee by the amount of new budget authority provided in that bill (and that is within the levels set forth in subsection (b)(2)(A)) for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund.

(2) After the enactment of the transportation bill described in paragraph (1) and upon the reporting of a general, supplemental or continuing resolution making appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) establishing an obligation limitation above the levels specified in subsection (b)(2)(A) (at a level sufficient to obligate some or all of the budget authority specified in paragraph (1)), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation and aggregate levels of outlays to that committee for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 by the appropriate amount.

(d) REVISIONS.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this section shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(e) REVERSALS.—If any legislation referred to in this section is not enacted into law, then the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall, as soon as practicable, reverse adjustments made under this section for such legislation and have such adjustments published in the Congressional Record.

(f) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

(g) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''highway trust fund'' refers to the following budget accounts (or any successor accounts):

(1) 69-8083-0-7-401 (Federal-Aid Highways).

(2) 69-8191-0-7-401 (Mass Transit Capital Fund).

(3) 69-8350-0-7-401 (Mass Transit Formula Grants).

(4) 69-8016-0-7-401 (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration-Operations and Research).

(5) 69-8020-0-7-401 (Highway Traffic Safety Grants).

(6) 69-8048-0-7-401 (National Motor Carrier Safety Program).

SEC. 302. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of any concurrent resolution on the budget and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, no amounts realized from the sale of an asset shall be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues if such sale would cause an increase in the deficit as calculated pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) CALCULATION OF NET PRESENT VALUE.—The deficit estimate of an asset sale shall be the net present value of the cash flow from—

(A) proceeds from the asset sale;

(B) future receipts that would be expected from continued ownership of the asset by the Government; and

(C) expected future spending by the Government at a level necessary to continue to operate and maintain the asset to generate the receipts estimated pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''sale of an asset'' shall have the same meaning as under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) TREATMENT OF LOAN ASSETS.—For the purposes of this section, the sale of loan assets or the prepayment of a loan shall be governed by the terms of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

(d) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 303. ENVIRONMENTAL RESERVE FUND.

(a) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—In the House, after the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure report a bill (or a conference report thereon is filed) to reform the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of hazardous waste sites, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall submit revised allocations and budget aggregates to carry out this section by an amount not to exceed the excess subject to the limitation. These revisions shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments made under this section shall not exceed—

(1) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(2) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(3) $1 billion in budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(c) READJUSTMENTS.—In the House, any adjustments made under this section for any appropriation measure may be readjusted if that measure is not enacted into law.

SEC. 304. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES.

(a) ALLOCATION BY CHAIRMAN.—In the House, upon the reporting of a bill by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) providing up to $165 million in outlays for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority Federal land exchanges for fiscal year 1998 (assuming $700 million in outlays over 5 fiscal years), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall allocate that amount of outlays and the corresponding amount of budget authority.

(b) TREATMENT OF ALLOCATIONS IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, allocations made under subsection (a) shall be deemed to be made pursuant to section 602(a)(1) of that Act and shall be deemed to be a separate suballocation for purposes of the application of section 302(f) of that Act as modified by section 602(c) of that Act.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Baselines are projections of future spending if existing policies remain unchanged.

(2) Under baseline assumptions, spending automatically rises with inflation even if such increases are not mandated under existing law.

(3) Baseline budgeting is inherently biased against policies that would reduce the projected growth in spending because such policies are portrayed as spending reductions from an increasing baseline.

(4) The baseline concept has encouraged Congress to abdicate its constitutional obligation to control the public purse for those programs which are automatically funded.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that baseline budgeting should be replaced with a budgetary model that requires justification of aggregate funding levels and maximizes congressional and executive accountability for Federal spending.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The Congress and the President should enact a law which creates a regimen for paying off the Federal debt within 30 years.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESIDENT'S SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The President's annual budget submission to Congress should include a plan for repayment of Federal debt beyond the year 2002, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The plan should specifically explain how the President would cap spending growth at a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues.

(3) If spending growth were held to a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues, then the Federal debt could be repaid within 30 years.

SEC. 403. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMISSION ON LONG-TERM BUDGETARY PROBLEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) achieving a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 is only the first step necessary to restore our Nation's economic prosperity;

(2) the imminent retirement of the baby-boom generation will greatly increase the demand for government services;

(3) this burden will be borne by a relatively smaller work force resulting in an unprecedented intergenerational transfer of financial resources;

(4) the rising demand for retirement and medical benefits will quickly jeopardize the solvency of the medicare, social security, and Federal retirement trust funds; and

(5) the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that marginal tax rates would have to increase by 50 percent over the next 5 years to cover the long-term projected costs of retirement and health benefits.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to create a commission to assess long-term budgetary problems, their implications for both the baby-boom generation and tomorrow's workforce, and make such recommendations as it deems appropriate to ensure our Nation's future prosperity.

SEC. 404. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CORPORATE WELFARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the functional levels and aggregates in this budget resolution assume that—

(1) the Federal Government supports profit-making enterprises and industries through billions of dollars in payments, benefits, and programs;

(2) many of these subsidies do not serve a clear and compelling public interest;

(3) corporate subsidies frequently provide unfair competitive advantages to certain industries and industry segments; and

(4) at a time when millions of Americans are being asked to sacrifice in order to balance the budget, the corporate sector should bear its share of the burden.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to—

(1) eliminate the most egregious corporate subsidies; and

(2) create a commission to recommend the elimination of Federal payments, benefits, and programs which predominantly benefit a particular industry or segment of an industry, rather than provide a clear and compelling public benefit, and include a fast-track process for the consideration of those recommendations.

SEC. 405. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING BALANCED BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

It is the sense of Congress that reconciliation legislation considered pursuant to this legislation must include enforcement procedures to ensure that the Budget of the United States Government does reach balance by 2002 and remain in balance thereafter. Such language should include all portions of the budget and apply such enforcement proportionally to the specific parts of the budget that caused the deficit to exceed the levels provided for in this resolution in any year. Enforcement procedures should contain flexibility to allow adjustments for changes resulting from economic downturns.

H. CON. RES. 84

OFFERED BY MR. RIGGS

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999 through 2002 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,198,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,241,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,285,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,343,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,407,564,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: –$7,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: –$11,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: –$21,969,,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: –$22,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: –$19,871,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,386,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,439,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,486,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,520,242,,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,551,563,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $1,371,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,424,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1.468,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,500,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,516,024,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $172,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $182,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $183,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $157,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $108,460,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $5,593,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,836,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,082,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,031,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,473,200,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $33,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $34,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $37,099,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: $315,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $324,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $328,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $332,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $335,141,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $268,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $263,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $270,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $266,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $273,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $276,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $279,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,558,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,966,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $12,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,569,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,021,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,981,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,077,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,751,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,122,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $13,826,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,812,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,178,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $14,217,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,882,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,528,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,013,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,862,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,668,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,123,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,050,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,446,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,078,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,293,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,109,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $2,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,048,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,141,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $2,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,867,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,174,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $23,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,405,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $30,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $23,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,702,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,963,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $32,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $22,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,720,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $22,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,313,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $34,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,892,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,620,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,294,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,047,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,664,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,071,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,494,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,960,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,108,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,965,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $6,660,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$920,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,739,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $245,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,299,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,887,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $253,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $15,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,821,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,238,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $255,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,133,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,574,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $257,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $16,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,541,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,680,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $259,897,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $46,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,933,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $155,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $46,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,256,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $135,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $47,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,357,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $48,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,303,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,184,000.000.
(B) Outlays, $41,247,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,387,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,867,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $8,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,902,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,943,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,986,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,020,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $7,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,350,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,098,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $42,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $7,790,000,000.
(B) outlays, $8,429,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $3,180,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,475,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $60,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $12,328,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $60,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,092,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $21,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $63,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,926,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $23,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $68,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,701,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $24,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $73,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,426,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,676,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $137,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,767,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $85,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $144,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,944,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $154,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,947,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $163,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,135,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal Year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $172,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $171,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal Year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $210,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $201,764,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal Year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $212,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $211,548,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal Year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $225,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,537,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal Year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $239,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,781,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal Year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $251,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,769,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal Year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $239,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,758,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $45,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal Year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $254,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,064,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $75,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal Year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $269,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,161,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $110,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal Year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $275,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,264,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $145,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $286,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,239,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $170,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $37,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,524,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,196,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,866,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,043,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,383,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,398,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $40,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,337,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,029,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $27,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $41,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,068,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $41,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,908,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,177,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $26,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $42,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,215,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,249,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $42,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,436,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,277,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $25,129,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $24,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,609,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $25,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,476,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,240,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,901,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $24,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,879,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $14,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,959,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $14,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,363,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,727,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $13,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,131,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $296,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,547,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $304,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,558,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $305,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,075,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $303,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,833,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $303,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,728,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $0.

(B) Outlays, $0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, −$41,841,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$41,841,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, −$36,949,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$36,949,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$36,937,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$36,937,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$39,151,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$39,151,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$51,124,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$51,124,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for two separate reconciliation bills: the first for entitlement reforms and the second for tax relief. In the event Senate procedures preclude the consideration of two separate bills, this section would permit the consideration of one omnibus reconciliation bill.

(b) SUBMISSIONS.—

(1) ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—Not later than June 12, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (c) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—Not later than June 13, 1997, the House committees named in subsection (d) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(c) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: −$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, −$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and −$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $393,533,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,791,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,617,528,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $17,222,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,673,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $103,109,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $0 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $18,087,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,283,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,563,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $139,134,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,546,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,442,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,578,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: $1,176,253,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,386,546,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,517,939,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(d) INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO TAX RELIEF AND MISCELLANEOUS REFORMS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $34,571,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $37,008,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $211,443,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: −$8,435,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, −$5,091,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and −$50,306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $393,533,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,791,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,617,528,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $17,222,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,673,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $13,109,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $68,975,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $81,896,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $443,061,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $0 in fiscal year 1998, $621,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $1,829,000,000 in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $18,087,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $17,283,000,000 in ouutlays for fiscal year 2002, and $106,615,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $22,444,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $24,563,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $139,134,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The House Committee on Ways and means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $397,546,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, $506,442,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and $2,621,578,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee is not less than: $1,168,853,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 1998, $1,366,046,000,000 in revenues for fiscal year 2002, and $7,432,939,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(e) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(f) CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE.—If the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means report recommendations pursuant to their reconciliation instructions that, combined, provide an initiative for children's health that would increase the deficit by more than $2.3 billion for fiscal year 1998, by

more than $3.9 billion for fiscal year 2002, and by more than $16 billion for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002, the committees shall be deemed to not have complied with their reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to adjust the appropriate budgetary levels to accommodate legislation increasing spending from the highway trust fund on surface transportation and highway safety above the levels assumed in this resolution if such legislation is deficit neutral.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) In order to receive the adjustments specified in subsection (c), a bill reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that provides new budget authority above the levels assumed in this resolution for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be deficit neutral.

(2) A deficit-neutral bill must meet the following conditions:

(A) The amount of new budget authority provided for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund must be in excess of $25.949 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 1998, $25.464 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 2002, and $127.973 billion in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(B) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority set forth in subparagraph (A) must be offset for fiscal year 1998, fiscal year 2002, and for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002. For the sole purpose of estimating the amount of outlays flowing from excess new budget authority under this section, it shall be assumed that such excess new budget authority would have an obligation limitation sufficient to accommodate that new budget authority.

(C) The outlays estimated to flow from the excess new budget authority must be offset by (i) other direct spending or revenue provisions within that transportation bill, (ii) the net reduction in other direct spending and revenue legislation that is enacted during this Congress after the date of adoption of this resolution and before such transportation bill is reported (in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution), or (iii) a combination of the offsets specified in clauses (i) and (ii).

(D) As used in this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) REVISED LEVELS.—(1) When the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill (or when a conference report thereon is filed) meeting the conditions set forth in subsection (b)(2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation of new budget authority to that committee by the amount of new budget authority provided in that bill (and that is above the levels set forth in subsection (b)(2)(A)) for programs authorized out of the highway trust fund.

(2) After the enactment of the transportation bill described in paragraph (1) and upon the reporting of a general, supplemental or continuing resolution making appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) establishing an obligation limitation above the levels specified in subsection (b)(2)(A) (at a level sufficient to obligate some or all of the budget authority specified in paragraph (1)), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation and aggregate levels of outlays to that committee for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 by the appropriate amount.

(d) REVISIONS.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this section shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(e) REVERSALS.—If any legislation referred to in this section is not enacted into law, then the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall, as soon as practicable, reverse adjustments made under this section for such legislation and have such adjustments published in the Congressional Record.

(f) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

(g) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''highway trust fund'' refers to the following budget accounts (or any successor accounts):

(1) 69–8083–0–7–401 (Federal-Aid Highways).

(2) 69–8191–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Capital Fund).

(3) 69–8350–0–7–401 (Mass Transit Formula Grants).

(4) 69–8016–0–7–401 (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration-Operations and Research).

(5) 69–8020–0–7–401 (Highway Traffic Safety Grants).

(6) 69–8048–0–7–401 (National Motor Carrier Safety Program).

SEC. 302. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of any concurrent resolution on the budget and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, no amounts realized from the sale of an asset shall be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues if such sale should cause an increase in the deficit as calculated pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) CALCULATION OF NET PRESENT VALUE.—The deficit estimate of an asset sale shall be the net present value of the cash flow from—

(A) proceeds from the asset sale;

(B) future receipts that would be expected from continued ownership of the asset by the Government; and

(C) expected future spending by the Government at a level necessary to continue to operate and maintain the asset to generate the receipts estimated pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''sale of an asset'' shall have the same meaning as under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) TREATMENT OF LOAN ASSETS.—For the purposes of this section, the sale of loan assets or the prepayment of a loan shall be governed by the terms of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—For the purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the House Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 303. ENVIRONMENTAL RESERVE FUND.

(a) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—In the House, after the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure report a bill (or a conference report thereon is filed) to reform the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of hazardous waste sites, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall submit revised allocations and budget aggregates to carry out this section by an amount not to exceed the excess subject to the limitation. These revisions shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments made under this section shall not exceed:

(1) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(2) $200 million in budget authority for fiscal year 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(3) $1 billion in budget authority for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 and the estimated outlays flowing therefrom.

(c) READJUSTMENTS.—In the House, any adjustments made under this section for any appropriation measure may be readjusted if that measure is not enacted into law.

SEC. 304. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES.

(A) ALLOCATION BY CHAIRMAN.—In the House, upon the reporting of a bill by the Committee on Appropriations (or upon the filing of a conference report thereon) providing $700 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1998 for Federal land acquisitions and to finalize priority Federal land exchanges, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall allocate that amount of budget authority and the corresponding amount of outlays.

(b) TREATMENT OF ALLOCATIONS IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, allocations made under subsection (a) shall be deemed to be made pursuant to section 602(a)(1) of that Act and shall be deemed to be a separate suballocation for purposes of the application of section 302(f) of that Act as modified by section 602(c) of that Act.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(A) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Baselines are projections of future spending if existing policies remain unchanged.

(2) Under baseline assumptions, spending automatically rises with inflation even if such increases are not mandated under existing law.

(3) Baseline budgeting is inherently biased against policies that would reduce the projected growth in spending because such policies are portrayed as spending reductions from an increasing baseline.

(4) The baseline concept has encouraged Congress to abdicate its constitutional obligation to control the public purse for those programs which are automatically funded.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that baseline budgeting should be replaced with a budgetary model that requires justification of aggregate funding levels and maximizes congressional and executive accountability for Federal spending.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Congress and the President have a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The Congress and the President should enact a law which creates a regimen for paying off the Federal debt within 30 years.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRESIDENT'S SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) The President's annual budget submission to Congress should include a plan for repayment of Federal debt beyond the year 2002, including the money borrowed from the Social Security Trust Fund.

(2) The plan should specifically explain how the President would cap spending growth at a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues.

(3) If spending growth were held to a level one percentage point lower than projected growth in revenues, then the Federal debt could be repaid within 30 years.

SEC. 403. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COMMISSION ON LONG-TERM BUDGETARY PROBLEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) achieving a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 is only the first step necessary to restore our Nation's economic prosperity;

(2) the imminent retirement of the baby-boom generation will greatly increase the demand for government services;

(3) this burden will be borne by a relatively smaller work force resulting in an unprecedented intergenerational transfer of financial resources;

(4) the rising demand for retirement and medical benefits will quickly jeopardize the solvency of the medicare, social security, and Federal retirement trust funds; and

(5) the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that marginal tax rates would have to increase by 50 percent over the next 5 years to cover the long-term projected costs of retirement and health benefits.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to create a commission to assess long-term budgetary problems, their implications for both the baby-boom generation and tomorrow's workforce, and make such recommendations as it deems appropriate to ensure our Nation's future prosperity.

SEC. 404. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CORPORATE WELFARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the functional levels and aggregates in this budget resolution assume that—

(1) the Federal Government supports profit-making enterprises and industries through billions of dollars in payments, benefits, and programs;

(2) many of these subsidies do not serve a clear and compelling public interest;

(3) corporate subsidies frequently provide unfair competitive advantages to certain industries and industry segments; and

(4) at a time when millions of Americans are being asked to sacrifice in order to balance the budget, the corporate sector should bear its share of the burden.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted to—

(1) eliminate the most egregious corporate subsidies; and

(2) create a commission to recommend the elimination of Federal payments, benefits, and programs which predominantly benefit a particular industry or segment of an industry, rather than provide a clear and compelling public benefit, and include a fast.track process for the consideration of those recommendations.

SEC. 405. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FAMILY VIOLENCE OPTION CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Domestic violence is the leading cause of physical injury to women. The Department of Justice estimates that over 1,000,000 violent crimes against women are committed by intimate partners annually.

(2) Domestic violence dramatically affects the victim's ability to participate in the workforce. A University of Minnesota survey reported that one quarter of battered women surveyed had lost a job partly because of being abused and that over half of these women had been harassed by their abuser at work.

(3) Domestic violence is often intensified as women seek to gain economic independence through attending school or training programs. Batterers have been reported to prevent women from attending these programs or sabotage their efforts at self-improvement.

(4) Nationwide surveys of service providers prepared by the Taylor Institute of Chicago, Illinois, document, for the first time, the interrelationship between domestic violence and welfare by showing that from 34 percent to 65 percent of AFCDC recipients are current or past victims of domestic violence.

(5) Over half of the women surveyed stayed with their batterers because they lacked the resources to support themselves and their children. The surveys also found that the availability of economic support is a critical factor in poor women's ability to leave abusive situations that threaten them and their children.

(6) The restructuring of the welfare programs may impact the availability of the economic support and the safety net necessary to enable poor women to flee abuse without risking homelessness and starvation for their families.

(7) In recognition of this finding, the House Committee on the Budget unanimously passed a sense of Congress amendment on domestic violence and Federal assistance to the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution. Subsequently, Congress passed the family violence option amendment to last year's welfare reform reconciliation bill.

(8) The family violence option gives States the flexibility to grant temporary waivers from time limits and work requirements for domestic violence victims who would suffer extreme hardship from the application of these provisions. These waivers were not intended to be included as part of the permanent 20 percent hardship exemption.

(9) The Department of Health and Human Services has been slow to issue regulations regarding this provision. As a result, States are hesitant to fully implement the family violence option fearing it will interfere with the 20 percent hardship exemption.

(10) Currently 15 States have opted to include the family violence option in their welfare plans, and 13 other States have included some type of domestic violence provisions in their plans.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) States should not be subject to any numerical limits in granting domestic violence good cause waivers to individuals receiving assistance for all requirements where compliance with such requirements would make it more difficult for individuals receiving assistance to escape domestic violence; and

(2) any individuals granted a domestic violence good cause waiver by States should not be included in the States' 20 percent hardship exemption.

H. CON. RES. 84

OFFERED BY: MR. SHUSTER

AMENDMENT NO. 11: At the end, add the following new title:

TITLE V—TRANSPORTATION REVENUES USED SOLELY FOR TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 501. READJUSTMENTS.

(a) INCREASE IN FUNCTION 400.—Levels of new budget authority and outlays set forth in function 400 in section 102 shall be increased as follows:

(1) for fiscal year 1998, by $0 in outlays and by $0 in new budget authority;

(2) for fiscal year 1999, by $770,000,000 in outlays and by $3,600,000,000 in new budget authority;

(3) for fiscal year 2000, by $2,575,000,000 in outlays and by $4,796,000,000 in new budget authority;

(4) for fiscal year 2001, by $3,765,000,000 in outlays and by $5,363,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(5) for fiscal year 2002, by $4,488,000,000 in outlays and by $5,619,000,000 in new budget authority.

(b) OFFSETS.—(1)(A) The total budget outlays for each fiscal year set forth in each functional category in section 102 shall be reduced by an amount determined through a pro rata reduction of discretionary outlays within each function necessary to achieve the following outlay reductions:

(i) for fiscal year 1998, by $0 in outlays;

(ii) for fiscal year 1999, by $746,000,000 in outlays;

(iii) for fiscal year 2000, by $2,422,000,000 in outlays;

(iv) for fiscal year 2001, by $3,532,000,000 in outlays; and

(v) for fiscal year 2002, by $4,242,000,000 in outlays;

and corresponding reductions in new budget authority shall be made in each function consistent with such pro rata reductions in outlays. Reductions in new budget authority shall be made to section 101(2) consistent with this subparagraph and subsection (a).

(B) These reductions shall not be made to the mandatory outlay portion of any function, including (but not limited to) Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. For purposes of the application of this paragraph to function 400, the pro rata share shall be determined by using the amounts provided for function 400 prior to any adjustment made by subparagraph (A).

(2) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed as set forth in section 101(1)(B) are reduced as follows:

(A) for fiscal year 1998, by $0;

(B) for fiscal year 1999, by $24,000,000;

(C) for fiscal year 2000, by $153,000,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2001, by $233,000,000; and

(E) for fiscal year 2002, by $246,000,000.

(3) The amounts by which to appropriate levels of total budget outlays in section 101(3) are increased as follows:

(A) for fiscal year 1998, by $0;

(B) for fiscal year 1999, by $24,000,000;

(C) for fiscal year 2000, by $153,000,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2001, by $233,000,000; and

(E) for fiscal year 2002, by $246,000,000.

(4) The reconciliation directives to the Committee on Ways and Means in sections 201(c)(8)(B) and 201(d)(8)(B) shall be adjusted accordingly.

SEC. 502. HIGHWAY TRUST FUND ALLOCATIONS.

(a) ALLOCATED AMOUNTS.—Of the amounts of outlays allocated to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate by the joint explanatory statement accompanying this resolution pursuant to sections 302 and 602 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the following amounts shall be used for contract authority spending out of the Highway Trust Fund—

(1) for fiscal year 1998, $22,256,000,000 in outlays;

(2) for fiscal year 1999, $24,063,000,000 in outlays;

(3) for fiscal year 2000, $26,092,000,000 in outlays;

(4) for fiscal year 2001, $27,400,000,000 in outlays; and

(5) for fiscal year 2002, $28,344,000,000 in outlays.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—Determinations regarding points of order made under section 302(f) or 602(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall take into account subsection (a).

(c) STATUTORY IMPLEMENTATION.—As part of reauthorizaton of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, provisions shall be included to enact this section into permanent law.

SEC. 503. PRIORITY FOR RESTORATION OF CUTS.

Any outlays that would have been allocated for surface transportation pursuant to section 301 shall first be used to restore any cuts to discretionay spending made as a result of section 501. The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall implement section 301 consistent with this section.

SEC. 504. MATHEMATICAL CONSISTENCY.

The Chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may make technical changes consistent with this title to ensure mathematical consistency.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 19, 1997 No. 66

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who has said, ''Judgment is Mine!'', forgive us when we play god by assuming the right to judge people's ultimate worth on the basis of their positions on issues. We confess the judgmentalism that renders others as good or bad people on the basis of their ideas. Forgive any cowardice that steps back from debate of convictions and hides behind condemnation of character. Jesus said,

''Judge not that you be not judged. For with what judgment you judge, you will be judged . . .''—Matthew 7: 1–2.

The men and women of this Senate have two things in common as they begin this week: They all are conscientious about their crucial leadership role; and they all want what is best for our Nation. Now create in all of them a dominant desire to seek Your guidance and will. May their hourly prayer be, ''Show me, reveal to us, Your way.'' In response, express Your direction for the Nation. In the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader, Senator LOTT of Mississippi, is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period of morning business to accommodate a number of Senators who have asked for time to speak.

The Budget Committee is scheduled to mark up the budget resolution beginning this afternoon at 4 p.m., and it is my hope that we may count any debate time today that we will use relating to the budget toward the statutory time limitation.

Tomorrow, the Senate will begin consideration of the concurrent budget resolution, and Members can anticipate rollcall votes throughout the day.

It is also possible that the Senate may resume consideration of H.R. 1122, the partial-birth abortion ban bill, with the intention of a vote on final passage occurring early this week. We had actually hoped that we could get a vote on that perhaps right after the luncheon on Tuesday. But there are some discussions underway, and we may not be able to get to that that soon.

As always, all Members will be notified as soon as any votes are scheduled on these or other matters.

Also, as a reminder to Members, this is the last week prior to the Memorial Day recess and, therefore, Senators can expect a very busy week with us more than likely having to go into the evening on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. And we should expect votes on Friday. At least on Tuesday, I don't know that there will be recorded votes, but certainly on Wednesday and Thursday in order to finish the budget resolution, complete action on the partial-birth abortion ban, and also get to another vote on the comptime-flextime Family Friendly Workplace Act. We will have to have some votes on that probably on Thursday. Then we would probably need to do the budget resolution by Friday, or probably on Friday, as well as the supplemental appropriations on Friday, if we haven't been able to get an agreement to do it before then.

Also this week we will have to pass the Chemical Weapons Convention implementation bill. I think the problems are being worked out there. It shouldn't take too much time, although a block of time will be necessary to explain what is included in that implementation bill.

So, Mr. President, I just want to reconfirm that we do still this week intend to do the budget resolution, finish the debate and final vote on the partial-birth abortion ban, have votes on the comptime-flextime bill with the hope that we could reach some agreement to actually get the legislation completed, and then vote on the budget resolution conference and the supplemental conference.

We will keep the Members advised of any changes in the schedule.

By the way, we do expect this week to take up perhaps some action on the Executive Calendar, at least the judicial nominations, probably Wednesday or Thursday. And we will have to have recorded votes on those three nominations, if we actually do take them up.

So we would try to schedule that either Wednesday or Thursday.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1997

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a topic which is going to be voted on here in the U.S. Senate tomorrow, the topic of partial-birth abortion. This is an issue which I think is understandable by virtually every American who has given it any consideration. They understand this is a brutal technique which inflicts pain and is the kind of thing which would shock the conscience of most Americans not only as it relates to unborn children, but if it were, as a matter of fact, a procedure used even on animals.

Mr. President, about 2 weeks ago, a Rhode Island jury found a mother guilty of second-degree murder in the death of her newborn daughter. The State medical examiner, according to a May 9 article in the Providence Journal-Bulletin, testified that the little girl died from a single blow to the back of the head that left a laceration on her scalp and an inch-long skull fracture. The umbilical cord and the placenta were still attached to the child.

Now, ironically, this Rhode Island woman who had been found guilty of second-degree murder, if she had, prior to giving birth, allowed a physician to perform a procedure very similar to what she did, a procedure called partial-birth abortion, there would have been no criminal action involved. The baby would have been there, the blow to the head would have been similar, the umbilical cord would still have been attached, the placenta would still have been there, but because the baby would have been only partially born, it would have been entirely legal.

This kind of tension that exists in the law between charging and convicting a mother of second-degree murder and authorizing a physician to conduct what is called a partial-birth abortion makes no sense to the American people.

Let me take a few moments today to talk about the lessons we teach when we as a culture allow such tensions to persist. When we come down here to the floor and we argue before the cameras, the Nation is affected on a level of which we too often take little notice. People look, people listen, people understand.

Right now we are debating a violent medical procedure that, in my judgment, should be a clear-cut wrong. People understand that. However, the high emotion of the abortion debate seems to blur the vision of many of us who are in the U.S. Congress. We are so caught up in arguing about the definition of technicalities that we are in danger of slipping into absurdities ourselves, absurdities that are exemplified by the charge and conviction of the woman in Rhode Island.

The stakes are high here, as we are talking, in no uncertain terms, about the value of human life. It seems so clear that all of us should vote to ban the direct killing of a fully formed, often viable, human being. Yet because the child is 80 percent born, somehow we have allowed the killing of that child to be legal.

Now the partisan political rhetoric we expend here and the attempts to turn this vote into abstract public policy are setting an example in our society and in the world that bring into question our Nation's status as a moral leader. How can we lecture or threaten China on its human rights abuses when we stand up and argue that human beings should be brutally butchered in a procedure that is rarely, if ever, medically necessary?

How can we question the practice of child slavery in foreign nations when our own Nation's lawmakers cast cavalier votes to torture our own infants?

Let me be clear, though. Our position as a world leader does not trouble me as much as the positions we put our youth in when we refuse to provide moral guidance.

What are we teaching our own children? What are we saying to them about the value of life? What are we saying to them when we suggest that a technicality provides the difference between destroying a life, committing murder, and merely having an abortion?

What values are we teaching when we vote that the difference between a partial-birth abortion and a homicide is a mere 3 inches?

If the physician took forceps or scissors to collapse the baby's skull outside the mother's body, he or she would be charged with murder.

Yet, if the skull is collapsed when the baby's head is still partially in the birth canal, the homicide becomes a legal procedure.

What values are we teaching when lawmakers show more concern for animals or the environment than for human life? Let's look at two pieces of legislation that demonstrate the absurdity of our present value system.

H.R. 3918 was introduced by then Representative BARBARA BOXER on November 25, 1991. The Congressional Research Service summarizes the bill as follows:

> Requires each Federal department or agency head to review and evaluate nonanimal alternatives with the potential for partial or full replacement of the Draize or other animal acute toxicity tests for some or all of the products regulated by such department or agency.

I might not have all the facts, but it seems to me that Senator BOXER—one of the strongest opponents of this legislation—seems to put the pain and suffering of laboratory animals above the pain and suffering of human beings.

When you say that you want to replace the Draize, or other animal acute toxicity tests, and you are willing to say it is necessary to spare animals this kind of pain but it is not necessary to spare these mostly born children of the pain inflicted on them by partial-birth abortion, I think you can again raise the level of tension between what the public knows is right and the technicality of the law which would allow something which the public knows to be very wrong.

Former Senator Pell introduced S. 1701 during the 104th Congress. The bill prescribes criminal penalties for use of steel jaw leghold traps on animals; directs the Secretary of the Interior to reward nongovernment informers for information leading to a conviction under this act; and empowers enforcement officials to detain, search, and seize suspected merchandise or documents and to make arrests with and without warrants.

Senator Pell stated on the floor, ''While this bill does not prohibit trapping, it does outlaw a particularly savage method of trapping.'' Well, the bill we are debating today does not outlaw abortion—it outlaws ''a particularly savage method of abortion.''

I am surprised and even a bit dismayed that the Members supporting and proactively fighting for measures that would reduce the suffering of animals have not been willing to afford at least the same protections to human beings.

What values are we teaching when we appear to value to limbs of animals over the lives of children?

And this takes me back to my opening—the emotion and strife of the abortion debate is blinding and confusing some Members. However, the legislation before us today is not about an uncertainty, it is about combating acts of barbarism against human beings.

Of course, part of the confusion on this issue is due to misleading reports on the necessity and practice of partial-birth abortions. As reported in Newsweek last October:

> When the partial-birth-abortion debate took shape last year, pro-choice groups insisted the procedure was extremely rare. The number 500 to 600 was tossed around, with the President and others explaining that it was reserved for heart-wrenching cases involving women whose tests show severely deformed fetuses or whose health was at risk.

That comes from Jonathan Alter, ''When the Facts Get Aborted,'' Newsweek, October 7, 1996.

But we now have a fairly clear and broad concurrence on the truth about the rarity and utility of this procedure. Let's look at the facts.

The fact is that partial-birth abortions are not rare or unusual.

The fact is not that it is 500 or 600 cases a year in the entire country.

The Sunday Record of Bergen County, NJ stated: ''But interviews with physicians who use the method reveal in New Jersey alone, at least 1,500 partial-birth abortions are performed each year''—triple the 450–500 number which the National Abortion Federation [NAF], a lobby for abortion clinics, has claimed occur in the entire country.

The same article in the Bergen County Sunday Record reported:

> Another [New York] metropolitan doctor who works outside New Jersey said he does about 260 post-20-week abortions a year, of which half are by intact D&E. The doctor, who is also a professor at two prestigious

teaching hospitals, said he had been teaching intact D&E since 1981, and he said he knows of two former students on Long Island and two in New York City who use the procedure.

The truth contravenes the myths of last year's debate—the suggestions by proponents of this procedure that it is only used in situations of dire medical emergency, and that it is limited in its use to about 500 or 600 a year nationwide. The truth of the matter is that in New Jersey alone it is three times that number.

Is partial-birth abortion needed to protect the health of the mother?

Frankly, I think we have to always be very concerned about the health of women in this debate. We should not do those things that would unduly or unnecessarily impair the health of women in this country.

President Clinton has justified his veto of the partial-birth abortion ban last year by pointing to the legislation's absence of a health exception. Some Members of this body also argue for a health exception. However, the facts indicate that such an exception is unnecessary.

Four specialists in ob/gyn and fetal medicine representing PHACT—Physicians' Ad Hoc Coalition for Truth—a group of over 500 doctors, mostly specialists in ob/gyn, maternal and fetal medicine, and pediatrics, stated in a September 19, 1996, Wall Street Journal article:

> Contrary to what abortion activists would have us believe, partial-birth abortion is never medically indicated to protect a woman's health or her fertility. In fact, the opposite is true: The procedure can pose a significant and immediate threat to both the pregnant woman's health and her fertility.

In response to the President's statements that partial-birth abortions were necessary to preserve the woman's health and their ability to have future pregnancies, former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop stated:

> I believe that Mr. Clinton was misled by his medical advisors on what is fact and what is fiction in reference to late-term abortions. Because in no way can I twist my mind to see that the late-term abortion as described—you know, partial birth, and then destruction of the unborn child before the head is born—is a medical necessity for the mother.

''Because in no way can I twist my mind in a way * * *.''

C. Everett Koop, former Surgeon General of the United States, indicates that it takes a twisting of the mind to get to the point of saying that the baby must be destroyed in that setting.

Even Dr. Martin Haskell, who has performed over 1,000 partial-birth abortions, said that he performs them routinely for nonmedical reasons, and that 80 percent are purely elective—not required to protect the health of the mother.

Dr. David Brown, a physician investigating this procedure for the Washington Post wrote:

> [I]in most cases where the procedure is used, the physical health of the woman whose pregnancy is being terminated is not in jeopardy * * *. Instead, the ''typical'' patients tend to be young, low-income women, often poorly educated or naive, whose reasons for waiting so long to end their pregnancies are rarely medical.

The PHACT doctors have even said that at 21 weeks or later, abortion is riskier to a woman's health than childbirth. They state in a recent letter to the editor of the Washington Post:

> It should be noted that at 21 weeks and after, abortion is twice as risky for women as childbirth: the risk of maternal death is 1 in 6,000 for abortion and 1 in 13,000 for childbirth.

I hope we will be successful in our endeavor to obtain enough votes to override an expected Presidential veto in this matter. Clearly the President won't be able to rely on the myths and misrepresentations this year that he relied on last year if he is to veto it.

We are not only teaching poor values. We are not only setting a bad example. We are risking lives and losing lives as a result of this procedure.

George Will tells an interesting story in an April 24 Washington Post op-ed which demonstrates the irony of what we are debating here. The story is about Stephanie and Sandra Bartels of Hull, IA. Sandra and Stephanie were twins born in a South Dakota hospital. They were born 88 days apart by what is called ''delayed-interval delivery.'' Will states:

> Stephanie, born January 5 when her mother went into premature labor in the 23rd week of her pregnancy, weighed 1 pound, 2 ounces. Sandra, weighing 7 pounds, 10 ounces, was born April 2, by which time Stephanie weighed 4 pounds 10 ounces.

For 88 days, while her twin sister's life was protected by the law, Sandra, who was still unborn, under the current law could have been the subject of a partial-birth abortion.

As Will states,

> Location is the key factor. Unless she is completely outside the mother she is fair game for the abortionist.

The tension between the fact that one twin already born is protected by our law, while the other twin yet unborn is fair game for destruction through a brutal procedure called a partial-birth abortion, is obvious.

Such an absurdity in the law is not consistent with American values. It is not consistent with the expectation of the American people that we govern rationally. Physical location should not be the key factor. However, George Will is right. Location was and is the key factor, and that locational factor should be abandoned.

We should ask ourselves about location. We should ask ourselves: To what location will our moral compass direct us when we vote on the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act? I believe it should direct us to the location where we abandon and outlaw this painful and brutal procedure.

We should ask ourselves: Where will we end up on the scale of decency and humanity?

Will we continue to be guilty of basing our reasoning on a thin, irrational thread of support for an inexcusable practice which we would not tolerate in terms of animal experiments?

Should we keep drawing these illogical distinctions to sustain the brutal inhumane treatment of our citizens?

I hope when this vote comes before the Senate that we will all end up on the high ground. I hope that our vote to ban this procedure will be so resounding that the President will look at our action and think, This legislation is not only based upon rationality and consistency, but it was also endorsed so thoroughly by the U.S. Senate that I ought to sign it rather than veto it. We as a nation must refuse to allow the grotesque brutality of partial-birth abortion to continue.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Chair.

FAMILY FRIENDLY WORKPLACE ACT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, families in America are facing a challenge raising children—especially since in most cases —if there are two parents, they both are in the workplace. Certainly for single parents being in the workplace makes raising children even more difficult. For these single parents, if their children have to go to the doctor—they take them. If their children are having trouble at school or get sick during the day, the single parent does not have anyone else to rely on.

The single parent must take care of the problem themselves. As difficult as that may be, if that single parent is a salaried worker, she can work with her employer to arrange her work schedule to accommodate these needs. However, if that single parent is an hourly worker, she must find a way to meet her child's needs and work all of the required hours during a 7-day period or lose part of her pay.

Demographics have changed significantly since the passage of our major employment laws. In 1938, when the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted, only 2 out of 12 mothers with school-age children were in the workplace. Today only 3 out of 12 mothers of school-age children are not in the workplace—obviously, the statistics have taken a real flip. People have gone into the workplace in order to tackle the incredible tax burden and the cost of living. It has been said that in some families, in most families, one parent works to pay the Government and the other parent works to provide for the family.

It is very difficult for families to make ends meet unless you have both

parents working to provide financial resources for the family. Therefore, we have a high level of involvement of the parents of America in the workplace—this stresses our families. Regardless of why we have this kind of stress in our lives, it exists. It is real as any other societal problem that we are dealing with today. We need a solution.

Parents need to be available to their children to go to award ceremonies, to see them play soccer or football, and to confer with the teacher. Parents need to be able to care for a sick child or a child that becomes sick or ill at school without worrying that they will have to miss time away from work—and the income that goes with it.

We have proposed and will continue to debate—and I think we will enact—what is called the Family Friendly Workplace Act. It is a way of saying to parents you should be able to make agreements with your employer about flexible working arrangements, that you should be able to save up some time off that comes when you work overtime. Instead of being paid time-and-one-half, if you want to—at your option and at your request—you should be able to take time-and-one-half in time off with pay. You can use that time later so that when the need arises you will be able to meet the needs of your family.

Those who have been opposed to providing this option for America's workers have their own solution to the problem—they think that providing the American worker with more unpaid leave will somehow help already financially strapped workers. They want to expand Family and Medical Leave to allow for 24 hours of unpaid leave to attend a child's event.

I think the Family Friendly Workplace Act is a superior option. This would allow you—at your option—instead of being paid time-and-one-half for overtime to take time-and-one-half with pay some other time to meet the needs of your family. The Family Friendly Workplace Act does not say to the moms and dads of America, in order to be a good mom and dad, you have to take a pay cut. It says if you can work something out with your employer to put some time-and-one-half hours in the bank and take time off later, you still will be paid for them because you have hours in the bank.

There is more social tension, there is more financial tension, and we need to have the flexibility for families to spend more time with each other to resolve those tensions. It is simply true that moms and dads in America should not have to take a pay cut in order to be good parents.

Experience has shown us that pilot programs—or experiments—help us understand whether a program should be permanently authorized or more broadly adopted. It will tell us whether there are bugs in it that need to be worked out or whether it is a program that will work well and can succeed.

The Family Friendly Workplace Act is modeled off of one such pilot program. Since 1978, Federal Government workers have been able to work flexible work schedules as provided for in the Federal Employees Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act. That is, we have had flexible working arrangements. We have had compensatory time off for overtime that has been used at the option of the worker. I believe it has been a model that we can follow to provide for American laborers who work by the hour.

As a matter of fact, in 1994 in an Executive order, President Clinton directed more broad use of these flexible scheduling programs throughout the Federal Government. So what we have here is a system which is working for Federal employees that should be allowed for the men and women of America who work by the hour.

I should just take a moment to indicate that all the people who are salaried workers have flextime potentials—the people in the board rooms, the presidents and the owners of the companies, the supervisors and managers generally. As a matter of fact, the great majority of workers in the country, especially when you put in governmental workers, have comptime and flextime options, but the average hourly worker in America does not. It is time to give the hourly workers, the laboring people what the great majority of workers have and that is flexible working arrangements.

Now, one of the things that opponents of this bill constantly say is that this proposal destroys the 40-hour week, that it somehow would force people to work overtime without pay. Nothing is further from the truth. Taking compensatory time off in the bill is totally—completely—voluntary. The Family Friendly Workplace Act provides for new, voluntary choices for workers. Section 3 provides, under compensatory time off, that it is voluntary participation. It says, No employee may be required to receive compensatory time in lieu of monetary compensation.

That basically says no one can be required, instead of taking time-and-one-half pay, to take time-and-one-half off later with pay. It is a system that says we want to give workers the choice. As a matter of fact, so committed are we to choice, even if you decided you wanted to take compensatory time off when you work the overtime hours but later change your mind, the bill says you have an absolute right to get paid the cash.

Comptime provides some flexibility for those workers who get paid overtime. However, many workers never earn overtime compensation. The biweekly work programs and flexible credit hour programs provide flexibility for those workers. Participation in these programs also are completely voluntary. ''No employee may be required to participate in a program described in this section.'' This is all voluntary. Those who say there are not employee choices in this matter simply have not read this legislation.

There are protections for workers to make sure that voluntary means voluntary. The protections that are involved in this bill for workers exceed those protections that are involved in the Federal law for State and local government workers. ''Section (d). Prohibition of Coercion. An employer shall not directly or indirectly intimidate, threaten or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten or coerce any employee.'' And ''the penalties for abuse are doubled in the current law.'' We have taken great steps here to make sure that this is totally voluntary and that any coercion, direct or indirect, is impermissible and would be punished substantially with higher penalties than we have under current law.

As a matter of fact, the situation we are recommending in the Family Friendly Workplace Act has far more guarantees and protections for workers than are currently involved in the law for State and local government workers. The Federal law allowing State and local government workers to have comptime says that workers can be required to be involved in comptime as a condition of employment. That is not so under the law we are proposing for private workers. It is strictly voluntary. It cannot be required. It is up to the worker. No worker can be required to participate.

Under the law which now applies to State and local government workers, management can decide when a worker must use comptime. Under the Family Friendly Workplace Act, workers cannot be coerced into using their comptime. Penalties would be doubled for any direct or indirect coercion. There is another significant difference. There is no cash-out provision under the system for State and local government workers, comptime only is paid in cash when the employee is either terminated or quits. In other words, if a State or local government worker wants to get his overtime in cash, you can only get the cash out of the system when you leave your job. You have to quit your job to get your money.

Under the Family Friendly Workplace Act, you do not have to quit to get your money. Any time you change your mind, comptime must be cashed out on request. It must be cashed out at the end of each year. So that the Family Friendly Workplace Act is totally voluntary—and there are these structural guarantees—with doubled penalties. These arrangements are strictly voluntary. They cannot be required, they cannot be coerced, penalties are doubled, and comptime must be cashed out on request. This is a system which basically allows workers to make choices. It allows them to make meaningful choices. These are choices about spending time with their families.

We have talked about just one of these choices—the choice that relates to comptime which you get when you work overtime. But the truth of the matter is, many American workers seldom if ever get overtime. As a matter

of fact, in 1996, our census data indicates that only 4.5 percent of working women in the private sector get regular overtime.

If we were just to leave this bill at the comptime level and not do anything about flexible working arrangements, we would not be providing much relief to women who work by the hour and never get overtime so they could take comptime instead of time-and-one-half in pay. In order to meet the real needs of American workers—the broad workforce—we need to have the kind of breadth of options in the program that is in the program for Federal workers. Federal workers have more than just comptime as an option for flexibility. They have the potential for flexible working arrangements so individuals who never get overtime still have the ability to have flexible working arrangements and spend time with their families.

If only 4.5 percent of the 28.9 million women who work by the hour in this country—if only 4.5 of percent of them get overtime—really, if we only do comptime, we are not going to help the vast majority of the women. We have to give the private sector workers the same range of options that exist for the Federal employees. And that includes flextime arrangements; the ability to schedule work flexibly and the ability 1 week to work an hour extra so the next week you can take an hour off.

Right now, it is shocking, but our legal framework makes it illegal for an employer to say to you, I'll let you work an extra hour on Friday so you can take an hour off on Monday. Most Americans are shocked by that. They also are shocked by the fact that it is not illegal for a Government employee to do it, but it is illegal for an average citizen to do it. They know it is not illegal for the boss to do it or for the boardroom guys to do it or the managers or the supervisors to do it. They know it is not illegal for the salaried people to do it. They ought to have some reservations about a system that has sort of second-class citizenship for hourly paid persons and it is illegal for them to work an extra hour on Friday and take an hour off on Monday, even when their employer agrees with it. We need to stop that illegality.

The point is simply this. Since very few working women who work by the hour get overtime, very few will benefit from a comptime only option. We need to provide a framework for these women to have the ability to be with their families, and we have to have flextime in order to get that done.

Mr. President, this is a great opportunity for us to say to American families, We are with you. We are not against you. This is a great opportunity for us to say to the working people of the country, You deserve the same chance for flexibility that the Federal Government employees have. You deserve the same chance to be with your children that the salaried workers have—the managers, the supervisors, and CEO's or the company Presidents. As a matter of fact, they are a minority of workers who do not have these options. We understand that. Hourly workers are a minority of workers in this country when compared to the Government and the salaried and other workers. But they should not be treated as second-class citizens.

The soccer game is just as important to the hourly worker's child as it is to the boss' child. It is just as important to go to the school doctor to confer about your child's health if you are an hourly worker as it is if you are a Federal Government employee. It is just as important for your family to operate as a family, to be able to shape the values and to provide the framing, the development of the next generation if you are an hourly worker as if you are paid in some other way. The Family Friendly Workplace Act is simply a means of getting that done.

It is a means we have designed with protections that are strong. The protections are superior to the protections that are there for State/local government workers. I am a little bit befuddled because the individuals who argue most aggressively against providing this for hourly private sector workers across this country sponsored the legislation for State and local government workers. Not only did they sponsor the legislation for the State and local government workers, but that legislation —that they cosponsored—has fewer protections than does the legislation we are proposing for private workers. Yet those who sponsored the fewer protections for State and local government workers are criticizing the proposal in the private sector because they say enough protections do not exist in the measure. That is difficult to understand. Those individuals, I think, should reevaluate their position.

When organized labor leaders of this country oppose laboring people getting the opportunity to spend time with their families and flexible working arrangements, we ought to ask them to come to the table to help us, to help us assure an opportunity for America's working people, not stand aside and hurt us and criticize a system which is far superior to the one that has been endorsed and for which they negotiate when they are representing State and local government workers.

Mr. President, the opportunity to pass flexible working arrangements to help parents be better parents, to have more time to spend with their families, to be able to take the time off with pay by using compensatory time and flexible working arrangements is what the future of America will be all about. Those who suggest we have to have more unpaid leave so parents will have to choose between taking a pay cut and helping their child are on the wrong track. People are not working because they can afford to take a pay cut. They are working because they need the money, and we should never ask them to sacrifice their child in order to make more money or to sacrifice the money they need to help their child in order to spend time with their child.

The last time I checked, when my children had to go to the dentist and I needed to take them there, that is not the time I could do with less money. That's the time I needed more money, when there was a crisis, when I needed to go to school to see what was happening with my child, take the child to the doctor or to the dentist. I didn't want to take a pay cut. I didn't want to have my salary reduced. Of course I wouldn't. I am a Member of the Senate, I am a Government employee. I have flexible working arrangements. But I do know this, for us to say to the working people of America: When you have a special need in your family, you should take a pay cut and you should take leave without pay, we are asking them to jump out of the frying pan into the fire.

As a matter of fact, family and medical leave has been the occasion for a lot of people to find themselves in real financial distress. When the Commission on Family and Medical Leave met, it found that over 10 percent of all people who took that unpaid leave to meet the needs of their family had to go on welfare because of the loss of salary. Wouldn't it have been better to have flexible working arrangements and some comptime in the bank so you could do that? Ten percent went on welfare, over 40 percent said they had to defer the payment of bills. They just had to stop paying their bills. About 20 percent said they had to borrow money. We have a great opportunity to say to families, ''If you work together, cooperate with your employer in a framework of solid protections in a voluntary system, you will be able to be better parents and you will not have to take a pay cut to do it.''

I call upon my colleagues to enact this legislation as a matter of great service to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. HELMS pertaining to the introduction of S. 763 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. HELMS. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1997

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, there are many times when I am so inclined to pay my respects to Senators who have gone out of their way to take a somewhat different stand. And I imagine that during the past week—and throughout the days of debate on the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act in the 104th Congress, as a matter of fact—that if unborn children had a vote or a message of communication and a way to deliver it, they would be sending their love to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SANTORUM; and to the distinguished occupant of the chair, Mr. DEWINE of Ohio; and to the able Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH as well as to the able Senators from Texas and Tennessee, Mr. GRAMM and Mr. FRIST; and on and on.

It has not always been easy to take the pro-life position on this floor, but it is a lot easier and a lot more comfortable now, thanks to these great Senators and others. I personally pay my respects to all who have participated in the debate on the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act up to this point.

By the way, as one who has participated in the abortion debates since the Supreme Court's Roe versus Wade decision in 1973, and as one who has been condemned by many in certain quarters, I am so thankful that the cavalry has arrived in the Senate and now other Senators are standing up to be counted on an issue that involves the survival of this country. I have long felt if our country cannot reconcile with morality and decency and honesty, the position on the deliberate destruction of the most innocent, the most helpless of human life, that may be at peril—lying just down the road—is the survival of this country.

In any case, the abortion debate shifted dramatically when legislation was introduced in the 104th Congress to spare unborn babies from a merciless procedure known as a partial-birth abortion. Because of the debate in Congress and the heightened concern of the American people, the spotlight no longer is focused on the sanctimonious, so-called right to choose; instead, the debate now centers around the ultimate question: Does an innocent, defenseless, unborn child have a right to live? Senators have cast their votes for and against legislation outlawing partial-birth abortions on two previous occasions—first on December 6, 1995, when 54 Senators voted to ban partial-birth abortions. But the President of the United States, Mr. Clinton, saw fit to veto that bill. The Senate, on September 26 of last year, failed to override that Presidential veto. Fifty-seven Senators voted to override, but the 57 were 10 votes fewer than the two-thirds necessary and required to override.

Which brings me to where we are now and the reason I stand here to pay my respects to Senators like the distinguished occupant of the chair, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SMITH, and others. The Senate has been considering whether an innocent baby—partially born, just 3 inches from the protection of the law—deserves the right to live, to love, and to be loved. Interestingly enough, the House of Representatives has already passed H.R. 1122, which is the bill now before the Senate. In my judgment, the Senate must not squander this opportunity to outlaw partial-birth abortions, and I cannot believe it will.

Those who oppose the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, as it is named, have again asserted the necessity of the procedure that enables doctors to deliver babies partially, feet first from the womb, only to have their brains brutally removed by the doctor's instruments. This procedure has prompted revulsion across this land, even among many who previously have been vocal advocates of the right to choose.

Well-known medical doctors, obstetricians and gynecologists have repeatedly rejected the assertions that a partial-birth abortion is needed to protect the health of a woman in a late-term complicated pregnancy. Dr. Pamela E. Smith, who is director of medical education in the department of obstetrics and gynecology at Chicago's Mount Sinai Hospital, in a letter to Senators described these assertions as—in her words, not mine—''deceptive and patently untrue.''

Also, Mr. President, there is much to be said about the facts surrounding the number of partial-birth abortions performed annually and the reason they are performed—or at least the given, stated reason. It is hard to overlook the recent confession of Ron Fitzsimmons, executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, who admitted that he, himself, had deceived the American people on national television about the number and the nature of partial-birth abortions.

Mr. Fitzsimmons now estimates that up to 5,000 partial-birth abortions are conducted annually on healthy women carrying healthy babies. This is a far cry from the rhetoric espoused by Washington's pro-abortion groups who maintain that only 500 partial-birth abortions are performed every year, and only in extreme medical circumstances.

Mr. President, I could go on and on, but Senators throughout this debate have provided ample evidence affirming the need to rid America of this senseless, brutal form of killing. And it is also important to note that the American people recognize the moral significance of this legislation. The continued outpouring of letters and phone calls from across the country in support of a ban on partial-birth abortions has been nothing short of remarkable.

I remember so vividly the day in January 1973, when the Supreme Court handed down the decision to legalize abortion. It was hard to find many people to speak up, certainly on the floor of the Senate, on behalf of unborn babies.

But it is time, once again, for Members of the Senate to stand up and be counted for or against the most helpless human beings imaginable, for or against the destruction of innocent human life in such a repugnant way. The Senate simply must pass the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, and I pray that it will do it by a margin of at least 67 votes in favor of the ban.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, May 16, 1997, the Federal debt stood at $5,343,648,869,296.26. (Five trillion, three hundred forty-three billion, six hundred forty-eight million, eight hundred sixty-nine thousand, two hundred ninety-six dollars, and twenty-six cents)

One year ago, May 1996, the Federal debt stood at $5,113,663,000,000. (Five trillion, one hundred thirteen billion, six hundred sixty-three million)

Twenty-five years ago, May 1972, the Federal debt stood at $427,214,000,000 (Four hundred twenty-seven billion, two hundred fourteen million) which reflects a debt increase of nearly $5 trillion—$4,916,434,869,296.26 (Four trillion, nine hundred sixteen billion, four hundred thirty-four million, eight hundred sixty-nine thousand, two hundred ninety-six dollars, and twenty-six cents) during the past 25 years.

THE RAPID CITY FIRE OF 1997

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, last week a fire devastated downtown Rapid City, consuming the historic Sweeney Building in a furious blaze that threatened to destroy the entire block. Only the heroic efforts of the Rapid City Fire Department and emergency workers from all over the county ensured that the damage, as severe as it was, was contained.

This terrible blaze took a much-loved part of our heritage from us. The Sweeney Building had towered over Rapid City for 111 years, and was one of the oldest buildings in the Black Hills. Its builder, Tom Sweeney, was legendary. His name and slogan ''Tom Sweeney Wants to See You'' were famous throughout the hills, and his showmanship put Buffalo Bill to shame. His store was full of everything from gold pans to wagons for the early pioneers, and it was said that he could—and did—sell anything. Tom's store is gone now, and it will be missed.

Although part of our past, the Sweeney Building also was a vibrant part of our present. Seven businesses located in the building were lost in the Rapid City fire. They ranged from the State Barbershop, where Vern Johnson cut hair for 37 years, to the 1-week-old Blue Moon nightclub. No one is yet

sure how the fire started, but shortly after firefighters arrived to investigate reports of smoke, a broken window fed the fire with a sudden rush of oxygen. The result was a fiery explosion that shattered storefront windows and blew out the rear wall of the building, causing a rain of bricks to fall on Larry and Mike Blote, two owners of the building, and Pat Dobbs, a reporter for the Rapid City Journal. Thankfully, they had just minor injuries.

Soon after the explosion, Fire Chief Owen Hibbard made the difficult decision to retreat from the building. Few choices are more painful for firefighters. They are by nature people whose instincts urge them to save and preserve, and to fight a fire until the end. Yet as the flames of the Sweeney Building climbed higher and 40 mph winds blew cinders and sparks onto the roofs of neighboring buildings, Chief Hibbard recognized that the out-of-control blaze could destroy the entire block. Ordering his people back, he formed a defensive line around the fire and began the difficult work of containing it. Over the next 2 hours, with the sounds of exploding gunpowder and ammunition thundering from the burning First Stop Gun and Coin shop, the firefighters labored to cool nearby buildings and reduce the intensity of the blaze. By 4 p.m., the fire had been successfully contained, and dozens of homes and businesses that could have been destroyed were saved.

Mr. President, I commend the Rapid City Fire Department for their outstanding job containing this fire. It is due to their preplanning, training, and strong leadership that no one sustained serious injuries, despite dangerous circumstances ranging from backdraft explosions to ricocheting bullets. I also want to thank Mayor Jim Shaw for his calm and solid leadership throughout this crisis. The loss of the Sweeney Building has been difficult, especially for those men and women who lost their livelihood, but I am confident that, together, we will recover.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 7 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we are going to, this week, enter into one of the most serious debates that we will have all year, one of the matters that I think is the most serious that we will address all year, and that is the question of the budget. As a matter of fact, it is my understanding we will talk about two budgets. One will be the appropriations for the supplemental budget, designed to deal with disaster and other matters, but then the real budget for the year which will outline the spending for this country.

I think this is important, particularly important, because there is much more to it than arithmetic. It is not simply numbers. It is not simply what we will spend. I think it has to do with a number of things that are of particular significance. I hope that we give some consideration to these broader things as we talk about numbers, which we inevitably will do. One has to do with the size of the Government. It has to do with the potential and the opportunity to reduce the size of Government. I happen to believe that Government has become too large and that it could be smaller. It could be much more efficient. I suspect it would be more efficient if it were smaller. The budget is one of the ways that you do that.

Government by its nature does not get smaller unless somehow there is a restriction on the amount of money available. I think it also gets more efficient when there is less money to do the job, and it is similar to what has to be done in the private sector.

Second, it has, of course, to do with priorities. Each of us, as we spend our money, whether in business or personal and private family lives, have to set priorities. There is never enough money for everything. Certainly that is increasingly true with Government. So it is necessary to set priorities, to decide which of the many functions of Government are most important, which ones need to be financed, which ones need to be funded, which ones, indeed, could be reduced or eliminated.

Third, it has to do with taxing. It has to do with how much money we are going to allow families to keep, to spend for themselves. Average family spending for taxes now is nearly 40 percent, 40 percent of revenue from the family. It was just recently that we had tax day, so that everything we earned up until just a week or so ago all went for taxes.

The budget has to do with the potential, the possibility of reducing the burden on the families in this country. It has to do with the incentive for investment. Tax reduction is also an opportunity to have investments for people to put into their businesses, to create jobs, to strengthen the economy. There is a direct relationship, particularly in tax reductions such as capital gains which encourages people to invest.

The budget gives us an opportunity to keep Medicare and entitlements available.

I just met this morning with a great group of young people, high school people. We talked a little bit about entitlements. We talked specifically about Medicare. Frankly, all of them, 18 years old, said, ''We really do not think there will be any Medicare for us.'' Indeed, there will not be unless we make some changes. Budgets, of course, are where it is possible to do that.

Budgets also test our willingness to be financially responsible, to balance the budget and not spend more than we take in, which we have done for more than 30 years here in this Congress. I have to say I have not done it for 30 years because I have not been here for 30 years.

Finally, and related to that, of course, budgets determine what will we leave to our kids to pay in terms of budgets, in terms of debts. What we have done, of course, over the last few years, is we have spent more than we took in and put it on the old credit card, and it is maxed out. So we will determine how much of a debt we leave to our kids.

That is what we are talking about in terms of budgets. It will be difficult. It will be difficult. American voters, as someone said, and I think it is true, sent two teams to do the same thing, two teams with quite different philosophies. If everyone here had the same philosophy then we would have a certain kind of a budget. If everybody believed we ought to have smaller Government, we would have smaller Government. If everybody thought we ought to have more tax relief, we would have that, but everybody does not. There are two different points of view that will have to be reconciled before anything can be done.

So we approach a budget with, I think, a certain amount of reserve. Certainly this is not a breakthrough budget. This is not a turnaround. This is not a change, a sea change, I do not believe. I do not think it is designed for meaningful reduction in the size of Government or spending reductions. It is not dedicated to real honest-to-goodness tax relief.

Now, on the other hand, I think in fairness, and we will have to talk about it, it does provide some of the principles that most of us have talked about for some time. It probably comes closer, and I hope it does, to a real balance than any budget in recent history over a period of 5 years, a real balanced budget.

Now you have to keep in mind you can balance the budget in many ways. You can continue to increase taxes and increase revenue and balance the budget up here, when the real idea that most people want to balance the budget is down here, and reduce some of the spending.

Second, it provides some tax relief. We are told that there will be an opportunity on the floor for debate of tax relief. One will be $500 per child for family relief. That is good. Another would be some relief of capital gains taxes. That is good. It will help the economy. And in the short term, at least, it will increase revenues. Some reduction in estate taxes, I think, is good.

In my State of Wyoming, there are lots of family farmers, ranches, and

small businesses. People have worked all of their lives—and many times the lives of their forebears—to put together a business or a ranch or a farm, often with relatively little flow of cash but lots of assets. Under the present circumstances, that is taxed at nearly 50 percent. Many have to sell those assets in order to pay the taxes. That ought to be changed.

There will be some effort made at entitlement reform. That is good. It helps preserve Medicare for people who will be on it in the future. There has to be some changes made to do that. So it is a kind of a mixed bag, it seems to me.

There are some other items I would like to see changed. I would like to see some incentives to increase the capital gains so that there is incentive to invest in the economy.

I would like to see some real long-term meaningful changes in Medicare so that our kids will have a chance.

The President has sort of tinkered around the edges, and takes down the providers' cost a little here and there to avoid any real tough decision, but he is doing a little something. We have to make them. The sooner we make them, the less costly they will have to be. We need to allow families to keep more of their dough.

We need to be careful about balancing the budget and about making very optimistic projections in the future. Suddenly, there was $200 billion-plus because of the projections for the future.

We ought to make kind of a level projection, it seems to me. And then, if we are fortunate enough to have revenue growth, why not apply that to the debt? Wouldn't that be a nice idea? But no, we put that on so that we continue to spend and see the Government grow larger.

These are some of the things we will be grappling with this week. I think they are very difficult ones, and some things I hope we do regardless of what we do with the tax bill, regardless of what we do with the budget. I hope we move on past that to reform the tax system. The tax system needs to be changed.

People are increasingly complaining about the IRS. And I understand that. The tax issue is not going to change the IRS a great deal until you change the system that they have to enforce. We ought to do that.

This budget should not mean we are going to leave it as it is for 5 years. We need meaningful reductions in taxes.

We need a smaller Government. We need to change the situation so that the Government doesn't compete with the private sector in those things that the Government does that are commercial in nature. We ought to allow for contracting, and let private small businesses be able to compete to do things that the Government does that are basically commercial.

Mr. President, there is something else that I think we ought to do that would help us. We ought to have a biennial budget.

We spend almost all of our time with this budget. We started this thing just about this time in January when the Congress came in. We will be very fortunate if we are through by the middle of September or the 1st of October. And, as you know, Mr. President, it has been longer than that in the past.

It wouldn't take any longer to do it on a biennial basis. We could know those figures just as well. The agencies would have 2 years of knowing where their money is going to be. But, most important of all, we could have the budget one year and the next year do oversight. That is part of Congress' responsibility, to oversee the things that the Government is doing. We can accomplish a great deal, if we can do that.

So, Mr. President, I look forward to this week's debate and discussions. I am confident we will come out of it with something better than we have had.

Thank you for the time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, thank you.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1997

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to announce that in the last few days I have been working with Representative CANADY in the House, with Senator FRIST here in the Senate, and with the American Medical Association in trying to work out some changes to H.R. 1122, the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, which would satisfy some of the concerns that the board at the American Medical Association had with the legislation.

I am very pleased to report that we have been able to reach some technical changes with the legislation that has gained the support of the American Medical Association. I will read for the RECORD and insert into the RECORD a copy of a letter that was sent to me just a very short time ago from P. John Seward, M.D., executive vice president of the American Medical Association.

DEAR SENATOR SANTORUM: The American Medical Association (AMA) is writing to support HR 1122, ''The Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997,'' as amended. Although our general policy is to oppose legislation criminalizing medical practice or procedure, the AMA has supported such legislation where the procedure was narrowly defined and not medically indicated. HR 1122 now meets both those tests.

Our support of this legislation is based on three specific principles. First, the bill would allow a legitimiate exception where the life of the mother was endangered, thereby preserving the physician's judgment to take any medically necessary steps to save the life of the mother. Second, the bill would clearly define the prohibited procedure so that it is clear on the face of the legislation what act is to be banned. Finally, the bill would give any accused physician the right to have his or her conduct reviewed by the State Medical Board before a criminal trial commenced. In this manner, the bill would provide a formal role for valuable medical peer determination in any enforcement proceeding.

The AMA believes that with these changes, physicians will be on notice as to the exact nature of the prohibited conduct.

Thank you for the opportunity to work with you towards restricting a procedure we all agree is not good medicine.

Sincerely,

P. JOHN SEWARD, M.D.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, IL, May 19, 1997.

Hon. RICK SANTORUM,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SANTORUM: The American Medical Association (AMA) is writing to support HR 1122, ''The Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997,'' as amended. Although our general policy is to oppose legislation criminalizing medical practice or procedure, the AMA has supported such legislation where the procedure was narrowly defined and not medically indicated. HR 1122 now meets both those tests.

Our support of this legislation is based on three specific principles. First, the bill would allow a legitimiate exception where the life of the mother was endangered, thereby preserving the physician's judgment to take any medically necessary steps to save the life of the mother. Second, the bill would clearly define the prohibited procedure so that it is clear on the face of the legislation what act is to be banned. Finally, the bill would give any accused physician the right to have his or her conduct reviewed by the State Medical Board before a criminal trial commenced. In this manner, the bill would provide a formal role for valuable medical peer determination in any enforcement proceeding.

The AMA believes that with these changes, physicians will be on notice as to the exact nature of the prohibited conduct.

Thank you for the opportunity to work with you towards restricting a procedure we all agree is not good medicine.

Sincerely,

P. JOHN SEWARD, M.D.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, before I go into the details of the amendment, let me also enter into the RECORD a statement by Senator BILL FRIST.

I cannot emphasize enough how important he has been as the only physician here in the U.S. Senate in helping us in the debate here on the Senate floor and providing that expertise that is so necessary in these kinds of medical issues, and also in helping us work with the AMA to come up with some language that could garner their support.

I quote Senator FRIST's statement. He would have been here to announce this. But I understand we are going to be closing up shortly, and he is still on an airplane.

As the only physician in the Senate, I am proud of the American Medical Association's decision to support the ban on partial birth abortions. This is the strongest medical confirmation yet that this so-called medical

procedure, is brutal, inhumane, and medically unnecessary. As I said on the floor of the United States Senate, any provider who performs a partial birth abortion has violated the Hippocratic principle, ''First do no harm.''

The President has already been standing on shaky ground in his efforts to explain his intent to veto once again a ban of this grisly and unnecessary procedure. With these technical changes and the endorsement of the AMA, it's time for the President to do the right thing—it's time for him to sign this bill.

Mr. President, let me go through the changes that are in the bill that we are going to amend tomorrow morning. We hope to get unanimous consent to amend it. These are technical changes, and we believe that, irrespective of your position on the bill, these are changes that can be supported.

The first thing this bill does, as has been referred to, is to tighten up the language on what we mean by partial-birth abortion. There was some concern principally about a situation where the doctor would be delivering a baby with a normal delivery, but the baby would be delivered breech. And that happens on occasion. The baby is delivered in a breech position. The concern is that some complication may occur in the course of this breech delivery, and the doctor would be required, in order to save the mother's life, to perform some sort of procedure that would result in the killing of the baby.

Those are always very terrible situations. But the AMA was concerned that, because the definition was not specific enough from their reading, some zealous prosecutor could come out and accuse the doctor, who has not performed an abortion—does not intend to perform an abortion—but performed a normal delivery and, because of a complication, that somehow he or she could be covered under this act.

We have tightened up the language with mens rea, to use the legal term. That directs the mental state—as to what the doctor was doing when he was delivering the baby for the purpose of a live birth and is not doing an abortion.

So we tightened that language up substantially to satisfy that. That kind of situation would no longer be covered under the act. Frankly, I don't believe it is covered under the original act. But this makes it crystal clear that it is not covered under the act.

I think to the extent that we have made that clear and that it is positive to the extent that we have put in the requisite mens rea for a criminal statute, which arguably was somewhat vague in the original bill, we have now done that. We have tightened it up. This is a good, solid criminal statute as a result of that.

Second, as was discussed in the AMA letter, the State medical boards, we understand that if the doctor is going to be charged in doing one of those procedures, there is going to be medical evidence presented. The doctor and his team are going to present their medical experts, and the prosecutor will present their medical experts.

This gives us some medical expertise, if you will, that is not in either camp but gives us a peer review determination as to what they saw happen and what they believe happened. It will most likely result in as many people who agree with the physician as not. It is not something that we believe is a stacked deck one way or the other. We believe it is a legitimate peer review mechanism.

It is admissible in court but not determinative. It is simply medical evidence to be used should the prosecution continue with the case. We think that is important. It certainly is important for the professional standards that the AMA and other State medical associations would like to see in their profession.

So we have no problem with that. We believe it is legitimate medical evidence that would be otherwise included. So that is, again, a positive contribution to the legislation.

The other change is really the ultimate of technical changes that was surplus language in the life-of-the-mother exception where we said basically twice that it was the only procedure necessary. We said it twice. You don't need to say it twice. You just say necessary. It was the only procedure available that is necessary to save the life of mother. We don't say ''necessary'' twice. So we eliminated the surplus language.

Those are the three changes. They certainly do not go to the substance of the legislation. They are technical in nature. They are defined and solidifying in nature as a criminal statute and, I believe, a positive contribution.

I believe eventually, whether it is in the next few months as a result of this bill being passed and either signed by the President or having the President's veto overridden, that this bill will end up in court. Someone will challenge the constitutionality after this legislation.

My feeling is that this legislation not only has to be solid on the basis of abortion law, but also it has to be solid based on criminal law and how a criminal statute is drafted.

I think what we have done with these changes is improve the language as a criminal statute. I think that is very important, and I would hate to go through the entire legislative process and have the courts say, ''Well, on abortion law you are fine, but on criminal law you are too vague, and we are throwing it out for that.''

That would be a disconcerting result, one that I do not want to see and one that I believe is greatly reduced as a result of the changes that we hope to make tomorrow in this legislation, and which we will make tomorrow.

I have to say, finally, how excited I am that the AMA has stepped forward and supported this legislation.

This is the association that is the most preeminent association that oversees medicine in this country. As Dr. Seward said, partial-birth abortion is not good medicine. As Dr. C. Everett Koop said, it is not medically necessary for the life and health of the mother to do this procedure. This is a procedure that is a rogue procedure. It should be an outlawed procedure. We are attempting to outlaw this procedure because it just simply goes too far.

I am hopeful, with the support of the preeminent medical authority in this country, the American Medical Association, Members of this Senate will look long and hard now in these last few hours before the vote, which we are hoping to have scheduled tomorrow afternoon, they will look long and hard at the changes, at the evidence that now has been presented, the facts that have now been presented as a result of some of the admissions by the abortion industry as to what a partial-birth abortion is, when it is used, who it is used on, all of this new information that we have been presented in the Senate since the last vote a year ago, almost a year ago, and hopefully it is enough evidence and enough change in the statute that is being proposed, the bill that is being proposed, that we will get the requisite 67 votes.

I know there are a half a dozen or more Members who have still not publicly announced what their position is on this bill. That is more than enough votes for us to get it to the 67 we need to override the President's veto. I ask each and every Member who is not committed, and, frankly, I would ask those Members who are committed in light of the evidence that has been presented, in light of the changes that we have made in this legislation, in light of the AMA's strong endorsement and support for this legislation, to take another look. I know it is very difficult for Members on this issue to walk outside of their camp of support. If you are a pro-choice Member, it is very difficult to walk outside of that camp and venture away from those groups of abortion-rights supporters who have supported you in your election and who by and large agree. But it takes a lot of courage to look at your friends and tell them when they are wrong. The AMA supports legalized abortion, and they have been able to look at their friends and say in this case you are wrong; this is not an approved medical procedure and we should not have it legal in this country.

That took a lot of courage. I commend them for their courage. I just suggest that if the AMA can stand up to others in the medical community who believe abortion anytime, anywhere, under any procedure should be legal, they are willing to stand up to those within their ranks who hold that very extreme position, then I hope Members of this body who are not supposed to come here to argue extremist, irrational positions but here to represent what is in the best interests of this country will be able to look into the faces of the organizations that I know they seek support from on election day and with whom I know they

find themselves in agreement on most occasions, look at them and say, you have gone too far this time; we have to draw a line somewhere on this issue; it is not an absolute right for anyone at any point in time under any method to kill their children, that we have to have limits. Even Senator DASCHLE and, to some degree, although minor, Senators FEINSTEIN and BOXER have admitted there is some limit here as to what we can do, on what we should allow in the area of abortion.

The AMA and other professionals in the field have stood up and said this is the line to draw. I hope Members have the courage to stand up and say this is where we draw the line. I commend Members who have done that already. I commend them for their understanding that, frankly, this is less about abortion and more about infanticide; this is more about when we take a baby that is out of the womb, being born, outside of the mother and, frankly, gratuitously kill that baby. We have gone too far. There is no medical reason that a baby four-fifths delivered, everything outside of the mother with the exception of the head, there is no reason to perform a procedure on that baby that kills it at that point. There is no medical reason to protect the life or health of the mother ever to kill the baby at that point. In fact, it is more dangerous for the mother to insert instruments, to puncture bone by stabbing the baby at the base of the skull. That is dangerous to the health and life of the mother. It is obviously very dangerous to the baby.

That is not a safe procedure. You cannot argue that the baby sitting there in that position, that it is for the health of the mother to insert an instrument into the baby's skull. It is not. It can never be. So what we are saying is, whether it is partial-birth abortion or all length, give the baby a chance. Give the baby a chance.

There may be cases, and we understand that—folks who have gotten up and argued to ban this procedure have always recognized that there are situations in which the health and life of the mother are in danger and that separation of the child from the mother is necessary to protect the mother's health and life. But it is never necessary, certainly not by doing this barbaric procedure, to kill the baby in the process. You have a baby four-fifths born with a tiny head that is inches away from that first breath. Let the baby be born. Give it at least a chance to see if that baby can survive. Why do violence to that little baby? There is no medical reason. Why protect a procedure that does violence unnecessarily to little babies who otherwise would be born alive? They may not survive long. They may only survive minutes or hours. But give them the dignity of being born and brought into our human community. Give them the dignity of not having violence be the only thing they know of this Earth. Give them the dignity of life and memory as a part of our human family.

I am very hopeful that as a result of the endorsement of the AMA and other evidence that has come out, we can muster up the moral courage to say no to this procedure. I hope you can.

I hope that anyone who is in the sound of my voice will call, write, fax, E-mail, pray, send any kind of communication they possibly can to Members of the Senate who are going to be voting here tomorrow on this legislation asking that they now look at the evidence presented, look at the changes in the legislation, look at the evidence that has been presented and make the right decision for these children, make the right decision for our culture.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I appreciate so much the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I associate myself with everything he said, and I intend to speak on this subject tomorrow before we have the final vote. I trust that Members will give it great thought before they make their final decision because we are on the verge of making a determination that I think is very important to the future of this country.

THE QUADRENNIAL DEFENSE REVIEW

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, this evening I should like to take just a very few moments to report, along with my colleague from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, on the recently released Quadrennial Defense Review. It was released today by the Secretary of Defense. It is the culmination of a very extensive process at the Department of Defense over the shape and makeup, the characterization and the implementation of our Armed Forces for the next several years.

We are at a unique point in our history, particularly as it relates to defense issues. We have come through a period of time when our strategy was primarily based on the threat from another superpower—the Soviet Union—a nuclear threat that required an extraordinary commitment of resources, of manpower, of effort to try to contain and to try to nullify that threat. With the fall of the Berlin Wall, with the fall of the Soviet Union, with the realignment that has taken place with the United States emerging as the one superpower in the world, we may have the luxury of looking at our defense structure, of making decisions and beginning a process of fashioning our defense forces for the threats of the future and not the threats of the past.

It is important to recognize, as Secretary Cohen has and as acknowledged in this Quadrennial Defense Review which was just released today, this is not a status quo situation. We have made extraordinary strides in terms of reshaping our forces from perhaps what was the peak of our defense effort in 1985, a very, very substantial decline in the number of active duty forces and the percentage of our budget and percentage of our gross national product that is devoted to defense. In the process, much of the framework that puts us in a position to make decisions in the future has at least been initiated, and the QDR, Quadrennial Defense Review, encompasses a lot of that thinking.

Because so often in the Congress we receive the conclusion of the analysis of the Department of Defense after all the decisionmaking process has been conducted and after the options have been evaluated, we do not have those same resources here in the Congress to ask the appropriate questions and get the full view of where we think we ought to go with our national defense policy. So Senator LIEBERMAN and I, along with others, in last year's authorization bill created a National Defense Panel consisting of outside experts in military affairs, who had a lifetime of experience, who could give us through this process a second look, a second opinion. I am pleased that they were able to have access to the process, the thinking process and the decisionmaking process that was undertaken in the Department of Defense on the QDR. They will now undertake a very thorough and very complete analysis of this QDR and report back to Congress. We have their preliminary report. They will report back to Congress no later than December 15 of this year giving us their view of current threats and future threats the United States might face, the strategy that we ought to employ to address those threats, as well as how we ought to implement that particular strategy and how we pay for it.

So we are looking forward at a process, and I have described this process in some detail because I do not want Members to think that this is the final chapter in the book. This really is the initial chapter in the decisionmaking process that has to be undertaken by the Congress and the administration over the next several months, if not several years, as we look into the next century and try to define the national defense strategy and the force to implement that particular strategy.

I will say this: I think the Secretary of Defense and the people who have undertaken this effort, the QDR, have done this in good faith. I think they have asked the tough questions. They have evaluated the various options. They will admit that this is an initial stage of the process and not the final chapter. They will indicate that there is more to come. There are more decisions to be made.

But I also say to my colleagues, a lot of the burden and responsibility also falls on us. The Department of Defense has presented its viewpoint of where we are going in the future, but we are the ones who have to ultimately make the decision as to whether to ratify what they have said, modify what they have

said, or reject what they have said and come up with our own alternatives. There are issues in the QDR Report to which a lot of Members, various Members, are going to say: ''wait a minute, that gets a little too close to home.'' We are talking about two more rounds of base closings. We have reduced our force structure more than a third since 1985, and yet we have reduced our infrastructure, our bases which support that force structure, by only approximately one-half of the amount that we reduced manpower. There is infrastructure that is excessive, and we are looking at a very difficult decision, in terms of how to go ahead and continue to advance the process of closing bases, of scaling back infrastructure, because every dollar spent on a facility or a support function that does not go to support our forces takes resources away from more pressing needs. To simply preserve excess infrastructure because it happens to be in a particular State or particular Member's district, or to preserve it because we were not able to come to a conclusion about closing it results in dollars staying in infrastructure that take away dollars from the very badly needed modernization of our forces, from research and technology, and from support for our active duty forces in terms of their readiness and deployment, et cetera.

So we have to recognize that the decisions that will be made here, whether it is streamlining the Department of Defense, whether it is consolidating or streamlining various defense and support agencies, which is recommended here—I wish the QDR provided recommendations in more detail, but it is recommended here nonetheless—whether it is closing bases, and even decisions on modernization will be made in this Chamber, will be made by these Members, and they will not be easy decisions.

We all recognize, I think, that one of the most important actions we can take, as this report says, is make decisions about modernizing our forces and investing in research and development of new technology. Whether this relates to platforms like tactical air for the Air Force and the Navy, ships for the Navy, land forces for the Army and Marines, or new technology to advance the way they do their business, all of that requires resources. And all of that will have to be done with offsets, because we pretty much have a static budget line. Without an external threat that we can foresee right now and without a major conflict, we are going to be at a pretty level funding appropriation for the next several years. If that is the case, then, if we want to retain the forces readiness, if we want to retain our current forces capability to deal with the threats as we see them, and if we want to restructure and modernize the force, we are going to have to provide them with the resources, and the only place we can get the resources is from existing expenditures.

This report takes us some of the way down that road. I am a little disappointed in the QDR in that it did not more specifically outline how we can go about particularly restructuring the base closing procedure, how we can restructure some of the defense or support agencies, how we can restructure the Reserve and the National Guard to better complement our active duty; but also to define, in some sense, different roles for them in that process, how we could go forward in making the decisions on modernization, what the different options are, and so forth.

I think there are several questions that Congress is going to have to address. I just mentioned modernization. Commitment to modernization, yes, but where do we put that money? What research? What new technologies? What new military platforms—ships, planes, et cetera—should we select? And how many of those should we buy?

These are critical decisions. It is not enough just to say we need to increase our modernization budget. It is where we put those dollars that will be critical to define the military of the future, and how we address these questions about the role of the Guard and Reserve and the reductions in defense infrastructure, which I mentioned earlier. I am disappointed we did not address the medical care issue in the QDR. Clearly, how we provide medical care for our active duty servicemembers and their family members, Reserve forces and others such is a major cost item in the defense budget. That needs to be addressed in the future.

Missile defense, how we allocate funds to missile defense, the Secretary says we have a shortfall in research and development funds for a National Missile Defense System and we need to shift a substantial amount of money, up to $2 billion, into that particular account—where does that money come from? That is not identified.

These are all issues which the Congress is going to have to grapple with in the next several months. Beyond that, we need to ensure that, in our thinking, we realize this is the beginning and not the end of the process. We need to look to outside sources like the National Defense Panel to give us guidance in terms of what the proper questions are: How we look at the scenarios in the future that will require a defense structure to address those challenges; how we devise the right kind of strategy to meet the threats; how we build in the flexibility—because we do not know what all those threats are going to be—how we build in the flexibility to have our forces able to adapt to those threats of the future; how we avoid making critical mistakes in resource allocation that prohibit us from having that flexibility in the future; how we go about implementing all of this and how we come up with the resources to address it.

So there are many, many questions still outstanding. It is an ongoing process. I look forward to working with my colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN of Connecticut, as we explore this, as well as my other colleagues, both on the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee, as well as our colleagues here in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank my friend and colleague and, on matters of defense, my partner, Senator COATS from Indiana.

Mr. President, I want to add a few words to those spoken by my colleague about the Quadrennial Defense Review, which was released by Secretary of Defense Cohen earlier today. It has been my pleasure to work with the Senator from Indiana, as well as with our colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator MCCAIN, Senator ROBB, Senator KEMPTHORNE, Senator LEVIN, and many others in a bipartisan effort that led to legislation requiring the Quadrennial Defense Review and the National Defense Panel.

Our intent in sponsoring this legislation, was to drive the defense debate to a strategy-based assessment of our future military requirements and capabilities, not to do a budget-driven incremental massage of the status quo.

We were motivated by two factors in calling for this over-the-horizon review of our defense needs. First, we did not want this to be just another annual report on what our defense needs are. Second, we wanted to force the Pentagon to look beyond the short range and to understand that many of us inside and outside of Congress believe that the decisions we are making today will affect our ability to protect our national security 10 to 20 years out.

From my first review of the Quadrennial Defense Review I would say while the report issued today does not live up to the high expectations I had for it, it is a step forward in the process that Senator COATS has just described. If we want to make defense decisions effectively, we have to consider two dramatic changes that have occurred in our world, which are influencing our defense needs. One is the dramatic and ongoing change in the post-cold-war world; second is the extraordinary change in technology, the transition we have made from an industrial age to an information age, which inevitably will affect the way wars are fought.

Even before it was released, the Quadrennial Defense Review achieved, I think, an important part of our goal by catalyzing a broad and vigorous debate within the Pentagon which engaged more people who considered more options than either of the previous two post-cold-war security assessments done in the Bush administration and then in the first year of the Clinton administration. The reviewing process began, also, to stimulate similar debate outside of the Pentagon and outside of Congress. I believe that all those involved in the Pentagon effort

have done well by debating the controversial questions and in making recommendations they believed were essential, even though some of those did not, in my opinion, go far enough and were not bold enough, and even though some of them are recommendations that will be controversial here in Congress.

I want to particularly draw attention to significant steps forward that are made in the QDR in three critical areas.

First, I believe the QDR has developed a much more comprehensive view of our strategic future military environment than we had from the two previous studies; that is, the way in which the national security environment, will be affected by unconventional threats to our security, including, of course, terrorism and chemical and biological warfare, but also including the capacity of an enemy to strike at us in what the military calls an asymmetrical way, that is, to find our vulnerability, invest much less than we spend on our military, and then to strike at that vulnerability.

Second, I think the QDR has taken some significant steps forward in beginning to deal with management improvements within the Pentagon and in confronting the need for some reductions in manpower and some reductions in acquisition of high-visibility procurement programs and in recommending, as Senator COATS has indicated, two additional rounds of BRAC, of the base closure process. To put it mildly, that will not be popular on Capitol Hill. And, yet, the more you look at the reductions that have already occurred in the size of our military forces and the extent to which we have reduced tooth but not reduced tail, it is hard to conclude that, in the interest of our national security, we do not need to further reduce military infrastructure.

Third, although I would criticize the QDR for being more budget driven than strategy driven, the Pentagon has presented some conclusions about reducing forces that they assume can help bring the defense program more closely and realistically in line with the fiscal assumptions that they are operating under.

Nevertheless, why do I say the report, as I looked at it this afternoon, does not live up to my own hopes for it? I find it to be too much of a status-quo document. While it is true we have reduced personnel and force structure significantly since the close of the cold war, the shape and focus of our military remains substantially what it was then. This report represents, as others have said, essentially a ''salami-slicing'' approach. It is not a dramatic change, nor does it seem to point to future dramatic changes to deal with increased workload for our military forces to respond to the much more complicated geopolitical situation nor to changes in technology, which have created a revolution in military affairs.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, the report was more budget driven than strategy driven. Perhaps that is understandable for the Pentagon has to live within the constraints we impose, but I must say, Senator COATS and I and the others did not introduce legislation which called for this Quadrennial Defense Review as a way to cut the defense budget. That might be a result, but a future-oriented review might just as logically lead to an increase in the defense budget, depending on what a strategic review of the world determines that our future defense needs will be. In fact, as you look at the more comprehensive strategic review of the future of the military environment that is in this QDR, it argues for additional capacity to that which the report continues to advocate: Which is the capacity to meet two major regional threats, a series of additional requirements, including terrorism, chemical and biological warfare, missile defense, and peacekeeping. Yet, I don't see the connection between what I think is the more accurately described complicated strategic future we have and the programs the report advocates to meet that future.

The report is not strategy driven. It continues to require that the military be structured to deal with two major regional conflicts but its assessment of the strategic environment raises questions about whether that is an appropriate standard, particularly since one of those conflicts presumably would be on the Korean Peninsula against North Korea, a state that many question will constitute a threat to security very much longer. So, as we look 10 to 20 years out, will our major threat in Asia be on the Korean Peninsula, or will it come from another great power or midsize power that has gained nuclear capability and can disrupt the entire region?

The report makes no recommendations for change to the organization of the current force and only minor changes to the size of that force. As I have indicated, some weapons-purchasing programs were reduced, but no major programs have been canceled. Perhaps even more important, from my own point of view, as we look forward, no new programs were recommended to deal with the extraordinary range of threats and responsibilities that are described in the strategic review part of the report. The explosion in technology could literally and totally change the way enemies will fight us and what weapons they will employ, while at the same time creating enormous opportunities for us, if we wisely and boldly use technology, to fundamentally improve our military capability to defend our interests perhaps in a much more cost-effective way.

I also was disappointed that the report did not deal with the further implementation of the Goldwater-Nichols legislation, which I think most observers would say has not fully achieved its goals for more jointness. The fact is, too much of what happens in the Pentagon and our military still happens in the stovepipes of the four services. We do not see enough cooperation across service lines—joint training, for instance—to either achieve the dollar savings or the increases in fighting effectiveness that many observers think will come from increased jointness.

Mr. President, a final word. There is a brief reference to space and the role space may play in future warfare. Remember, we are talking about 10 to 20 years from now. It is hard to imagine as we see the world depend more and more on space-based satellites that our future enemies will not rely on a wide range of space-based capabilities to fight us. It seems to me this suggests a very, very urgent need for us to consider the implications of that for our future military preparedness, including very controversial questions, which I think we have to consider in the responsible exercise of our duties, whether we should proceed with what might be called the weaponization of space, and what we should do to develop capacity to defend against attacks on us from space.

In summary, I feel strongly that we need to act more boldly and broadly now. We need to stop doing business as usual now so we can better respond to the challenges of the future, and that goes not just for those in the Pentagon, but also for those of us in Congress, because the decisions that we are making today will commit enormous national resources and determine the military forces we will have for decades.

The fact is that the extraordinary victory we achieved in the gulf war was the result not only of the extraordinary military leadership we had and the extraordinary bravery and skill of our troops on the ground, in the air, on the water, but it also was the result of decisions and investments made in the seventies in military technology that came online and were available to be used in the early 1990's in the gulf war.

We have to think, as we make the decisions we do committing hundreds of billions of dollars to defense programs, whether these are the programs we will need 10 and 20 years from now. The fact is, if we choose unwisely and a future opponent chooses more wisely, we may well be jeopardizing not only the lives of our soldiers, but also the lives of our children and our grandchildren. When we discover that, we will have precious little time and perhaps not the resources to fix our mistakes.

So in those ways, I find the QDR to be lacking, but Senator COATS and our cosponsors anticipated this and believed it would be the first step in a dynamic process. I hope that is the way in which the QDR, will be seen—as a first step, an important one—in a series of steps to determine what our future military needs will be. It does, in fact, provide a sound base from which this critical discussion can proceed.

I think Secretary Cohen himself has recognized this is only the beginning—

it is the end of the beginning, not the beginning of the end—not only in what he specifically said, but in the fact that last week he announced the appointment of a task force which will now go the next step, particularly in considering reform of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

We all have high hopes for the independent National Defense Panel, that was created as part of our legislation, to go further and create clear alternatives and to begin to identify the critical unanswered questions that we are left with after reading the QDR. Then, as Senator COATS has said, it will be up to those of us in Congress and to those in the White House and the administration to absorb the recommendations of the QDR we received today; then of the National Defense Panel which will be presented to us in December; and then to push boldly against the status quo.

Our responsibility may require us to make difficult decisions about the weapons we buy and where our forces will be based and how they will be structured so that tomorrow's American military will be ready to meet the security threats of the next century in the most cost-effective and technologically dominant way.

The point is this: Some people will say, ''QDR says it all, we're doing well, our security is clear. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.'' Of course, we agree our security is strong today and it ain't broke today, but if we don't fix it, it will be broke 10 or 20 years from now, and we will not have fulfilled the fullest measure of our responsibility under the Constitution to provide for and protect the common defense.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. COATS. If the Senator will yield.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I certainly agree with my colleague—we worked on this together—that this QDR report doesn't meet all of our expectations. We wanted a more visionary document. We wanted some bolder challenges, at least a broader definition of what the future might look like and what options we would have to address it, because the point is that we are at such a critical decisionmaking point, in terms of allocation of resources, that we need that look into the future in order to try to make the decisions that will give us the flexibility and the resources to address those future threats.

The real concern here is that we stay locked into, not necessarily a status quo proposal, but one that closely resembles the current state of affairs within the military, and that we will, on that basis, make decisions that will preclude us from having the resources to make different decisions in the future or to address different threats in the future. That, again, is the reason why we wanted a national defense panel, outside evaluators and experts, to give us some guidance on that.

While that Panel's report will not be available to support us in this year's decisionmaking process for the fiscal 1998 budget, it will be available for us next year. So I hope we can keep that in mind when we are allocating these resources and making these decisions.

Second, I say to my friend from Connecticut that, while many of our colleagues, and many individuals, will criticize this QDR as a status quo document, my guess is it will be extraordinarily difficult to convince them that they ought to adopt even half of the proposals of this status quo document because it will affect bases that are located in their State, it will affect defense contractors that manufacture defense products in their State, and so on.

Each of us has our favorite service, I suppose, perhaps one we served in. We try to be objective in that, but, you know: ''I was a marine, and therefore, we're not taking one person away from the Marines,'' or, ''I served in the Navy, and we can't take ships down.'' ''They build ships in my district; therefore, I can't support any changes in shipbuilding.'' And on and on and on it goes. We have that fight every year.

So my guess is that, if we can implement half of what is here, it would be a pretty extraordinary step for Congress.

Now, what is the point? The point is that we cannot just always blame the Department of Defense for not being bold enough, challenging enough, visionary enough when we ourselves are not willing to take some of those steps. So it is going to require several things: one, some good outside evaluation and expert help for us to even ask the right questions in order to arrive at the right decisions; and, second, some bold initiatives and some courage on our part in order to enact and effect some of these decisions.

The Senator from Connecticut talked about a different kind of threat, driven by technology, that we are just now beginning to understand. We probably are not looking at the massed formation type of standoff, a mass army versus mass army threat that we have looked at in the past. We are looking at technology which can give our adversaries advantages that perhaps we have not even thought of and capability we have not even thought of; but yet also offer us great promise in terms of defense capabilities to counter those threats if we can anticipate them coming our way in the future.

So there is a lot of work to do. I guess the caution here is that we allow ourselves to get outside the normal pattern of how we make decisions and how we appropriate funds for defense, to think beyond the next election cycle, to think into the next century, to be willing to take bold steps in either saying no or in saying yes to decisions that will have tremendous future implications for this Nation.

What does that mean? That means that we have to have an open mind, we have to see this as a process and not as a fixed point for which decisions made today will necessarily be those decisions which will be implemented tomorrow. We have to retain that flexibility as we understand how to develop a national defense strategy for the future.

It has been said that no major changes in military affairs in history have ever occurred except after a crushing defeat. We had a stunning victory in Operation Desert Storm. I think a lot of that was accomplished because of the lessons we learned in Vietnam, the changes that were consequently made. Yet, for us now to rest on that success and pretty much indicate that we are not willing to make major changes would condemn us to the lessons of history; we cannot simply strengthen and retain the capabilities of our last success, but we must fully understand and prepare for the potential of our next war. We want to avoid preparing for the past.

That is going to take some bold thinking. That is going to take some stepping outside the box to take some challenging questions about current assumptions and the current status quo as we look out in the future. I think we have started that process.

I want to commend my friend from Connecticut for all the effort that he has put into this and our other colleagues who have been involved in setting up our National Defense Panel and working with the Department of Defense, working with the new Secretary, who I think is committed and pledged to do this very thing.

I thank the Senator for his time.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank my friend from Indiana for his comments, which I agree with totally.

Part of what we are saying—I echo him—is the world is changing so dramatically that we must make sure that our national security structure changes as well. There is not a company doing business in America today the way it did 5 or 10 years ago, let alone 30, 40, or 50 years ago. What strikes me as so stunning is that the companies that are doing best today are looking ahead 3, 4, 5, 10 years forward to figure out how they are going to need to change to make sure they are still on top. There are limits to that comparison, but that is what we are trying to do with our national security structure.

We are, in a sense, being the burrs under the saddle here because we are riding tall in the saddle right now as a country. We are very strong. But history tells us that unless you look forward and change with the times, particularly to begin to absorb the full measure of technological change in your military plans, then you are not going to be riding securely for very long.

Just to echo a final point, a very important one, when we drafted this legislation, Senators COATS, MCCAIN, ROBB, KEMPTHORNE, LEVIN, and others,

and I had in mind that it was not just the Pentagon—as big and bureaucratic, although very effective, an institution as it is—that needed an outside push; it was Congress, it was us because we are as prone to ride along with the successful status quo and not take the painful looks out over the horizon, particularly if they affect us, as some of these changes may.

So this is the first step. It is an ongoing process. I feel even more strongly that legislation was correct in calling for an independent panel, a national defense panel. And ultimately it will be up to the Armed Services Committees, the Appropriations Committees, and all the Members of both Houses to have the guts to make the tough decisions today that will guarantee that America is strong and secure tomorrow and a lot of tomorrows forward into the 21st century.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:01 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1385. An act to consolidate, coordinate, and improve employment, training, literacy, and vocational rehabilitation programs in the United States, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1385. An act to consolidate, coordinate, and improve employment, training, literacy, and vocational rehabilitation programs in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–1872. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, case number 94–05; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–1873. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, case number 96–08; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–1874. A communication from the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Depeartment of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the Master Plan for Science, Mathematics, and Engineering Education for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1875. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, the notice concerning a retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1876. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, the notice concerning a retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1877. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, the notice concerning a retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1878. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the notice concerning a retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1879. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice relative to live fire testing of the V–22 Osprey aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1880. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule relative to the list of entities of proliferation concern, (RIN0694–AB60) received on May 12, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1881. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule relative to expansion of short-form registration, (RIN 3235–AG82) received on May 9, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1882. A communication from the Acting President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report on tied aid credits; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1883. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for 1996; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1884. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, two rules relative to Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, received on March 25, 1997; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1885. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the U.S. Uranium Industry for calendar year 1995; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1886. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on matters contained in the Helium Act for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1887. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the biennial report on the Quality of Water, Colorado River Basin, Progress Report No. 18; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1888. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Royalty Management Program, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the intention to make refunds of offshore lease revenues where a refund or recoupment is appropriate; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1889. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior (Land and Minerals Management), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a notice on leasing systems; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1890. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, two rules relative to Arkansas and North Dakota, received on April 23, 1997; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1891. A communication from the Chairperson of the Klamath River Compact Commission, transmitting, a report relative to Congressional authorization to implement a management plan; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1892. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1893. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Notice 97–28, received on May 6, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1894. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Announcement 97–52, received on May 12, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1895. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to Revenue Ruling 97–20, received on April 23, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1896. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to Revenue Ruling 97–22, received on May 1, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1897. A communication from the National Director, Tax Form and Publications Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of rule relative to private printing of substitute forms W–2 and W–3, (Rev-Proc. 97–24) received on April 24, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1898. A communication from the National Director, Tax Form and Publications Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of rule relative to Medical Savings Accounts, (Rev-Proc. 97–25) received on May 6, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1899. A communication from the Chief of the Regulation Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to Revenue Procedure 97–27, received in May 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1900. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Public Debt, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule relative to United States Savings Bonds, received on May 1, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1901. A communication from the Assistant Commissioner (for Examination) of the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, two

rules relative to the mining industry, received on May 6, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1902. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Public Debt, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a rule relative to Treasury Bills, received on May 12, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1903. A communication from the Chairman of the Social Insurance Committee of the American Academy of Actuaries, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual reports of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplemental Medical Insurance Trust Fund calendar year 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1904. A communication from the Chairman of the Social Insurance Committee of the American Academy of Actuaries, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds for calendar year 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1905. A communication from the Administrator of the Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Rural Health Care Transition Grant Program for 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1907. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Officer of the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of rule relative to the Earning Test, (RIN0960–AE60) received on April 22, 1997; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1908. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the certification of a proposed issuance of an export license; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1909. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the certification of a proposed approval of a manufacturing license agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1910. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the certification of a proposed issuance of an export license; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1911. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the certification of a proposed approval of a manufacturing license agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1912. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the certification of a proposed issuance of an export license; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1913. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to the semi-annual report on program activities for facilitation of weapons destruction and non-proliferation in the Former Soviet Union; to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1914. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals dated March 1, 1997; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on the Budget, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, to the Committee on Armed Services, to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to the Committee on Finance, to the Committee on Foreign Relations, to the Committee on Governmental Affairs, and to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1915. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to accredited veterinarians, received on May 7, 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1916. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to pork products from Mexico, received on May 7, 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1917. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to pork products from Mexico, received on May 7, 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1918. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to pork products, received on May 14, 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1919. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to cotton, received on May 12, 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1920. A communication from the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to tobacco, received on May 7, 1997; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1921. A communication from the General Sales Manager of the Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule relative to commercial export programs, received on May 12, 1996; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1931. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, case number 93–11; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–1932. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, notices relative to retirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELMS (for himself, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 763. A bill to amend the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 to require a local educational agency that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to expel a student determined to be in possession of an illegal drug, or illegal drug paraphernalia, on school property, in addition to expelling a student determined to be in possession of a gun; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 764. A bill to reauthorize the mass transit programs of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. Con. Res. 27. An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002; from the Committee on the Budget; placed on the calendar.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HELMS (for himself, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 763. A bill to amend the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 to require a local educational agency that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to expel a student determined to be in possession of an illegal drug, or illegal drug paraphernalia, on school property, in addition to expelling a student determined to be in possession of a gun; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I have just presented a bill to the clerk, S. 763, the goal of which is to strike a decisive blow in the war against drugs by protecting America's schoolchildren from the scourge of drugs in their classrooms.

Before anyone says, ''Here we go again,'' I counsel all to consider the differences between this bill and anything which was enacted before.

Incidentally, I am honored to be joined in the sponsorship of this measure by several distinguished Senators—Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. SESSIONS.

Specifically, this legislation will require each school accepting Federal education funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to adopt a zero tolerance policy regarding illegal drugs and illegal drug paraphernalia in schools. Zero tolerance means what it sounds like. It requires the expulsion, for not less than 1 year, of any student who possesses this contraband at school. This will send a clear message to students, parents, and teachers: Drugs and schools do not mix.

Illegal drug use is, in my judgment, the most insidious and destructive influence in our country today. Its cost to society, in terms of crime and wasted lives, is enormous. Just think of the innocent babies born already addicted

to drugs; think of the families destroyed because fathers, mothers, or children care more about where they will get their next fix than they do their loved ones; think of the neighborhoods that have been devastated by swaggering drug dealers peddling poison. These terrible things are going on right in the shadow of this Capitol in which the U.S. Senate operates.

Mr. President, Americans have heard these tragic stories so often that some citizens have questioned the wisdom of waging war against drugs. Last fall, California and Arizona voters took the unprecedented step of legalizing the so-called medicinal use of drugs, such as marijuana, heroin, and LSD, and in an outrageous decision reported recently, a Federal judge in San Francisco, Judge Fern Smith, ruled that the Federal Government cannot impose sanctions on doctors who recommend marijuana to their patients, despite the fact that such use remains illegal under Federal law.

Is it not time to say enough is enough? Is it not time to go all out in the drug war? Mr. President, the answers to these questions are obvious: It is time and we must do it. It is time to take every possible step to reverse this retreat from responsibility, and eliminating drugs from America's classrooms is the imperative, inescapable first step.

Anybody wondering if this bill is needed should take a look at the results of the latest ''Monitoring the Future'' [MTF] study of drug use among America's 8th-, 10th-, and 12th-graders and ''The National Household Survey on Drug Abuse'' study which measures drug use among the general population. Both studies dramatically confirm what many of us have known: We have lost ground in the war against drugs over the past 4 years. Most disturbing is the shocking increase in illicit drug use by our school-age children.

The findings in the ''Monitoring the Future'' study are eye-opening: 50 percent of 12th-graders have used illicit drugs during their lifetime; about 25 percent have used drugs during the past 30 days; almost one-third of 8th-graders have used illegal drugs during their lifetime; with about 15 percent of 8th-graders using it in the last 30 days. Marijuana use among 8th- and 10th-graders almost tripled from 1992 to 1996, while 5 percent of 12th-grade marijuana users are daily users.

But perhaps the most distressing finding is that the youngest students surveyed, our 8th-graders, report the highest rate of heroin use. Moreover, the percentage of actual drug use may be even greater than reported, because the MTF does not survey school dropouts. Instead, it relies solely on student self-reporting.

Similarly, ''The National Household Survey on Drug Abuse'' found startling increases in drug use among teenagers over the last 4 years. For example, the survey found that teen cocaine use increased 166 percent in 1 year, 1994–95; teen use of LSD and other hallucinogens skyrocketed 183 percent from 1992 to 1995; and the use of marijuana among teenagers soared 141 percent over the same period.

So, Mr. President, it is no coincidence that drug use among our children has skyrocketed. Drug dealers deliberately target our young people to be both consumers and distributors of illicit drugs because our children are our most precious and vulnerable resource. As a result, students report that drugs are now the No. 1 problem they face, far outdistancing any other concern. That, by the way, was the finding of a recent survey conducted by the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University. And what an alarming conclusion it was, that it is our students who are on the front lines of the war against drugs.

Today, students of all ages have immediate access to a wide variety of drugs that are cheaper and more powerful than those of the past. According to the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, 69 percent of 17-year-olds report going to schools where students keep, use, and sell drugs. Here in the Nation's Capital authorities have closed unsafe schools for fire code violations, yet thousands of children still attend drug-infested schools. Billions of dollars spent on schools will accomplish little, Mr. President, if we do not first ensure that our children are safe there.

The relationship between violence and drug use is clear. The most recent national Parents' Resource Institute for Drug Education [PRIDE] survey found that students who carried guns to school were 20 times more likely to use cocaine than those who did not bring a gun to school. Gang members were 12 times more likely to use cocaine, and students who threaten others were 6 times more likely to be coke users.

The findings of a recent Department of Education report prepared by the Research Triangle Institute, in my home State of North Carolina, confirmed the findings of the PRIDE study. The Research Triangle Institute, found—and I quote—''[t]he use of drugs was related to violent behavior in schools. A much larger percentage of current users of alcohol and/or other drugs (32 percent of them) reported being involved in school fights as the aggressors than did current nonusers (14 percent of those students) or students who had never tried drugs (6 percent).''

Mr. President, that report went on to say that 37 percent of the students reported that they are afraid of attacks at school while 29 percent said they feared attacks when traveling to and from school. And, sadly, we must acknowledge that those fears are too often justifiable.

According to the North Carolina Center for the Prevention of School Violence, over 8,100 incidents of school violence were reported in North Carolina during the last full school year. Possession of a controlled substance, possession of a weapon other than a firearm, and assault on a school employee together accounted for 85 percent of those incidents. That study concluded: ''[t]he high number of reported weapon possessions may be reflective of student concern for their own safety, even in schools, since the most often cited reason for carrying weapons * * * is 'protection'.''

Parents and Government have a duty to do everything we can to protect children from the ravages of illegal drugs and the crimes spawned by the drug trade. Up until now—I think we ought to be frank with each other and acknowledge that we have failed miserably. It is not enough to prohibit students from taking guns to school if we do not address the reasons why they do so.

Mr. President, Congress addressed the issue of school violence in 1994 with the passage of the Gun-Free Schools Act, which required States to adopt a law mandating the expulsion of any student who brings a gun to school.

During debate on that bill, it was argued that we should state, as a matter of policy, that children should not bring guns to school. In my opinion, the Senate should also state, as a matter of policy, that drugs have no place in school. That is why I am offering today S. 763, a bill which I believe to be a logical and commonsense extension of the 1994 law.

Like that act, the bill sponsored by myself and several other Senators conditions the receipt of Federal education dollars, that is to say, Federal funds, on a State's adoption of a policy requiring the expulsion, for not less than one year, of any student who brings illegal drugs to school. Now, like the Gun-Free Schools Act, this bill does not create a new criminal offense, but it does require schools to refer violators to proper law enforcement authorities.

Both the 1994 act and the bill I am introducing today are flexible. Each bill allows the chief administrative officer of a school district to grant an exemption on a case-by-case basis, and permits, but does not require, school districts to establish alternative education facilities for violators.

So I think the policy is firm, yet fair. The drug trade and the violence associated with it have no place in America's classrooms. Schools should provide an environment that is conducive to learning and supportive of the vast majority of students who are in school to learn. Children and teachers alike deserve a school free of the fear and violence caused by drugs.

Mr. President, on the issue of drugs, many speeches have been made citing respected authorities and a lot of impressive statistics as I have done today. However, nothing any Senator has said on this floor speaks quite as eloquently of our responsibilities as the statement of one of the students

involved in the Research Triangle Institute study who said—and get this, I say to the Chair and other Senators—this student said, ''I don't like how dangerous it is at this school. I just wish the teachers and the rest of the school staff would have better control over their students and keep kids like me safe.''

Isn't it time for us to give the teachers and school administrators the support they need to remove violence and drug offenders from our schools? I think the answer to that is obvious.

Therefore, Mr. President, the removal of drugs and violence from our schools surely are goals that everybody agrees with. The President, during his State of the Union Address, said that ''we must continue to promote order and discipline'' in America's schools by, as he put it, ''remov[ing] disruptive students from the classroom, and hav[ing] zero tolerance for guns and drugs in school.''

Obviously, I think the President was right on that one. I do not always agree with him, but you can't get any clearer than that. I commend him for that statement, and I hope he will support this effort by several of us who are concerned about the safety of our youngsters. I believe that working together, we can eliminate illegal drugs and illegal drug paraphernalia from America's classrooms.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the complete text of the aforementioned bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 763

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SAFE SCHOOLS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Part F of title XIV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''PART F—ILLEGAL DRUG AND GUN POSSESSION

''SEC. 14601. DRUG-FREE AND GUN-FREE REQUIREMENTS.

''(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the 'Safe Schools Act of 1997'.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State receiving Federal funds under this Act shall have in effect a State law requiring local educational agencies to expel from school for a period of not less than one year a student who is determined—

''(A) to be in possession of an illegal drug, or illegal drug paraphernalia, on school property under the jurisdiction of, or on a vehicle operated by an employee or agent of, a local educational agency in that State; or

''(B) to have brought a weapon to a school under the jurisdiction of a local educational agency in that State,

except that such State law shall allow the chief administering officer of such local educational agency to modify such expulsion requirement for a student on a case-by-case basis.

''(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to prevent a State from allowing a local educational agency that has expelled a student from such a student's regular school setting from providing educational services to such student in an alternative setting.

''(3) DEFINITION.—For the purpose of this section, the term 'weapon' means a firearm as such term is defined in section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code.

''(c) SPECIAL RULE.—The provisions of this section shall be construed in a manner consistent with the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

''(d) REPORT TO STATE.—Each local educational agency requesting assistance from the State educational agency that is to be provided from funds made available to the State under this Act shall provide to the State, in the application requesting such assistance—

''(1) an assurance that such local educational agency is in compliance with the State law required by subsection (b); and

''(2) a description of the circumstances surrounding any expulsions imposed under the State law required by subsection (b), including—

''(A) the name of the school concerned;

''(B) the number of students expelled from such school; and

''(C) the type of illegal drugs, illegal drug paraphernalia, or weapons concerned.

''(e) REPORTING.—Each State shall report the information described in subsection (d) to the Secretary on an annual basis.

''(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Two years after the date of enactment of the Safe Schools Act of 1997, the Secretary shall report to Congress with respect to any State that is not in compliance with the requirements of this part.

''SEC. 14602. POLICY REGARDING CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM REFERRAL.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—No funds shall be made available under this Act to any local educational agency unless such agency has a policy requiring referral to the criminal justice or juvenile delinquency system of any student who is in possession of an illegal drug, or illegal drug paraphernalia, on school property under the jurisdiction of, or on a vehicle operated by an employee or agent of, such agency, or who brings a firearm or weapon to a school served by such agency.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this section, the terms 'firearm' and 'school' have the same meaning given to such terms by section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code.

''SEC. 14603. DATA AND POLICY DISSEMINATION UNDER IDEA.

''The Secretary shall—

''(1) widely disseminate the policy of the Department in effect on the date of enactment of the Safe Schools Act of 1997 with respect to disciplining children with disabilities;

''(2) collect data on the incidence of children with disabilities (as such term is defined in section 602(a)(1) of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401(a)(1))) possessing illegal drugs, or illegal drug paraphernalia, on school property under the jurisdiction of, or on a vehicle operated by an employee or agent of, a local educational agency, engaging in life threatening behavior at school, or bringing weapons to schools; and

''(3) submit a report to Congress not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Safe Schools Act of 1997 analyzing the strengths and problems with the current approaches regarding disciplining children with disabilities.

''SEC. 14604. DEFINITIONS.

''In this part:

''(1) ILLEGAL DRUG.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'illegal drug' means a controlled substance, as defined in section 102(6) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(6)), the possession of which is unlawful under such Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) or the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.).

''(B) EXCLUSION.—The term 'illegal drug' does not mean a controlled substance used pursuant to a valid prescription or as authorized by law.

''(2) ILLEGAL DRUG PARAPHERNALIA.—The term 'illegal drug paraphernalia' means drug paraphernalia, as defined in section 422 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 863), except that the first sentence of section 422(d) of such Act shall be applied by inserting 'or under the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.)' before the period.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act take effect 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I urge my fellow Members of the Senate to support the legislation being introduced today by my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Senator HELMS—the Safe Schools Act of 1997.

Urgent calls for more and more Federal money for schools to pay for everything from school construction to Internet access are misplaced. I would argue they are misplaced in any case, because decisions about how a school district should allocate its resources are better left at the local and State level. But they are certainly misplaced without a primary commitment to reducing school violence.

Students cannot learn effectively unless they feel safe. It was hard enough to learn in the days when I was in school with the normal distractions—the occasional spitball or gum-smacking student. Now some students worry about whether they will even survive to graduate from high school.

My colleagues have noted the results of several studies which confirm the very strong correlation between school violence and illegal drug use. And we already know the cost illegal drugs have exacted in terms of ruined lives and the breakdown of families. Yet in the past year we have seen two States, California and Arizona, pass laws to legalize the so-called medicinal use of drugs like marijuana, heroin, and LSD. That is why I introduced the Drug Use Prevention Act to impose strict penalties on doctors who prescribe marijuana. As my colleague has noted, a San Francisco Federal judge has recently overruled such penalties. But that particular debate is far from over yet.

Many Americans have concluded that the ground lost in recent years in the war on drugs is not recoverable, that the war is lost. I disagree. Too much is at stake to simply surrender the fight, especially when it comes to providing a safe environment for students in public schools. At the very least, schools should not receive Federal funds unless they refuse to tolerate the presence of drugs as well as firearms on school property.

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. SANTORUM and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 764. A bill to reauthorize the mass transit programs of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Finance.

THE MASS TRANSIT AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1997

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to introduce legislation that would reauthorize and expand upon existing Federal mass transit programs. My legislation, the Mass Transit Amendments Act of 1997, is intended to lay the groundwork for the Senate's consideration of mass transit legislation in the context of reauthorizing the 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA]. Substantial increases in Federal spending on mass transit are warranted, notwithstanding current budget constraints, because a greater commitment to public transportation is in the national interest. I would note, however, that this legislation is an authorization bill which does not increase the deficit; funds authorized to be spent out of the mass transit account of the highway trust fund would still be subject to the annual appropriations process, which is subject to the discretionary spending caps set in the budget resolution and the 602(b) allocation process.

Transit should not be viewed as a partisan issue or a regional issue. This bill recognizes the valuable role transit plays in reducing our energy dependence, protecting our environment, reducing gridlock, and providing access to jobs, schools, and health care facilities for millions of Americans in urban and rural areas throughout the Nation. In particular, I urge my colleagues to review my proposed reverse commute pilot program, which would authorize $250 million annually in new grants targeted at improving access to employment for residents in economically distressed urban areas and rural communities.

This bill is intended to encourage the Banking Committee, led by Chairman ALFONSE D'AMATO and Senator PAUL SARBANES, to report to the Senate legislation which will preserve much of the ISTEA transit program but at increased funding levels which reflect the importance of mass transit to our economy, quality of life, and environment. I look forward to working with Senator D'AMATO, Senator SARBANES, and others on the Banking Committee and Appropriations Committee who want to improve the Nation's transit systems through the ISTEA reauthorization process.

This legislation takes into account the transit industry consensus proposal put forth by the American Public Transit Association (APTA), which represents transit systems, large and small, in all 50 States. I am pleased to note that APTA's new president is Bill Millar, whom I had the pleasure of working with for a number of years when he was the executive director of the Port Authority of Allegheny County.

In preparation for the ISTEA reauthorization process and the annual appropriations process, I have met with many individuals in an effort to learn more about the needs of transit systems, the towns and cities in which they operate, and the riders they are trying to serve. In recent months, I have discussed strategies to increase transit funding with Gov. Tom Ridge, Senator RICK SANTORUM, and Chairman BUD SHUSTER. In addition, I have visited with Jack Leary, the general manager of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA), Mayor Tom McGroarty of Wilkes-Barre, and representatives of the Pennsylvania Public Transportation Association. I have also met with transit system officials during my regular visits to Pennsylvania's 67 counties.

I am particularly pleased to be introducing this bill with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, RICK SANTORUM, who has joined with me regularly to increase support for public transportation, such as when we unsuccessfully offered an amendment to the fiscal year 1996 Transportation appropriations bill to restore $40 million in Federal operating assistance. Both Senator SANTORUM and Gov. Tom Ridge recognize the vital role mass transit plays in Pennsylvania and have worked with me to maximize the Federal resources available to urban and rural transit systems in our State.

I am also pleased that Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG has joined in this bipartisan effort. For two years, Senator LAUTENBERG has joined me in cochairing an informal Senate transit coalition, which has served as an information clearinghouse for Senate transit supporters and their staffs and which will play an even greater role, I hope, during the reauthorization process.

For some time, I have addressed an ongoing threat to our Nation's security and prosperity, a threat with dual roots—in the precarious Middle East and right here at home. As I stated in a speech on the Senate floor on January 30, 1997, I am very concerned by our nation's increased reliance on potentially unstable foreign sources of oil and believe it is critical that during the 105th Congress, we focus on increasing energy conservation.

I have been troubled that United States imports of foreign oil continue to increase from the current 50-percent level, with 20 percent of our purchases coming from the Arab countries of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries [OPEC]. According to the American Petroleum Institute, we import more than 9 million barrels per day, with a 6-percent increase in 1996 alone. This is a huge jump from the 6 million barrels imported per day in 1973. Further, if these trends continue, analysts say in ten years we will look overseas for two-thirds of our energy needs.

In part because of the ready availability of less expensive sources of foreign oil, it has not been cost-effective for U.S. energy companies to increase domestic production. Further, the effectiveness of the strategic petroleum reserve has dwindled because it only holds an amount comparable to 75 days of foreign imports, a situation that was not helped by the Clinton administration's decision last year to sell off approximately 25 million barrels of petroleum from the reserve to generate revenues.

The timing for selling our reserves was less than prudent, particularly considering the state of affairs in the Middle East today. Saudi Arabia, in particular, poses unique cause for concern. If a hostile nation seized Saudi oil wells, the largest reserve in the world, the American economy and world markets could tumble. The deplorable June 25, 1996, terrorist attack at the Khobar Towers facility in Dharhan, which resulted in the murders of 19 airmen and the wounding of more than 400 United States personnel, also gives cause for concern because there is a strong possibility of links to internal domestic struggles in Saudi Arabia. Pressure is mounting from politically activist and conservative Islamic movements to undermine the ruling monarchy, who are viewed by some to be too liberal and western. If American access to Persian Gulf oil cannot be guaranteed, then the United States must reduce its dependence on foreign oil.

While reducing our dependence on foreign oil is a difficult task, we can achieve meaningful reductions in energy consumption by promoting the use of public transportation. On the significant link between energy consumption and our transportation infrastructure, a Department of Transportation study of the 50 largest urban areas in the United States suggests that nearly 4 billion gallons of gasoline a year are wasted due to traffic congestion—approximately 94 million barrels of oil. There is much at stake, for the annual economic loss to businesses in the United States caused by traffic congestion is estimated at $40 billion by the Federal Transit Administration.

Mass transit has developed to include traditional bus and subway lines, commuter rail, cable cars, monorails, water taxis, and several other modes of shared transportation. Public transportation is a lifeline for millions of Americans and deserves substantial funding for that reason alone. However, it deserves even greater funding when one considers that public transportation saves 1.5 billion gallons of fuel consumption annually in the United States and that each commuter who switches from driving alone to using public transportation saves 200 gallons of gasoline per year, according to government and private studies.

Transit also does much to protect our environment. For example, on May 12, I visited the site of the proposed Frankford Intermodal Center in Philadelphia, which will be built on the site of the existing Bridge-Pratt terminal. At present, the terminal serves 40,000 El passengers daily, translating into

17,600 fewer cars on the road each day and mitigating the release of 16,500 pounds of pollutants into the city's air. The new facility is expected to attract new ridership, taking more cars off the streets and reducing pollution even further. But, without increases in transit capital assistance programs, projects such as the Frankford Center will be difficult to get off the drawing boards.

There are ample other reasons to increase our commitment to transit funding. In our States, citizens and communities depend on good public transportation for mobility, access to jobs, environmental control, and economic stability. Public transportation lets the elderly visit their health care providers, shops, or friends. In rural areas, buses are essential to reduce isolation and ensure economic development. Also, children use public transportation to go to school. Without affordable mass transit, people in America's inner cities can't get to work. Under the welfare reform law enacted last year, there are expectations that most individuals receiving welfare benefits will find gainful employment. If they can't afford to get to work, or bus routes are cut, we are just making it that much harder for them to get off welfare. It should also be noted that millions of Americans have jobs in the transit industry, operating and maintaining buses and subways, manufacturing vehicles, and constructing new facilities.

I am troubled that some have proposed freezing Federal transit spending around $4.4 billion. Transit systems depend to a great degree on Federal assistance in order to remain viable. A survey by my staff of 18 Pennsylvania transit operators shows that they receive an average of 26.7 percent of their total operating and capital funding from the Federal Transit Administration. In addition, SEPTA receives 15 percent of its overall funding from the Federal Government—55 percent of its capital funds—and the Port Authority of Allegheny County receives 32.9 percent from FTA. Reductions in Federal operating and capital support cannot necessarily be made up by local sources. Further, if the systems must cut routes, increase fares, and let their facilities fall into disrepair, they will lose the critical mass of riders needed to sustain operation. The Department of Transportation has calculated that $13 billion in annual transit capital spending is needed just to preserve current conditions—$7 billion more than current capital expenditures—demonstrating the great need to increase, rather than freeze, Federal support.

Responding to this need, my legislation includes several provisions to strengthen our transit systems and enable them to respond to our society's growing need for efficient and affordable public transportation.

First, the bill reauthorizes transit programs for 5 years at a total of $34.4 billion through fiscal year 2002. For fiscal year 1997, total transit appropriations are $4.3 billion. Under my bill, the fiscal year 1998 authorization would be $6.5 billion and this figure would be adjusted up for inflation through fiscal year 2002. The authorization is based on calculations of available gasoline tax receipts in the mass transit account of the highway trust fund, considering past surpluses and the additional revenue stream that would be created by diverting a portion of the 4.3 cent per gallon gas tax increase from 1993 into this account. While the $6.5 billion figure may seem substantial to some, I would note that Congress enacted in ISTEA in 1991 a $7.45 billion authorization for fiscal year 1997 in recognition of the importance of investing in public transportation. We have been remiss in not meeting the ISTEA authorization levels. We must do better under its successor legislation.

Under my proposal, discretionary capital grants for new starts, rail modernization, bus acquisitions, and bus facility construction would rise from the current $1.9 billion to $2.5 billion in fiscal year 1998. Formula capital grants would rise from current $2.2 billion to $3.5 billion in fiscal year 1998, meaning more funds for urbanized areas, rural areas, and elderly and disabled program needs. My legislation also preserves operating assistance within the formula program for all areas, unlike pending proposals to eliminate it in fiscal year 1998.

The bill's truth in taxation provision redistributes the 4.3 cent per gallon gasoline tax which is currently going to deficit reduction in the following manner: 0.76 cents to the mass transit account of highway trust fund, 0.5 cents to a new intercity passenger rail trust fund that would serve as a dedicated source of revenue for Amtrak and is identical to the legislation introduced by Senator ROTH (S. 436), and the remaining 3.04 cents to the highway trust fund. I have long argued that gas tax receipts should be used for the transportation infrastructure purposes for which the tax was enacted and that to do otherwise is comparable to the crime of fraudulent conversion, which I used to prosecute as District Attorney in Philadelphia. When people pay Federal taxes at the gas station, they are under the impression that their funds will be used to improve highways and roads and other forms of transportation infrastructure. Accordingly, it is time to redirect the 1993 gas tax increase to its traditional purposes.

As I noted earlier, a new proposal for a reverse commute pilot program is also included in my bill. In order to stimulate economic development and help individuals in both urban and rural areas obtain meaningful employment and job training, the bill authorizes a new $250 million per year discretionary grant program for the Secretary of Transportation to provide funds to States, local governments, and transit systems for pilot projects providing access to suburban jobs and job training to residents of distressed urban areas with a population of over 50,000 and for pilot projects involving access to employment in rural areas as well. Funding uses could include, but are not limited to, grants to employers to purchase/lease a van or bus dedicated to shuttling employees from inner cities to suburban workplaces. Grants could also fund additional reverse commute bus routes or commuter rail operations. Such grants are intended to serve as seed money that will generate self-sustaining commute options for years to come. 954 distressed urban areas currently meet the definition contained in the bill.

This program would not come at the expense of transit core formula and discretionary programs. The reverse commute pilot program would be a separate program and as a member of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, given the importance of helping increase mobility for Americans seeking good jobs, I would urge my colleagues to fund it above and beyond the traditional formula and discretionary grant programs, for which there is already a great need for funds.

My legislation also includes several technical program changes that will benefit transit systems of all sizes. My bill would allow the use of capital grants for maintenance of capital assets, such as buses, subways, which is currently not allowed. It would allow the smallest urban and rural transit systems complete flexibility between use of capital and operating assistance for various needs. It would also allow transit systems that sell capital assets—bought in part with Federal funds—to keep the proceeds and reinvest in new capital assets, rather than returning some small share of the proceeds to the Federal Transit Administration. This is intended to stimulate acquisitions of new equipment and vehicles by such systems.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to consider supporting this authorizing legislation, which would spend out funds accumlating in the mass transit account of the highway trust fund, subject to the appropriations process and not in a manner that increases the deficit. I hope that this bill will stimulate debate in the Senate on the need to increase our commitment to mass transit and I look forward to the opportunity to work with the Banking Committee and the Appropriations Committee in the coming months.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a brief summary of the bill and four letters in support of the Mass Transit Amendments Act of 1997 from Mr. William W. Millar, president of the American Public Transit Association, Mr. Armando V. Greco of the Lehigh and Northampton Transportation Authority, Mr. Paul Skoutelas, executive director of the Port Authority of Allegheny County, and Mr. Sonny Hall, international president of the Transport Workers Union of America.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF MASS TRANSIT AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1997

1. Reauthorizes transit programs for five years at a total of $34.4 billion through FY 2002

FY97 total transit spending: $4.3 billion appropriated (FY97 authorization $7.45 billion) Proposed FY98 authorization: $6.5 billion (adjust up for inflation through FY2002)

Discretionary capital grants up from current $1.9 billion to $2.5 billion in FY98

Formula capital grants up from current $2.2 billion to $3.5 billion in FY98, meaning more funds for urbanized areas, rural areas, and elderly and disabled program needs

Preserves operating assistance within formula program for all areas

Continues funding for transit planning and research

2. ''Truth in Taxation'' provision redistributes the 4.3 cent/gallon gasoline tax which is currently going to deficit reduction in the following manner:

0.76 cents to Mass Transit Account of Highway Trust Fund

0.5 cents to a new Intercity Passenger Rail trust fund (identical to Roth Amtrak bill S. 436)

3.04 cents to Highway Trust Fund

3. ''Reverse Commute Pilot Program''—In order to stimulate economic development and help individuals in both urban and rural areas obtain meaningful employment and job training, the bill authorizes a new $250 million/year discretionary grant program for the Secretary of Transportation to provide funds to States, local governments, transit systems, and private non-profit organizations for pilot projects providing access to suburban jobs and job training to residents of distressed urban areas with a population of over 50,000 and for pilot projects involving access to employment in rural areas as well. Funding uses could include, but are not limited to, grants to employers to purchase/lease a van or bus dedicated to shuttling employees from inner cities to suburban workplaces. Grants could also fund additional reverse commute bus routes or commuter rail operations. 954 ''distressed urban areas'' currently meet the definition contained in the bill. Grants will be made where they are coordinated with local transportation and human resource services.

4. Technical program changes that will benefit transit systems of all sizes—

Allows use of capital grants for maintenance of capital assets (such as buses, subways) which is currently not allowed.

Allows smallest urban and rural transit systems complete flexibility between use of capital and operating assistance for various needs.

Allows transit systems that sell capital assets (bought in part with federal funds) to keep the proceeds and reinvest in new capital assets.

Amends list of factors to be considered by Metropolitan Planning Organizations to include the transportation requirements of a strategy to revitalize the Nation's inner cities by creating new employment, job training, housing, mobility, and other economic development given the importance of helping increase mobility for Americans seeking good jobs.

AMERICAN PUBLIC TRANSIT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 13, 1997.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: On behalf of the American Public Transit Association (APTA), I want to thank you for introducing the Mass Transit Amendments Act of 1997, a bill to reauthorize the federal transit program. APTA strongly supports the Mass Transit Amendments Act of 1997. The bill would build on the success of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and increase investment in the nation's transit infrastructure.

Adequate investment in the nation's transit infrastructure is essential to a healthy economy; the movement of people, services, and goods; access to health care, education, and jobs. The Mass Transit Amendments Act would increase investment in the federal transit program providing $34.4 billion for transit program over five years.

Your proposal also recommends a number of substantial and innovative changes to current law which we strongly support. It permits a wide range of maintenance activities to be funded with capital funds and grants small urbanized areas the authority to use formula funding for capital or operating expenses. The bill recommends the use of the 4.3 cents fuels tax that now goes to deficit reduction for transportation purposes, including intercity passenger rail and proposes a number of changes aimed at making program delivery more efficient. We are pleased to note that many of the provisions of your bill are consistent with APTA's ISTEA reauthorization proposal, which has been endorsed by our membership.

The Mass Transit Amendments Act will help us address the nation's transit needs, and you can count on APTA's membership to support this important legislation.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM W. MILLAR,
President.

PORT AUTHORITY OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY,
Pittsburgh, PA, May 19, 1997.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: I am writing to express my strong appreciation for your leadership in developing legislation to reauthorize federal programs supporting public transportation. The $6.5 billion annual funding level for transit proposed in your legislation recognizes the need for additional reinvestment and expansion in our public transportation infrastructure. Your legislation also recognizes the importance of continuing the strong federal-state-local partnership that has been so successful in funding public transportation.

Public transportation is a vital component of economic development strategies in Allegheny County. The capital investment programs outlined in your bill recognize this important relationship. Providing access to jobs is another area of fundamental importance to our economic systems. Your legislation addresses this in your innovative welfare to work program and in other policy initiatives. Still another priority is the need for transit providers to have the flexibility of using funds in accordance with the needs they know best. Again, your legislation establishes this important new direction in the federal program.

On a typical weekday over 250,000 riders use Port Authority to travel to and from their jobs, to shop, to worship, to go to school, or to pursue other social and professional needs. Public transportation provides daily mobility to the millions who use it for its convenience, cost savings, and to those who have no alternative means of transportation.

We are grateful to you, your cosponsors Senator Santorum and Senator Lautenberg, and your Senate colleagues who have stepped forward as advocates for national transportation policies fostering mobility and balanced transportation alternatives. I look forward to working with you as this legislation is considered in the coming months.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL P. SKOUTELAS,
Executive Director.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, NY, April 21, 1997.

Hon ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: I am writing to congratulate you on the introduction of the Mass Transit Amendments Act of 1997. The Transport Workers Union strongly supports this legislation because it increases the money available for mass transit and preserves crucial 13(c) protections for our members. We also commend you for the provisions in the bill which allow use of capital grants for maintenance of capital assets—an idea the TWU has supported for many years.

The TWU is grateful that you have again stepped forward to support mass transit and mass transit workers. We hope that the progressive concepts in your legislation will be enacted and we will do all we can to assist you in achieving that result.

Sincerely,

SONNY HALL,
International President.

LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON, TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY,
Allentown, PA.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: For the Lehigh and Northampton Transportation Authority, I extend a thank you for the time you afforded us during our recent visit to Washington. Your continued support for Pennsylvania public transportation is very much appreciated.

As part of the visit you shared with us the draft of the Mass Transit Amendments Act of 1997 and requested comments. Several items are listed below for your consideration, but I must begin by noted our general concurrence and support for the program changes and funding levels proposed. LANTA and the PA transit industry is prepared to support your legislative effort.

The items for change are as follows:

1. The reverse commute program should permit rural pilot projects as well as urban.

2. The population threshold for distressed urban areas should be set at 50,000.

Both of these changes are based on experiences LANTA has encountered in the communities adjacent to the Lehigh Valley. Access to employment is a problem found in all communities without regard to size.

Again, thank you. We look forward to working with you as ISTEA moves through the reauthorization process.

Sincerely,

ARMANDO V. GRECO,
Executive Director.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 2

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for American families, and for other purposes.

S. 102

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 102, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve Medicare treatment and education for beneficiaries with diabetes by providing coverage of diabetes outpatient self-management training services and uniform coverage of blood-testing strips for individuals with diabetes.

S. 222

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 222, a bill to establish an advisory commission to provide advice and recommendations on the creation of an integrated, coordinated Federal policy designed to prepare for and respond to serious drought emergencies.

S. 358

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] were added as cosponsors of S. 358, a bill to provide for compassionate payments with regard to individuals with blood-clotting disorders, such as hemophilia, who contracted human immunodeficiency virus due to contaminated blood products, and for other purposes.

S. 387

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] were added as cosponsors of S. 387, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide equity to exports of software.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make certain changes to hospice care under the Medicare program.

SENATE RESOLUTION 76

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 76, a resolution proclaiming a nationwide moment of remembrance, to be observed on Memorial Day, May 26, 1997, in order to appropriately honor American patriots lost in the pursuit of peace and liberty around the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 85

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 85, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that individuals affected by breast cancer should not be alone in their fight against the disease.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee to meet on Tuesday, May 20, at 4 p.m. for a markup on the following agenda:

LEGISLATION

S. 261, the Biennial Budgeting and Appropriations Act.

S. 207, the Corporate Subsidy Reform Commission Act of 1997.

S. 307, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the transfer to States of surplus personal property for donation to nonprofit providers of assistance to impoverished families and individuals, and for other purposes.

H.R. 680, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the transfer of surplus personal property to States for donation to nonprofit providers of necessaries to impoverished families and individuals, and to authorize the transfer of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions and instrumentalities of States, and nonprofit organizations for providing housing or housing assistance for low-income individuals or families.

NOMINATIONS

David J. Barram, to be Administrator, General Services Administration.

Kenneth M. Mead, to be inspector general, Department of Transportation. (Sequential referral with Commerce Committee).

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Wednesday, June 11, 1997, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is oversight of the State side of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Kelly Johnson at (202) 224–3329.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO MEET

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be permitted to meet on May 19, 1997, at 2 p.m. for the purpose of a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL

• Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, today I rise to proudly acknowledge the contribution that my home State of Minnesota made to the recently dedicated memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

On May 2, 1997, over 6,000 people joined President Clinton beside the tidal basin midway between the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials to dedicate a memorial to our Nation's 32d President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As those present at the dedication walked among the granite walls, waterfalls, and bronze sculptures, they were witnessing a piece of history which Minnesota's own Cold Spring Granite Co. helped make possible.

Minnesota's role in the Roosevelt Memorial began in 1975 when designer Lawrence Halprin chose Cold Spring Granite for the walls and floor of the memorial. Located just south of the Granite City of St. Cloud in central Minnesota, Cold Spring Granite Co. provided the more than 6,000 tons of granite that adorns the memorial.

Started in 1898 by Henry N. Alexander, the Cold Spring Granite Co. has grown into one of the world's largest granite quarrying and fabrication operations. Today the Cold Spring Granite Co. is headed by Patrick D. Alexander, the grandson of Henry Alexander, who oversees a company of over 1,400 employees with five fabrication facilities and 28 quarries located throughout North America.

Mr. President, the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial is expected to draw as many as 2 million visitors each year. I am pleased that those who visit this site will see not only a memorial to one of our Nation's most remembered Presidents, but also a testament to the hard work and patriotism of the men and women of Minnesota, particularly the dedicated employees of the Cold Spring Granite Co.•

DEATH OF JEFFREY J. DYE

• Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to observe the untimely death late last month of my former Senate staff member, Jeffrey J. Dye, the young executive director of the Tennessee Democratic Party, and the only son of Dennis and Janell Dye.

After serving less than 2 months in his new position, and reportedly meeting every challenge that this difficult job had to offer, Jeff was struck down in the very prime of life, at 27, by an epileptic seizure.

It was a tragedy to his family, his friends, and the party he served with such fire and dedication.

Jeff's passing has a very personal impact, Mr. President, because he worked for me for 2½ years, first as a research assistant and later as a legislative correspondent, until he obtained a coveted

position with the Democratic Legislative Campaign Committee [DLCC] last July.

As a Senate staffer, Jeff displayed the thirst for knowledge and eagerness to serve that characterizes many idealistic youth who come to Washington, He fulfilled his duties capably and supported me and my legislative staff in my Senate responsibilities. He gave much, Mr. President, and he learned much about the duties and responsibilities of public service.

But it was clear from the start that Jeff chafed to do more. His endless interest in the political drama of our times, coupled with his youthful energy, finally turned him to the arena that he truly was born for: electoral politics, the art and science of political campaigning.

Never was there an operative so constitutionally fitted for the rock and roll of modern, media-age politics as he. Jeff loved the ups and downs of elections, the eat-or-be eaten nature of the democratic process, whether in the form of a Presidential campaign or a race for the local school board. He had a Texas-size appetite where these things applied.

But Jeff was not merely interested in the process. He was driven by a real concern for the people of our country. He had a passion to help ordinary Americans, and an abiding confidence in the ability, and indeed the obligation, of government to help the less fortunate. That is why he worked long hours, well into the evenings, to learn more about the political profession.

Indeed, Jeff had a personal vision, one that he shared with some of my staff. He hoped to use the Internet as a communication tool for campaigns. His idea was to establish a multicandidate, multiparty bulletin board on the Internet for campaign literature and party platforms. Through this means, he hoped that everyone might have access to the information they needed to make better decisions about candidates and campaigns. Campaigns would thus be fairer and more informed.

So when Jeff left my office last July to take up a position with the DLCC, the organization within the national Democratic Party that focuses on electing Democrats to State legislatures, I felt the loss of his departure but understood that he was going forward in the right direction. And when I heard that his success at the DLCC led to a position with the Tennessee Democratic Party, I knew he had found his dream.

Jeff's unexpected death the third Monday in April was thus double tragic, for in addition to his youth, he seemingly had at last found a position that exactly meshed with his temperament, interests, and abilities. His opportunities appeared boundless.

But if Jeff was taken from us just as he appeared to be fully engaged in life, we must remember that he died doing that which he truly loved. How many of us can say the same?

Mr. President, Jeff's years among us were far too few, but let us take comfort in the knowledge that he lived them fully. May his parents and loved ones take solace in his bright memory.●

TRIBUTE TO DOROTHY CALLAGHAN, NEW HAMPSHIRE'S MOTHER OF THE YEAR

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President. I rise today to pay tribute to Mrs. Dorothy McGettigan Callaghan of Rochester, NH, for receiving New Hampshire's Mother of the Year Award.

Dorothy has strengthened her family with pride, dedication, and love, always putting the interests of her children first. She was raised with eight brothers and sisters, on a large farm in Wilton. Dorothy received her B.A. and her master of education degrees from Keene State College in Keene, NH. She has taught school in Rochester for 27 years and coached many youth sport teams. She is an active member of local school committees. Dorothy is also a eucharistic minister and has been honored as Rochester's Citizen of the Year and Teacher of the Year.

Her courageous fight against leukemia has created more volunteer opportunities, including Daffodil Days for the Cancer Society, the Jimmy Fund Marathon for the Dana Farber Cancer Institute, as well as making bandannas for cancer patients. She has turned a personal battle into a way to help others in unfortunate situations

Dorothy was chosen for her contributions and dedication to her community and family in accordance with the national mission of American Mothers, Inc. Dorothy is the mother of seven children and grandmother of six grandchildren. She has been married 33 years to Frank Callaghan. .

I commend Dorothy Callaghan for her long career of excellence as a mother and as a teacher who believes that children are individuals and should be treated that way. New Hampshire is fortunate to be blessed by her leadership and dedication. I applaud Dorothy Callaghan for her outstanding work with the children of New Hampshire and am proud to represent her in the U.S. Senate. Congratulations Dorothy.●

THE SECURE PUBLIC NETWORKS ACT

● Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, over the last several weeks, I have been meeting with colleagues about the need to aggressively pursue legislation to facilitate the creation of secure public networks for communication, commerce, education, research, telemedicine, and Government. There is an urgent need to enact legislation this year which can advance the creation of new networks and balance America's compelling interests in commerce and security.

Secure networks are critical for the protection of personal privacy and the promotion of commerce on the Internet and other interactive computer systems.

The Congress has been gridlocked for more than a year in a debate about the Nation's export policy for encryption software. I believe that meaningful compromise can be found on this issue which can clear the way for the consideration of broader legislation which fosters the creation of secure networks.

If we are successful, a powerhouse of economic activity and opportunity can be unleashed.

Senators BURNS and LEAHY as well as Congressman GOODLATTE have introduced legislation which identifies a real problem with the current law on the export of encryption software. Thanks to their leadership, there is a growing consensus that reform is needed. In many ways, the introduction of their legislation has already motivated meaningful changes in the administration's policy on software exports. Yet, even with those changes, the underlying law needs to be changed and a broader agenda for secure networks needs to be adopted.

What must happen in a relatively quick fashion is an agreement on a bipartisan, bicameral process to enact secure network legislation which includes a solution to the encryption export riddle. Our goal should be to enact legislation which the President can sign by October 1, 1997.

The ability to use strong encryption is an important element in creating secure networks. Through encryption, messages are encoded and decoded. Encryption protects privacy and security. The American people need to know that their communications are safe and that the most private, confidential personal information can be confidentially communicated on computer networks.

Encryption however, poses some very serious problems for law enforcement and national security which cannot be ignored. The challenge is to promote the use of encryption in a manner that does not unduly compromise national security or public safety and does not unnecessarily burden industry.

What needs to be created is an electronic environment which gives users total confidence in the security of commercial transactions and personal communications. To do so, a largely private infrastructure must be developed to provide for authentication of messages, keys, and digital signatures and when necessary, the recovery of keys.

As the largest purchaser of computer software and hardware, the Federal Government can create important incentives to help the market swiftly respond to this need.

I see three big interests at stake—network commerce, network government, and network security. First, the need to facilitate commerce, both in advancing America's leading position as an exporter of software and in the

promotion of commerce on the Internet, grows in importance every day. Second, there is the civic interest of Government. The American people should be able to have secure access to their Government, for the resolution of problems, the communication of ideas and access to services via electronic networks. Third, there is a security interest of law enforcement and national defense. Defensively, that interest is to protect citizens from foreign or criminal violations of privacy. Offensively, there needs to be a means fully consistent with our Constitution for discreet access to communications. That digital access should be no more or less expansive than exists in the nondigital world.

Mr. President, there needs to be a commitment to a process for resolving a host of issues. First and foremost what is needed is a commitment by the leadership of this Congress to work together in good faith to find a resolution that can be signed into law by the President.

I have proposed a discussion outline for compromise. If there can be agreement on principle and process, I am confident good faith negotiations between all interested parties can meet the ambitious goal of new legislation before the end of this session of Congress. This outline is meant to spark discussion and facilitate compromise on some very challenging issues. It is by no means etched in stone and I welcome suggestions for improvement and additions.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the Secure Public Networks Act discussion outline be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

THE SECURE PUBLIC NETWORK ACT DISCUSSION POINTS

PURPOSE

To encourage and facilitate the creation of secure public networks for communication, commerce, education, research, tele-medicine and government.

A. DOMESTIC USES OF ENCRYPTION

(1) Lawful Use of Encryption: Domestic use of encryption for any lawful purpose shall be permitted. No mandatory third party key escrow system for domestic encryption.

(2) Unlawful Use of Encryption: Penalty for the use of encryption technology in the furtherance of a crime—5 years or fine for 1st offense, and 10 years or fine for 2nd offense.

(3) Privacy Protection:

Penalties for:

(a) Unauthorized use of keys, authentication or identity;

(b) Unauthorized breaking of another's encryption codes;

(c) Theft of intellectual property on line through unauthorized interception of messages;

(d) Issuing key to unauthorized person;

(e) Impersonating another to obtain key;

(f) Knowingly issuing key in furtherance of criminal activity.

(4) Access to Encrypted Messages by U.S. Government Agencies: Access to encryption key by government entities only through properly executed court order (or certification under Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act).

(5) Access to Encrypted Messages by Foreign Governments: Attorney General may seek a court order for a foreign government pursuant to treaty and U.S. law.

(6) Civil Recovery: Recovery against the USA when information is improperly obtained or released.

(7) Destruction of intercepted information: Once lawful use of intercepted information is complete, intercepted information shall be destroyed.

(8) Illegal Disclosure: Violation of law to disclose recovery of information or execution of order.

B. GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

(1) Policy: It is the policy of the U.S. Government to create secure networks which permit public to interact with government through networks which protect privacy, intellectual property and personal security of network users.

(2) Government Purchases of Software: All encryption software purchased by the U.S. Government for use in secure government networks shall be software based on a system of key recovery.

(3) Software Purchased With Federal Funds: All encryption software purchased with federal funds shall be software based on a system of key recovery.

(4) U.S. Government Networks: All networks established by the U.S. Government which use encryption shall use encryption based on a system of key recovery.

(5) Networks Established With Federal Funds: All encrypted networks established with the use of federal funds shall use encryption based on a system of key recovery.

(6) Product Labels: Products may be labeled to inform user such product is authorized for sale or use in transactions with the U.S. Government.

(7) No Private Mandate: No federal mandate of private sector encryption standards other than for use in federal computer systems, networks or systems created with federal funds.

C. EXPORT OF ENCRYPTION

(1) Department of Commerce: The Department of Commerce shall be the lead agency on encryption software exports and have sole duty to issue export licenses on commercial encryption products and technologies.

(2) General License: Exports of encryption software up to * * * and software with encryption capabilities up to * * * shall be subject to a general license (license exception) provided, the product, or software being exported:

(a) Is otherwise qualified for export;

(b) Is otherwise legal;

(c) Does not violate U.S. law;

(d) Does not violate the intellectual property rights of another; and

(e) The recipient individual is otherwise qualified to receive such product or software.

The President may by executive order increase permissible encryption strength which is exportable under general license (license exception).

(3) General License (license exception)—Unlimited Strength: Exports of encryption software with unlimited strength permitted under general license (license exception) provided there is a qualified key recovery system or trusted third party system for encryption product.

(4) Fast Track Review: Fast Track consideration of licenses for certain institutions:

(a) Banks;

(b) Financial Institutions; and

(c) Health Care Providers

(5) Prohibited Exports: Export shall be prohibited when Secretary of Commerce finds significant evidence that product for export would be used in acts against the national security, public safety, integrity of transportation, communications, financial institutions or other essential systems of interstate commerce; diverted to a military, terrorist or criminal use, or re-exported w/o US authorization.

(6) License Review: In evaluating requests for export licenses for products with encryption capabilities, (in strengths above the level described in (C)(2)), the following factors shall be among those considered by the Secretary:

(a) Whether a product is generally available and is designed for installation without alteration by purchaser;

(b) Whether the product is generally available in the country to which the product would be exported; and

(c) Whether products offering comparable security and level of encryption is available in the country to which the product would be exported.

Licenses will be granted at the Secretary's discretion.

D. VOLUNTARY REGISTRATION SYSTEM

(1) Certificate Authorities: Secretary may establish procedures to register certificate authorities. Certificate authorities shall verify use of public keys and digital signatures.

(2) Agent Registry: Secretary may establish procedures to register key recovery agents.

(3) Public Key Certificates: Secretary or Certificate Authority may issue public key certificates.

(4) Voluntary System: Use of key management system is voluntary.

(5) Incentive to Use Voluntary System: Use of registered key management system shall be treated as evidence of due diligence and reasonable care in any civil or criminal proceeding.

E. LIABILITY LIMITATIONS

(1) Compliance with request: No liability for disclosing recovery information to government agency with properly executed order;

(2) Compliance defense: No liability for complying with Act.

(3) Good Faith Defense: Good faith reliance on court order is a complete defense.

F. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

The President shall conduct negotiations with other countries for the purpose of mutual recognition of Key Recovery and Certificate Authorities registered in USA.

G. CIVIL PENALTIES

(1) Civil Penalties: In addition to criminal penalties, Secretary shall establish civil penalties for violations of this act.

(2) Injunctive Relief: Attorney General may bring action to enjoin violations of act and enforce recovery of civil penalties.

(3) Jurisdiction: Original Jurisdiction of Federal District Courts for actions under this section.

H. RESEARCH

(1) Information Security Board: The Information Security Board shall be established to make recommendations to President and Congress on measures to establish secure networks, protect intellectual property on computer networks; promote exports of software, protect national security and public safety.

(2) Coordination: Coordination between federal, state and local law enforcement shall be encouraged.

(3) Network Research: Secure network research shall be encouraged.

(4) Annual Report: The NTIA in consultation with other federal agencies shall issue an annual report on secure network developments. The report shall review available information and report to the Congress and the President on developments in encryption, authentication, identification and security

on communications networks and make policy recommendations to the President and Congress.

I. PRESIDENTIAL POWER

The President may waive provisions of this Act with a finding of danger to national security, public safety, economic security, or public interest. President must report waiver to Congress in classified or unclassified form w/I 30 days of Presidential action.

J. MISC

(1) Severability.
(2) Interpretation: Will not affect intelligence activities outside USA; and will not weaken intellectual property protection.
(3) Definitions.
(4) Dates of regulations.
(5) Authority for fees.●

TRIBUTE TO ALEX HENLIN, BISHOP GUERTIN SENIOR, AND WINNER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION'S NATIONAL ORATORICAL CONTEST.

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Alex Henlin, a Bishop Guertin High School senior, on winning the American Legion's National Oratorical Contest. This is certainly an accomplishment of which he should be very proud and I salute him for his achievement.

Alex, 18, resides in Dracut, MA. He is president of his senior class and plans to study government next fall at Georgetown University. He was one of the State's representatives to the American Legion's 1996 Boys' Nation conference in Washington.

His speech, ''A More Perfect Union,'' reported the U.S. Constitution as being a versatile, living document able to address unforseen circumstances. Alex warned that amendments should not be created to address trivial issues. As a former history teacher, I admire and commend Alex's commitment to our Nation's most precious document.

Alex brought home an $18,000 college scholarship in addition to a $2,000 scholarship he received from the State contest. The national contest was hosted by Indiana University and Purdue University in Indianapolis.

I congragulate Alex Henlin on his outstanding accomplishments. I commend his hard work and perserverance and wish him luck at Georgetown in the fall semester.●

BAXTER BLACK COMMENTARY ON RANCHERS IN THE DAKOTAS

● Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, livestock producers across the Dakotas have suffered immeasurable losses this winter. Baxter Black, cowboy poet and commentator on National Public Radio, wrote a touching piece describing the struggles of ranchers facing the realities of the season's severe weather. National Public Radio aired the commentary on April 23.

Mr. President, I ask that the following transcript of Mr. Black's commentary be printed in the RECORD.

The transcript follows:

WE UNDERSTAND

Repeat after me: I do solemnly swear as shepherd of the flock to accept the responsibility for the animals put in my care, to tend to their basic needs of food and shelter, to minister to their ailments, to put their well being before my own if need be, and to relieve their pain and suffering up to, and including, the final bullet. I swear to treat them with respect, to always remember that we have made them dependent on us, and therefore have put their lives in our hands, as God is my witness.

Helpless. The worst winter in Dakota's memory. Cattle losses already predicted up to 50,000 head. And how did they die? From exposure and lack of feed. Basic needs—food and shelter. And now the flooding.

You think those Dakota ranchers said, ''Well, I'll just close down the store and put on the answering machine, we'll wait'll the storm blows over, no harm done''?

No, they couldn't. Wouldn't.

''Charlie, you can't go out there. The cows are clear over in the west pasture. You can't even see the barn from here.'' But he tried anyway. Tried to get the machinery running, tried to clear a path, tried to load the hay, tried to find the road.

These are not people who live a pampered life. These are not people who are easily defeated. These are not people who quit trying. But days and weeks on end of blizzards, blowing snow, and fatal wind chills took their toll.

Cattle stranded on the open plains with no cover, no protection, no feed, no place to go, and no relief from the Arctic fury died in singles and bunches and hundreds and thousands, frozen as hard as iron.

And back in the house sat the rancher and his family, stranded, unable to do what every fiber in their bodies willed them to do, knowing that every hour he could not tend his cows diminished him in some deep, permanent, undefinable way, changing him forever.

The losses will eventually be tallied, the number of head, and extrapolated to dollars. But dollars were not what kept him pacing the floor at night, looking out the window every two minutes, walking out in it 50 times a day, trying, trying, trying, knowing if he could only get to them he could save them. And then finally having to face the loss, his failure as a shepherd. That's what kept him trying. Exhausting, depression, and despair.

It's hard to comfort a person who has had his spirit battered like that. ''It couldn't be helped, there's nothing you could do,'' is small consolation.

So, all I can say to our fellow stockman in the Dakotas is, in our own way, we understand.●

TRIBUTE TO GARY HODSON ON BEING NAMED THE 1997 SOMERSWORTH CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Gary Hodson, postal carrier of Somersworth, on being named the Citizen of the Year by the Greater Somersworth Chamber of Commerce. I commend his outstanding community commitment and congratulate him on this well-deserved honor.

Gary's community involvements are numerous but his special dedication was directed to youth. Gary serves as director of youth education at Holy Trinity Church and volunteers teaching on evenings and weekends. He is president of the baseball, football, and hockey boosters.

Gary is known to many as always willing to take responsibility to make his community a better place to live and raise children. He puts forth his time and energy to help the youth of the community. Whatever he commits to, he always gets the job done.

Gary has dedicated his time, talent, and energy to serving the residents of Somersworth in an exemplary way. I am proud to honor Gary Hodson's outstanding community commitment, which is so important to the youth and their future. We are indeed indebted to him for his efforts. Congratulations to Dan for this distinguished recognition. I am honored to represent him in the U.S. Senate.●

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION—THE TRUTH

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to submit the following testimony for the RECORD. Dr. Curtis Cook is a board-certified obstetrician/gynecologist and a subspecialist in maternal-fetal medicine in Michigan. In March, Dr. Cook testified before the House-Senate joint hearing on ''Partial-Birth Abortion—The Truth.'' His expert testimony speaks to both the medical necessity of the partial-birth procedure and the issue of fetal pain during the procedure.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY CURTIS COOK, M.D., MATERNAL FETAL MEDICINE, BUTTERWORTH HOSPITAL, MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE OF HUMAN MEDICINE

My name is Dr. Curtis Cook. I am a board-certified Obstetrician/Gynecologist and a subspecialist in Maternal-Fetal Medicine (also known as Perinatology or High Risk Obstetrics). In my practice I take care of referred complicated pregnancies because of preexisting chronic medical conditions of the mother, or suspected abnormalities in the baby. I am also the Associate Director of our region's Maternal-Fetal Medicine division and also serve as Assistant Residency Director for our Obstetrics and Gynecology training program, I am an Assistant Clinical Professor at Michigan State University of College of Human Medicine, and a member of the American College of OB/GYN, The Society of Perinatal Obstetricians, The American Medical Association, and the Association of Professors of Gynecology and Obstetrics. I am a founding member of PHACT (Physicians Ad Hoc Coalition for Truth about Partial Birth Abortion), which I helped organize after hearing the appalling medical misinformation circulated in the media regarding this procedure. PHACT includes in its membership over 400 physicians from Obstetrics, Maternal-Fetal Medicine and Pediatrics. Many of these physicians are educators or heads of departments, and also include the former Surgeon General, C. Everett Koop. All that in required of a physician for membership in an Interest in maternal and child health, and a desire to educate the population on this single issue.

I must begin my statement by defining partial birth abortion as the feet first delivery of a living infant up to the level of its after coming head, before puncturing the base of its skull with a sharp instrument and sucking out the brain contents, thereby killing it and allowing the collapse of its skull and subsequent delivery. This description is based upon the technique of Dr. Haskell of Ohio, who has subsequently identified it as accurate. He has referred to his technique as

''D & X'' (Dilatation and Extraction), while Dr. McMahon of California refers to it as an ''intact D & E.'' An ACOG ad hoc committee came up with the hybrid term ''intact D & X''. As you can see, many terms are used and are not clear in their description.

Partial birth abortion is mostly performed in the fifth and six months of pregnancy. However, these procedures have been performed up to the ninth month of pregnancy. The majority of patients undergoing this procedure do not have significant medical problems. In Dr. McMahon's series, less than ten percent were performed for maternal indications, and these included some ill-defined reasons such as depression, hyperemesis, drug exposed spouse, and youth. Many of the patients undergoing partial birth abortion are not even carrying babies with abnormalities. In Dr. McMahon's series, only about half of the babies were considered ''flawed'', and these included some easily correctable conditions like cleft lip and ventricular septal defect. Dr. Haskell claimed that eighty percent of his procedures were purely elective, and a group of New Jersey physicians claimed that only a minuscule amount of their procedures were done for genetic abnormalities or other defects. Most were performed on women of lower age, education, or socioeconomic status who either delayed or discovered late their unwanted pregnancies. It is also clear that this procedure occurs thousands of times a year, rather than a few hundred times a year, as claimed by pro-abortion advocates. This has been independently confirmed by the investigative work of The Washington Post, The New Jersey Bergen Record and the American Medical Association News.

One of the often ignored aspects of this procedure is that it requires three days to accomplish. Before performing the actual delivery, there is a two day period of cervical dilation that involves forcing up to twenty five dilators into the cervix at one time. This can cause great cramping and nausea for the women, who are then sent to their home or to a hotel room overnight while their cervix dilates. After returning to the clinic, their bag of water is broken, the baby is forced into a feet first position by grasping the legs and pulling it down through the cervix and into the vagina. This form of internal rotation, or version, is a technique largely abandoned in modern obstetrics because of the unacceptable risk associated with it. These techniques place the women at greater risk for both immediate (bleeding) and delayed (infection) complications. In fact, there may also be longer repercussions of cervical manipulation leading to an inherent weakness of the cervix and the inability to carry pregnancies to term. We have already seen women who have had trouble maintaining pregnancies after undergoing a partial birth abortion.

There is no record of these procedures in any medical text, journals, or on-line medical service. There is no known quality assurance, credentialling, or other standard assessment usually associated with newly-described surgical techniques. Neither the CDC nor the Alan Gultmacher Institute have any data on partial birth abortion, and certainly no basis upon which to state the claim that it is a safer or even a preferred procedure.

The bigger question then remains: Why ever do a partial birth abortion? There are and always have been safer techniques for partial birth abortion since it was first described by Dr. McMahon in 1989 and Dr. Haskell in 1992. The usual and customary (and previously studied) method of delivery at this gestation is the medical induction of labor using either intravaginal or intramuscular medications to cause contractions and expulsion of the baby. This takes about twelve hours on average, and may also include possible cervical preparation with the use of one to three cervical dilators (as opposed to the three-day partial birth abortion procedure, with up to 25 dilators in the cervix at one time). This also results in an intact baby for pathologic evaluation, without involving the other risk of internally turning the baby or forcing a large number of dilators into the cervix. The only possible ''advantage'' of partial birth abortion, if you can call it that, is that it guarantees a dead baby at time of delivery.

The less common situation of partial birth abortion involves, an abnormal baby. These conditions do not threaten a woman over and above a normal pregnancy, and do not require the killing of the baby to preserve her health or future fertility. I have taken care of many such women with the same diagnoses as the women who provided testimony on this issue in the past. Each of these women stated that they needed to have a partial birth abortion performed in order to protect their health or future fertility. In these cases of trisomy (extra chromosomal material), hydrocephaly (water on the brain), polyhydramnios (too much amniotic fluid) and arthrogryposis (stiffened baby), there are alternatives to partial birth abortion that do not threaten a woman's ability to bear children in the future. I have personally cared for many cases of all of these disorders, and have never required any technique like partial birth abortion in order to accomplish delivery. Additionally, I have never had a colleague that I have known to have used the technique of partial birth abortion in order to accomplish delivery in this same group of patients. Moreover, there are high profile providers of third trimester abortions who likewise do not use the technique of partial birth abortion.

In the even rarer case of a severe maternal medical condition requiring early delivery, partial birth abortion is not preferred, and medical induction suffices without threatening future fertility. Again, the killing of the fetus is not required, only separation from the mother.

Finally, I wish to address the fetal pain issue, since it has been claimed that a fetus feels no pain at these gestational ages. This is about as ridiculous as the earlier claim that the anesthesia of partial birth abortion put the baby into a medical coma and killed it prior to the performance of the auctioning technique. This was no small claim to the many pregnant women undergoing non-obstetric surgery every day in this country. Fortunately, this was soundly denounced by both the American Society of Anesthesiologists and the Society of Obstetrical Anesthesia and Perinatology. In the course of my practice, we must occasionally perform life-saving procedures on babies while still in the uterus, I have often observed babies of five to six months gestation withdraw from needles and instruments, much like a pain response. Dr. Fisk in England has recently reported an increase in fetal pain response hormones during the course of these procedures at these same gestational ages. In addition, we frequently observe the standard grimaces and withdrawals of neonates born at six months gestation like any other pain response in a more mature infant.

While it is not my desire for legislators to enter into the realm of medical policy making, there are times when the public health risk needs to be addressed if the medical community is either unwilling or unable to address it. We have seen this precedent for female circumcision and forty-eight hour postpartum stays. I believe the unnecessary, unstudied, and potentially dangerous procedure of partial birth abortion is unworthy of continuance in modern obstetrics. It neither protects the life, the health or the future fertility of women, and certainly does not benefit the baby. For these reasons, I urge you to support the ban on partial birth abortion.

I thank you for the opportunity to share my testimony and my concern for the women and children of this country.●

TRIBUTE TO RAYMOND REID

● Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a great patriot who has served over 54 years in the Federal Government. On May 15, 1997, Raymond ''Ray'' T. Reid, retired from the U.S. House of Representatives, where he worked as a chief of staff for 23 years, lending his expertise and leadership to three different Congressmen representing the Third District of Arkansas. I was one of those fortunate Members who had the privilege of working with Ray for the 4 years that I served in the House. When I was first elected to Congress in 1992, I replaced John Paul Hammerschmidt, a retiring Member who had represented the Third District for 26 years, and had become a legend both on Capitol Hill and in the State of Arkansas. However, it was no secret that behind this great politician was Ray Reid, a man who over the years had become an Arkansas legend himself. When John Paul retired, his work continued on through Ray's service and dedication. As a newly elected freshman, Ray provided my office with continuity, efficiency, stability, and a wisdom that could only come from 19 years of being a chief of staff.

The successful career of Ray Reid began long before he worked on Capitol Hill. Ray began his career back in 1942 when he left Bowdoin College in Brunswick, ME, to join the U.S. Army to defend our Nation in World War II. Following the war, he rose quickly up the ranks, receiving honors for his leadership ability and outstanding achievement. He made the Army his career for 31 years, where he served on both foreign soil and here in the United States. Ray moved his family several times, living in countries around the globe. He fought for freedom and justice in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam in addition to faithfully serving his country in peacetime.

He continued his service undiminished until December 31, 1973, when he retired from the Army as a colonel. Having worked in the Office of the Congressional Liaison at the Pentagon, Ray was able to make a smooth, natural transition to working in a congressional office. He brought to Congressman Hammerschmidt's office a vast degree of knowledge from several years of international exposure and a solid background in domestic policy. By the time Ray came to work for me, he was an invaluable resource who possessed a wealth of information and experience. Throughout his tenure as chief of staff in my office, he provided guidance and an institutional knowl-

edge which would have been difficult to match. I can say without hesitance that Ray Reid conducted legislative business with the highest ethical standards. The best interests of the residents of the Third District were always placed above partisan politics and our office was managed in a way that was beyond reproach. When I moved over to the Senate, Ray demonstrated his commitment to the constituents of the Third District once again by agreeing to see another freshman, my brother, ASA, through the transition process.

So, today, as Ray enjoys the first Monday that he doesn't need to go to work after over a half a century of public service, on behalf of the State of Arkansas and the people he touched here on Capitol Hill, I want to offer my deepest thanks to a man whose loyalty and friendship will not be forgotten. Truly a job well done.●

TRIBUTE TO HOLLIS/BROOKLINE COOPERATIVE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS MATH TEAM

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Hollis/Brookline High School math team members who recently took first place in the small school division at the New Hampshire State Mathematics Contest.

As a former teacher myself, I commend their teamwork and talent which helped the 14-member squad oust 48 other teams for the State title and top the 19-team NH–SMASH league.

Math team adviser Vina Duffy also deserves special recognition for giving the team an organized and supporting approach to math. She encouraged the students' interest and animated the diverse group to strengthen their aptitude. The team had no formal practice, and had only worksheets to prepare them for the meets. Their congeniality and confidence grew with the number of wins they achieved.

I would like to honor math team members: Karl Athony, Dave Clark, Tyler Dumont, Michel Franklin, Mary Fries, Jason Glastetter, Jason Kerouac, Eric Larose, Bert Lue, James Robson, Jared Rosenberg, Steve Watkins, and Matt White.

Mr. President, I want to congratulate these outstanding young minds for their excellent performance and teamspirit and I am proud to represent them in the U.S. Senate.●

DECEPTIVE BUDGET DEAL

● Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I suggest that before we begin thinking about patting ourselves on the back for the budget agreement that was finalized last week, we consider the hard work ahead. The agreement is merely a broad outline—a blueprint—for the spending and tax bills yet to come. We still need to consider how it is supposed to be implemented before claiming any sort of victory.

We need to consider, for example, whether it will actually lead to a balanced budget by the year 2002. Is it good for families? Will it ensure that the Medicare Program is protected for today's generation of retirees and for our children and grandchildren? Will it help the economy produce the jobs needed for those trying to get off welfare, or those entering the work force for the first time? Will it help more young people get a college education? Will it provide the resources needed to safeguard our country from immediate and future threats from abroad?

Mr. President, as the broad outline of the budget agreement with the White House has been filtering out over the last 2 weeks, I could not help but think of the budget deal that was brokered by President Bush and congressional Democrats 7 years ago.

Here is what President Bush said when he announced that agreement in a broadcast on October 2, 1990:

> It is the biggest deficit-reduction agreement ever; half a trillion dollars. It's the toughest deficit-reduction package ever, with new enforcement rules to make sure that what we fix now stays fixed. And it has the largest spending savings ever, more than $300 billion.

Of course, the agreement produced no such thing. Looking back, it produced bigger deficits, not smaller deficits—221 billion dollars' worth of red ink in 1990, rising to $290 billion in 1993. Federal spending increased from $1.2 to $1.4 trillion—up nearly 17 percent in just 3 years. So the mere fact that there is an agreement with the President is not reason enough to believe that the problem has been solved. As Gen. George S. Patton once said, ''if everybody is thinking alike, then somebody isn't thinking.'' We need to look objectively at the details, and whether the plan is reflective of values that our constituents sent us here to uphold.

Right now, people are not sure. A CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll released on May 8 indicated that an overwhelming majority of Americans—roughly 8 in 10—do not believe the deal will actually result in a balanced budget by 2002. Obviously, we need to take a careful look at what is being proposed here before deciding whether or not to support it.

Mr. President, let me quote some of the words President Clinton used on May 2 when he announced the latest budget agreement. I think they will show why people have reason to be skeptical. While suggesting that ''it will be the first balanced budget in three decades,'' the President went on to note that it would ''continue to increase our investments,'' ''expand coverage,'' ''restore cuts,'' ''extend new benefits,'' and ''increase'' spending, while ''moderating excessive cuts.'' My friends, we cannot balance the budget by increasing spending and funding a whole host of new programs and benefits. Let us be honest about that. If it sounds too good to be true, it probably is.

As I recall, the goal in 1990, as it was again in 1997, was to devise a plan to balance the budget, while providing long-term Federal spending constraints and incentives for economic growth. I opposed the 1990 agreement, believing it was seriously flawed on all those counts, and I see similar problems looming in the latest agreement.

Let me focus first on the issue of taxes. The deal with the Clinton White House is different from the 1990 plan in that it includes some very modest tax cuts. But because the amount of tax reductions President Clinton would agree to is so small—less than 2 percent of the revenue that the Federal Government expects to raise over the next 5 years—it remains to be seen whether there is any tax relief here worthy of the name.

I know that some might ask why we even need a tax cut when the economy continues to grow at a relatively healthy clip. There are two reasons. First, think of families. A $500-per-child tax credit can make a world of difference to a mom and dad sitting around the kitchen table trying to find a way to pay for their daughter's education, to pay for summer camp or braces for the kids. What single mom could not use a $500-per-child credit to help make ends meet?

Yes, the Federal Government could keep the money and try to provide some kind of aid to these families. But if families could keep more of their hard-earned money to do for themselves, we probably would not need government to do so many things. It seems to me that we ought to put our trust in families to do what is right by their own children. And unfortunately, it is not clear we can accommodate the full $500-per-child credit under this plan.

What about tax relief for small businesses, including the new businesses started by women and minorities? After all, that is where most of the new jobs around the country are created. Provide a meaningful tax cut, and small businesses and family farms could expand, hire new people, pay better wages, and do the things necessary to become more competitive.

Alternatively, Government can keep the taxes. But remember, it then turns around and provides a whole host of subsidies to businesses because they do not have the resources to do for themselves.

It is an endless cycle. When people are not left with enough to care for themselves, the Government tries to do more. When it does more, it taxes more, and people are left with even less. It has to stop somewhere. Americans need some relief.

Mr. President, it is also important to understand how important a healthy and growing economy is to balancing the budget. We just received word from the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] that this year's deficit is expected to decline to $70 billion. That is $55 billion less than President Clinton's budget assumed as recently as February. And it is largely the result of two things:

robust economic growth during the last few months, and Congress finally beginning to restrain spending growth during the last 2½ years.

Limiting spending just takes some discipline, but how can tax policy help the economy to grow and prosper? It may come as a surprise to some, but lower tax rates not only help make people better off, but can produce more tax revenue for the Treasury as well. Just think what has happened during the last few months. The growing economy helped reduce the deficit $55 billion just since the President's February projections. CBO estimates that economic growth will produce an extra $45 billion a year for the next few years. So it is important to sustain that growth into the future.

The economy grows like any prudent business enterprise grows. It is like a weekend sale at the Target store. When prices are slashed, people buy more goods, and the increased volume of sales more than makes up for the price reduction. The converse is also true—higher prices cause people to shop elsewhere. Higher taxes cause people to shelter income, or make less, to avoid paying more taxes.

Mr. President, based upon what we know about the current agreement, it does not seem to me that we will be able to achieve either of these goals: providing families and small businesses with tax relief, or keeping the economy growing at a healthy rate. But what about spending? Does it do anything to constrain Federal spending—since it was excessive spending that caused the 1990 budget agreement to fail?

Well, here is how domestic spending totes up compared to the levels Congress approved a year ago in the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution. These are figures developed by our colleague, Senator PHIL GRAMM, a member of the Budget Committee. And I will note that the Budget Committee will not begin marking up the budget resolution until this afternoon, so these numbers may change. But they suggest an alarming trend in any event.

According to Senator GRAMM's figures, domestic spending in this deal will amount to $193 billion more over 5 years than we were willing to approve just 1 year ago. It is $79 billion more than President Clinton himself asked for just a year ago, and $5 billion more than he asked for in February.

Mr. President, the budget agreement with the White House would provide an additional $16 billion for new Government-provided health insurance, and another $18 billion to repeal parts of welfare reform and expand the Food Stamp Program. It puts more money into education, but because of the way this is done, the extra resources are likely to be eaten up by tuition increases. Or they will simply help those who had the means to go to college anyway.

Medicare savings in the plan come largely from reductions in provider reimbursements, which either will diminish the quality of care provided to older Americans or drive more doctors and hospitals out of the Medicare Program altogether, leaving seniors with limited health-care choices. Medicare solvency occurs as a result of shifting the costs of home health care from part A to part B—a gimmick that we roundly denounced when the President proposed it before.

The Medicare savings are enough to forestall the bankruptcy of the program for a few years, but they are not enough to ensure that Medicare remains safe and sound to take care of Americans in the baby-boom generation who will begin retiring within the next decade. The Medicare features of this agreement certainly will not protect the system for young people who are just entering the work force today.

Defense spending in this agreement is also insufficient to protect future generations. We have cashed in on the much-heralded peace dividend so many times that our military service chiefs have been warning about increased risks due to budget cuts.

I know that many believe this is a time when the United States can cut back its defense budget. But history teaches us the opposite. We have always enjoyed a period of calm before a storm. With the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that is occurring today, and the emergence of movements hostile to the West, we do not have the luxury of waiting until after we have been threatened to invest in our military. We must remain ready and fully capable, both to deter and to defeat any aggression against American citizens.

Mr. President, it is instructive that the first piece of legislation on the Senate floor after this deal was struck was the supplemental appropriations bill, which will add $6.6 billion to the deficit over the next few years. In other words, we have already added to the deficit before the ink on the budget agreement is even dry.

We had the chance to change that with the amendment that Senator GRAMM offered—an amendment which I supported. But it did not pass, and so for all practical purposes the budget agreement will have to be modified to account for this extra spending. At least that part of it will need to be fixed.

I think we need to learn a lot more about the agreement this week before signing off on it. Unless parts of it can be modified down the line as the House and Senate begin writing the tax and spending bills to implement it, I believe it will not lead to balance. It will certainly not lead to balance after the $6.6 billion that was added to the deficit by the supplemental spending bill.

Mr. President, it may even usher in a bigger, more powerful Federal Government, as happened in 1990. And that is not what many of us came here to do.

We can compromise on details without compromising our principles. We should never be afraid to take legitimate differences to the American people when we are unable to resolve them here. I ask that a column by Senator PHIL GRAMM, which includes some additional information about the budget agreement, be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 9, 1997]

DECEPTIVE BUDGET DEAL

(By Phil Gramm)

After two years of partisan confrontation on the budget, the president and Congress have reached a bipartisan deal that appears to be all things to all people. The president gets more social spending, Republicans get a tax cut, and the American people get a balanced budget. If it all seems too good to be true, that's because it is.

Because the budgeting arms of both the administration and Congress assumed—before the budget debate even started—that the strong economy we now enjoy would produce sustained growth beyond the year 2002, the amount of deficit reduction required to achieve a balanced budget immediately declined from $642 billion over the next five years to $330 billion. Then it got even better. At the very moment of impasse in the budget negotiations, the Congressional Budget Office discovered that even its previous estimates of an improving economy understated the revenue windfall expected in the next five years and predicted that windfall alone would lower the deficit another $225 billion. Negotiators then rolled up their sleeves and assumed $15 billion of additional savings from lower consumer prices and $77 billion in additional savings from the even stronger economic growth that would be generated by balancing the budget.

The net result is that before a single change in public policy became part of the budget compromise, deficits of $317 billion—96 percent of the total deficit—had simply been assumed away. Only $14 billion, or 4 percent of deficit reduction in the budget compromise, comes from actually changing policy.

The most distinctive feature of the budget compromise is the size of domestic discretionary spending increases. While it is fashionable for Republicans to claim that this budget deal achieves the goals of the Contract With America, in reality it spends $216 billion more on domestic discretionary programs than the contract contained. The compromise increases domestic discretionary spending by $193 billion above the 1997 budget resolution and by $79 billion above President Clinton's actual budget request for 1997. In fact, if you look at the president's 1998 budget as scored by the Congressional Budget Office, the budget deal actually gives the president $5 billion more in discretionary spending than his own budget would have provided.

The most permanent feature of the bipartisan budget compromise is an increase in domestic spending on social programs, which the president has rightly compared to the explosion of social spending that occurred in the 1960's.

In addition to these increases in discretionary spending, the budget compromise contains new entitlement benefits in Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps and SSI, and it overturns part of the one major reform of the 104th Congress: It reestablishes welfare benefits for legal aliens.

The budget compromise proudly trumpets $115 billion of savings in medicare, but by committing to accept the president's plan to simply cut reimbursement for doctors and hospitals, Congress buys into a policy that has been implemented over and over again in the past 30 years without achieving substantial savings. Like other forms of price controls, reducing reimbursement for physicians

and hospitals has historically been circumvented as the recipients have invented ways to work around the limitations. In addition, the compromise requires that the fastest growing part of Medicare, home health care, be taken out of the Medicare trust fund and financed from general revenues.

Perhaps the most perverse aspect of the compromise is that this budget will trample an emerging bipartisan commitment to real Medicare reform. This budget agreement virtually guarantees that five years from now Medicare will be in much worse shape than it is today. Moreover, virtually every penny of the $115 billion claimed from Medicare savings will be spent on increases in social programs and new entitlement benefits.

That brings us to my party's favorite part of the deal, the much-discussed $85 billion tax cut. The cut is largely funded by odds-and-ends measures, the largest of which is at least $25 billion of revenues assumed to be derived from auctioning off broadcast and non-broadcast spectrum—the right to use public airways for everything from broadcasting the 6 o'clock news to setting up a cellular phone system.

Last year Congress assumed a limited spectrum auction of $2.9 billion as an offset to new spending. When actually auctioned, the spectrum brought in just $13.6 million, or roughly $1 for every $200 that Congress had assumed would be raised. Given our experience of last year, it is highly unlikely that anything like $25 billion will be raised from spectrum auction unless television stations are forced to buy spectrum to broadcast their new digital signals, something the Federal Communication Commission, the White House and Congress have opposed.

The budget agreement claims a net reduction in taxes of $85 billion. Some $5 billion of that tax cut will be lost to the public because the assumed reductions in the consumer price index will raise income taxes by $5 billion. Of the remaining $80 billion, the Clinton administration's education tax credit will absorb roughly $35 billion, leaving Republicans some $45 billion in net tax cuts to fund their tax-cut priorities.

Unfortunately, the full Republican tax package costs $188 billion. Republicans on the House and Senate tax-writing committees now will be forced to try to stretch a net tax cut of $45 billion to cover a $500-per-child tax credit that costs $105 billion, capital gains relief that costs $32 billion, estate and death tax relief that cost $18 billion and individual retirement account expansion that costs $32 billion.

Even if $50 billion of offsetting tax increases can be found, it is a certainty that the individual tax credit will be dramatically curtailed, probably by ensuring that many middle- and upper-middle-income working families don't get any child tax credit. Capital gains and estate tax relief will be similarly truncated. In the end, despite all the talk of achieving a major tax cut, it is hard to see a substantial impact in a $7 trillion economy being created by a $45 billion tax cut.

Obviously, in a budget deal such as this, the logical question is: ''Is it better than nothing?'' And, as is usually the case, beauty is in the eye of the beholder. But in the final analysis, two factors ultimately make this budget agreement worse than no agreement. The first is the false perception it creates that the deficit problem has been fixed. This notion already has given rise to the largest increase in social spending since the '60s in this budget agreement and is likely to further open the floodgates as Congress convinces itself and the American public that the deficit is behind us. Second, by claiming to have solved the Medicare problem for 10 years, we will take the pressure off the president and Congress to reform Medicare even though the trust fund is careening toward bankruptcy, and Medicare will produce a $1.6 trillion drain on the federal Treasury over the next 10 years.

Historically, America has looked to its two great political parties to contest over principles and new ideas so that the highest principles and best ideas could become the governing consensus for the country. But divided government often produces massive pressure for bipartisanship, and the current budget deal is an example of how bipartisanship sometimes can manifest itself not in compromise policy but in a decision to join together to mislead the public. The opposite of gridlock is not necessarily efficiency, it is sometimes deception.●

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 20, 1997

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, May 20. I further ask consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the opening prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted, and the Senate then be in a period of morning business until the hour of 10 a.m., with Senators recognized to speak up to 5 minutes, with the following exception: Senator HAGEL and Senator KERREY in control of 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. I further ask unanimous consent the Senate recess from the hour of 12:30 to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE BUDGET COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORTED LEGISLATION

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Budget Committee have until 12 midnight this evening in order to file reported legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. COATS. For the information of all Senators, at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning it is hoped the Senate will be able to reach an agreement allowing for the completion of the partial-birth abortion ban bill. If that agreement is reached, Senators should anticipate a vote on passage of that legislation at approximately 2:30 p.m., on Tuesday.

Also, Senators should be reminded that it is the intention of the majority leader to begin consideration of the budget resolution tomorrow afternoon. Senators can expect rollcall votes throughout Tuesday's session, as the Senate attempts to make progress on the first concurrent budget resolution. Members who intend to offer amendments to that resolution should be prepared to offer those amendments during tomorrow's session. It is the hope that the Democratic leader will join the majority leader in an effort to yield back much of the statutory time limit for the budget resolution. All Members will be notified accordingly as any votes are ordered with respect to any of this legislation.

I thank all Members for their attention.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. COATS. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:37 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 20, 1997, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 19, 1997:

THE JUDICIARY

WILLIAM P. GREENE, JR., OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE U.S. COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS FOR THE TERM OF 15 YEARS, VICE HART T. MANKIN, DECEASED.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) TIMOTHY R. BEARD, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID L. BREWER III, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) STANLEY W. BRYANT, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) TONEY M. BUCCHI, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM W. COPELAND, JR., 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN W. CRAINE, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT E. FRICK, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) PAUL G. GAFFNEY II, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN A. GAUSS, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) EDMUND P. GIAMBASTIANI, JR., 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN J. GROSSENBACHER, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES B. HINKLE, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) GORDON S. HOLDER, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) PETER A.C. LONG, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) MARTIN J. MAYER, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) BARBARA E. MC GANN, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) CHARLES W. MOORE, JR., 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN B. NATHMAN, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM R. SCHMIDT, 0000
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT C. WILLIAMSON, 0000

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 5—INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1997

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in both parties today to support this remarkable achievement on behalf of children with disabilities and their families.

I have always believed that it is an honor and a privilege to serve in Congress. Today I can say that I am truly proud to serve in Congress and to have played a role in upholding the laws that protect our children and their families.

We had some very serious disagreements when we started this effort 2 years ago to revise the two-decades-old law on disability education.

At that time, there were several critical points that prevented us from coming to an agreement.

I believed then and still believe that all children, regardless of the nature of severity of their disability, must be guaranteed a free and appropriate public education and that no child should be denied an education.

I said last year that if the California Legislature could conclude that this sound educational and social policy does not compromise school safety, then Congress should do so as well. The language in this bill before us specifically prohibiting cessation of services accomplishes that goal.

I believed then and still believe that treatment of children with disabilities should be guided by what we know about the nature of the child's disability and its effect on his or her behavior. Unfortunately, this knowledge needs to be more widely disseminated. Language proposed in consideration of this bill previously would have allowed schools to discipline disabled students solely for so-called ''disruptive behavior''.

Most of us assume this was a well-intended effort, yet nonetheless it would have resulted in a situation where any of a wide-range of nonthreatening but, to some, unpleasant behaviors, could have been grounds for suspension or expulsion.

I am pleased that my colleagues had the good sense to strike this provision from the bill.

I believed then and still believe that parents are entitled to pursue all legal avenues available to them to ensure their child is treated fairly. Unfortunately, some had argued for provisions which would have curtailed or severely diminished these rights.

I am pleased that the bill before us maintains the fundamental rights we established when this groundbreaking law was written over 20 years ago.

The bill before us today resolves these differences to the satisfaction of the many different parties that have contributed to this process and who are affected by this legislation.

Other more, specific aspects of the bill also deserve note.

First, this bill permits a hearing officer to decide whether to place a child in an alternative educational setting for no more than 45 days if a school district proves beyond a preponderance of evidence that maintaining the child in his or her current educational placement is substantially likely to result in injury to the child or others. The standard substantially likely was established by the Supreme Court in Honig versus Doe. In that case, the Court described the children who could be moved as those who are truly dangerous, and noted that it was up to the school district to rebut the presumption of maintaining the child in the current placement. In deciding whether the district has met this burden, it would not be permissible to move a child based on behavior that is not truly dangerous.

In addition, H.R. 5 requires the hearing officer to consider the appropriateness of the child's placement and efforts by the school district to minimize the risk of harm. Thus, the bill assumes that it would not be permissible to remove a child when the child's behavior can be addressed in the current placement.

In placing the additional authority with the hearing officers, the proposed bill recognizes the important role already assigned to these individuals in guaranteeing the rights of children with disabilities. It is because of the importance of this role that the Act requires that hearing officers be impartial and prohibits the designation of an employee of the child's school district as a hearing officer.

It is expected that hearing officers will be provided appropriate training to carry out this new responsibility in an informed and impartial manner and that both State educational agencies and the Secretary of Education will closely monitor the implementation of this provision.

The intent behind this bill was to strengthen the least restrictive environment requirement and participation of children with disabilities in the general curriculum and the regular education classroom.

In keeping with this goal, the bill clarifies that the regular education teacher is part of the IEP team if the child is, or may be, participating in the regular education environment. With respect to the IEP team, it is also important to underscore the right of parents to bring advocates or anyone else they care to bring to support them in the IEP process. Parents often need this support to level the playing field and allow them to participate meaningfully in the IEP process.

I am particularly pleased that the bill strengthens enforcement of IDEA by providing the Secretary more flexibility in withholding funds in cases of noncompliance and by explicitly clarifying the Secretary's ability to refer matters to the Department of Justice for enforcement action. Enforcement of this Act has been one of the main obstacles to full implementation. These new features will help assure that noncompliance will not go unchecked.

This process we went through in crafting these agreements was not easy. We had to overcome very real and difficult disagreements. Those of us who believed the rights of children and their parents were going to suffer were able to work with our colleagues in Congress who saw this issue differently and were able to agree that these rights should be protected.

What we strove to achieve, and what I think we've accomplished, is a bill that protects the rights of children with disabilities, and at the same time fosters cooperation between parents, teachers, school boards, administrators, and State and local agencies to help ensure that each recognizes their responsibilities and that each must make a commitment to work collaboratively to serve the best interests of all children.

I particularly wish to thank Senate Majority Leader TRENT LOTT for allowing us the arena in which to make this achievement. It was a remarkable process. Senator LOTT's dedication, and that of his chief of staff, David Hoppe, have served us all well.

I would also like to thank the other members of the bipartisan House-Senate IDEA working group—Chairman GOODLING, Representatives RIGGS, CASTLE, MARTINEZ, and SCOTT, and Senators KENNEDY, JEFFORDS, HARKIN, and COATS—along with their staffs, for the extraordinary effort they made in putting this agreement together.

I would also like to extend special thanks to Assistant Secretary of Education Judy Heumann, whose commitment to and effectiveness in addressing issues affecting those with disabilities, and whose impact on my knowledge and understanding of these issues, is second to no one's. Judy was an integral part of this process from beginning to end and this agreement simply would not have been possible without her.

Mr. Speaker, during our deliberations on this act I received in the mail a letter from an old friend of mine, retired superior Court judge Robert J. Cooney, enclosing a copy of a book written by his son, Peter, describing what life is like for a child with Down's syndrome and for that child as he becomes an adult and seeks his place in American society. Over the years I have had the opportunity to watch Peter grow as he progressed through school and participated in the Special Olympics and achieve greater and greater independence.

Peter makes it clear in his book the importance of family and the available resources: ''it is the love of parents and others that make the person special. We need help sometimes. Parents and teachers and counselors should help us when we need help but don't do too much for us.—Some counselors need to think of us as special. Part of their job is helping us become independent.''

Peter is now 32 years old, lives in a residential facility and works in the food service business at Cosumnes River College when he is not attending a book signing.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about empowering parents and students to be able to get the best education they can, so that like Peter they too will have the chance to participate fully in American society.

We should never forget why we went through this process. Before the IDEA law was on the books over 20 years ago, more than a million children with disabilities were not being educated. Schools refused to take them, and States did not force them to do.

IDEA is a civil rights law. For a parent with a disabled child, there is nothing more important than knowing your child will get as good an education as any other child. You would think that is not so much to ask in this great and rich country of ours. In fact, twenty years ago, it was too much to ask. But it is not any more.

IN MEMORY OF LLOYD REYNOLDS

HON. ROBERT L. EHRLICH, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to pay tribute to a wonderful friend of mine, Mr. Lloyd Reynolds. Lloyd was 64 years old when he was suddenly and prematurely taken from us last month. It is difficult for me to express the profound loss to me, his family, and the State of Maryland.

Lloyd was born in Long Branch, NJ, and moved to Reisterstown, MD, when he was 16. He graduated from Franklin High School in 1950, and, 5 years later, founded Reynolds & Yellott Co., a construction firm.

Always interested in farming, Lloyd raised cattle, pigs, and turkeys near his home. He became increasingly involved with the farming community and was president of the Baltimore County Farm Bureau at his death. One of his greatest concerns was the loss of quality farmland to commercial developers, and he sought alternative ways for farmers to get equity out of their land without having to sell for such development.

Lloyd was also involved in community service of another kind. A staunch Republican in a State where Democrats outnumbered Republicans by a ratio of three to one, Lloyd was a Republican candidate for Lieutenant Governor of Maryland in 1982 and 1990. Although both attempts were unsuccessful, being involved was a way of life for Lloyd Reynolds.

I could always rely on Lloyd for advice about farming or small business issues because I knew he would be candid and sincere with me. He was always unselfish and genuinely concerned about others—qualities that defined him as a unique human being.

Mr. Speaker, I want to send my condolences to Lloyd's wife of 43 years, Barbara, and his entire family. I will miss him a great deal. At the same time, I remain most thankful that Lloyd Reynolds was a part of my life over the past 12 years.

A FACTSHEET ON ALCOHOL-IMPAIRED DRIVING FROM THE CENTER FOR DISEASE CONTROL [CDC]

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, 1997, I held a special order on the dangers of drunk driving. At the time, I submitted a factsheet to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on alcohol-impaired driving from the Center for Disease Control. However, the fact sheet was inadvertently left out of the RECORD. The factsheet is added here as an extension of remarks.

ALCOHOL-RELATED CRASH DEATHS: GENERAL POPULATION

Motor vehicle crashes are a leading cause of death in the United States for persons from one to 34 years of age.

41.3 percent of the 41,693 traffic fatalities in 1995 were alcohol-related (i.e., either the driver or nonoccupant (e.g., pedestrian) had a Blood Alcohol Content equal to or greater than 0.01 g/dL in a police-reported crash).

A driver with an alcohol concentration of point one-zero (0.10) (the legal limit in many States) or greater is seven times more likely to be involved in a fatal motor vehicle crash than is a driver who has not consumed alcoholic beverages. A driver with an alcohol concentration of 0.15 or greater is about 25 times more likely to be involved in a fatal motor crash.

From 1982 through 1995, the number of alcohol-related traffic fatalities decreased 31 percent, from 25,165 to 17,217.

Fatal crashes that occur at night, on weekends, and that involve only one vehicle have the highest percentage of alcohol involvement.

Men who die in motor vehicle crashes are almost two times more likely than women to be legally intoxicated.

Among drivers killed in motor vehicle crashes in 1995, the highest rates of alcohol intoxication were recorded for drivers 25 to 34-years of age (45.9 percent), followed by drivers aged 21 to 24 years (41.7 percent) and drivers 35 to 44 years of age (41.3 percent).

ALCOHOL-RELATED CRASH DEATHS: YOUTH AND YOUNG ADULTS

In 1994, 29 percent of the 2,610 traffic fatalities involving 15- to 17-year olds and 44 percent of the 3,616 traffic fatalities involving 18- to 20-year olds were alcohol-related.

Among young persons who drive after drinking alcohol, the relative risk of being involved in a crash is greater for young persons at all blood alcohol concentrations than it is for older persons.

ROLE OF OTHER DRUGS IN CRASH DEATHS

Drugs other than alcohol (e.g., marijuana and cocaine) have been identified in 18 percent of driver deaths. These drugs are generally used in combination with alcohol.

Most fatally injured drivers who have used drugs other than alcohol are males between the ages of 25 to 54.

ALCOHOL-RELATED CRASHES: FREQUENCY AND COST

Approximately 40 percent of persons will be involved in an alcohol-related crash during their lifetime.

In 1990, alcohol-related crashes cost $46.1 billion, including $5.1 billion in medical expenses.

DRINKING AND DRIVING: FREQUENCY AND CHARACTERISTICS OF DRINKING DRIVERS

In 1993, there were approximately 1.5 million arrests for driving under the influence of alcohol or narcotics in the United States.

Teenage and young adult drivers aged 16–29 years of age who have been arrested for driving while impaired are over four times more likely to die in future crashes involving alcohol than those who have not been arrested for drunk driving.

Adult drivers age 30 and older, who have been arrested for drunk driving, are over 11 times more likely to die in future crashes involving alcohol than those who have not been arrested.

Over 70 percent of drivers convicted of driving while impaired have serious drinking problems.

NATIONAL OBJECTIVES

By the year 2000, the U.S. Public Health Service wants to reduce alcohol-related motor vehicle crash deaths to no more than 5.5 per 100,000 population. (In 1994, the rate of deaths from these crashes was 6.4 per 100,000 population.)

By 2005, the U.S. Department of Transportation wants to reduce alcohol-related traffic fatalities to 11,000.

PROGRAMS AND POLICIES TO PREVENT ALCOHOL-IMPAIRED DRIVING

States lowering the legal BAC to 0.08 percent have experienced a 16 percent decline in the proportion of fatal crashes involving fatally injured drivers whose blood alcohol levels were 0.08 percent or higher and an 18 percent decline in the proportion of fatal crashes involving fatally injured drivers whose blood alcohol levels were 0.15 percent or higher, relative to other states who had not adopted these laws.

Raising the minimum drinking age to 21 years has been shown to reduce alcohol consumption among youth and significantly reduce crash deaths in the under-21 age group.

In one State, raising the minimum drinking age from 19 to 21 years resulted in a 38 percent decline in motor vehicle death rates among 19 and 20 year olds.

States lowering the legal BAC for drivers under age 21 years have experienced a 22 percent decline in deaths in single-vehicle crashes involving drivers 15–20 years of age compared to an only 2 percent decline in States that did not establish lower blood alcohol content for these drivers.

States that require the prompt suspension of the driver's license of persons who drive while intoxicated (i.e., administrative license revocation) have typically experienced a 6 percent decline in single-vehicle nighttime fatal crashes, crashes that typically involve alcohol.

Substance abuse treatment for DWI offenders has generally resulted in a 7- to 9-percent reduction in DWI recidivism.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL BLOOMBERG

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Mr. Michael Bloomberg on the occasion of his receiving the prestigious Herbert Lehman Award, presented by the American Jewish Committee. As a member of the tribute committee, I am well aware of Michael's leadership in civic and community service, as well as success in New York's financial community.

A 1964 graduate of Johns Hopkins University, and a 1966 graduate of Harvard Business School, Michael has achieved one success after another. Following graduation, Michael spent 6 years at Salomon Brothers where he

headed equity trading, sales, and systems development. During his tenure at Salomon Brothers, Michael created the company's first computerized information system. As Michael has said, ''There might be better traders than me, and there might be people who know more about computers, but there's nobody who knows more about both.''

At 39 years of age, Michael created the Bloomberg, would become the largest computerized information resource in the financial world. During the last 15 years, The Bloomberg Corp. has grown to include an internationally syndicated radio station, a direct broadcast television network, the Bloomberg monthly magazine, and of course, the Bloomberg on-line service. As Michael's company has grown, so have his revenues. Annual revenues rose from $100 million in 1989, to $2 billion in 1995.

Perhaps more important than his successes are his philanthropic endeavors. Among numerous other distinctions, he is a trustee of the Jewish Museum, the N.Y. Police & Fire Widows' and Children's Benefit Fund, the New York Academy of Medicine, and the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. He is also chairman of the board of trustees of Johns Hopkins University.

Michael Bloomberg has not only exerted tremendous influence on Wall Street; he has literally transformed the way the world does business. Traders now have instant access to a tremendous repository of information, not only real-time financial data, but also historical trends, corporate analysis, and new developments as well. Business transactions are now more efficient and more profitable because of Michael Bloomberg. For this, and many other reasons, Michael truly deserves the American Jewish Committee's Herbert H. Lehman Award.

TRIBUTE TO LYMAN BROWNFIELD ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of Ohio. Lyman Brownfield is retiring after decades of outstanding service as an attorney and community leader.

As Lyman retires, he can have the satisfaction of knowing that his career will stand as a hallmark for others to emulate. Over the years, both his clients and the citizens of the community have depended on him for assistance in solving problems and providing sound judgment on many issues in the region.

Lyman has always put forth a great amount of time and energy in vigorous support of his clients' causes and in community service. Long recognized as one of Ohio's most brilliant attorneys, he also took the time to train and help young lawyers to learn the skills of their profession. He served in many capacities in professional organizations and Government including exemplary service as general counsel of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. Speaker, we have often heard that America works because of the unselfish contributions of her citizens. I know that Ohio is a much better place to live because of the dedication and countless hours of effort given by Lyman Brownfield. While Lyman may be retiring he has left an indelible stamp on those who know him and on Ohio.

I ask my colleagues to join me in paying a special tribute to Lyman Brownfield's record of personal accomplishments and wishing him all the best in the years ahead.

MILESTONES 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the monthly publication Milestones as it marks its 10th anniversary as the premier publication for senior citizens in the Philadelphia region.

It is hard to believe that 10 years have passed since I first applauded the Milestones staff for having the vision to launch the first newspaper in the Philadelphia region which addresses the special needs, concerns, and interests of older Americans.

I was a junior Congressman, watching and learning from my esteemed colleague, the late Claude Pepper of Florida. As a staunch senior advocate, Congressman Pepper recognized the rights of retirees and senior citizens,and their need to have those rights protected and defended.

In many ways, Milestones became one of Congressman Pepper's early pioneers by heightening our awareness of senior citizens' issues. By seeing the needs of seniors, hearing their concerns and providing the outlet for them to share their ideas and opinions with other seniors, Milestones became the eyes, ears, and voice of the senior community.

Ten years later, Milestones maintains its unique position as a valuable information and communications source to this large and powerful segment of people in the Philadelphia area.

As the second oldest State, by population, in the country, Pennsylvania's senior citizen voice is powerful and strong. The Philadelphia region alone has one of the highest concentrations of older Americans in the country. One out of every five constituents in my congressional district is over the age of 65. This constituency is active, articulate, and passionately vocal about the issues affecting their lives.

Milestones has not only been their outlet for expressing opinions on issues like Medicare, Social Security, and health and long-term care concerns, but Milestones serves as a monitor of elected officials, informing readers about our positions and voting record with regard to seniors issues.

As a result, Milestones plays an important role in accurately portraying the senior community as the intelligent, active, unified, and legislatively powerful group it is. In doing so, Milestone helps dispel the stereotypes of older Americans—a positive and healthy reminder to people of all ages.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to represent in Congress a large number of men and women who read and contribute to this paper which is so valuable to the entire senior community. I ask you and my colleagues to support this commendation and congratulate Milestone on achieving its own 10-year milestone.

A SALUTE TO OUR NATION'S LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join others in the Nation who this week are recognizing our law enforcement officers for their role in protecting their respective communities. I would like to particularly recognize those officers of the sheriff's and police departments of Texas' district 30 which I represent, for I personally know of the distinction and valor with which they carry out their daily duties. Over the years, we have witnessed many of our communities—particularly in urban areas—undergo drastic change. With the scourges of crack, poverty and family dysfunction fraying the social fabric of our communities, law enforcement officers have been called upon to assume a greater responsibility for the safety of our neighborhoods.

Much has been said about the tensions that exist between law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve; however, I know that in communities such as Dallas and Irving, TX, the police departments are reaching out to neighborhood residents to establish partnerships in fighting crime and increasing community safety. Many of these policemen and policewomen are unsung heroes, who daily climb into their police cruisers, walk their neighborhood beats or ride their bicycles on patrol, each day knowing that they risk death or serious injury. While communities may be able to function without hostile corporate takeover specialists or sitcom stars, no community could function without a dedicated force of law enforcement personnel. It says something about our priorities as a society that—in spite of its indispensability—law enforcement is among the lowest paid professions.

I would also be remiss if I did not also recognize the husbands, wives and children of our law enforcement officers, the ones who stay home each day not knowing if their loved ones will be facing a life-threatening situation. Should anyone doubt the dangers of the job, they need only visit the National Peace Officers' Memorial in Washington, DC and read the names of those who have given their lives in service to their communities. The families of our peace officers deserve recognition for their steadfast support of their spouse or parent who is often under-appreciated and underpaid. We all should take the opportunity to let our law enforcement officers and their families know that their service and sacrifices are appreciated. As a Member of Congress, I pledge to continue work to enact legislation that aids our peace officers and law enforcement agencies in the performance of their duties. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I offer my heartfelt salute to our Nation's police officers, sheriff's deputies and highway patrol officers.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE FERRY INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION ACT

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the Ferry Intermodal Transportation Act. The ferry program in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA] is a small but vital program that has benefitted 38 States. Ferries are an essential component in many communities, providing vital transportation services for passengers, automobiles, buses and trucks in locations where there are no alternatives. Since ferries do not require costly infrastructure such as roads, bridges, or tunnels, there are great savings in time, capital, and environmental resources. Ferries are effective because they use nature's own highways, rivers, lakes, and bays.

Looking around the Nation, ferries are quietly and efficiently serving their communities. In the northeast, ferries are used in Maine, Massachusetts' Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket Islands, and New Jersey's Cape May. In the South, you will find ferries in Florida, Texas, Louisiana, and North Carolina, which has the most extensive commitment to the ISTEA ferry program. The Great Lakes have entire communities which are wholly dependent on ferries in places like Mackinaw Island, Beaver Island, and Washington Island. The West has the famous Catalina ferry in southern California and extensive fleets in the San Francisco Bay. The City of Seattle heavily depends on the Nation's largest capacity ferries to move citizens from Whitby Island and around the Puget Sound. The name, Alaskan Marine Highway System, underscores the importance of ferries to this huge State's transportation needs. Many cities like Boston, Baltimore, and Fort Lauderdale have found water taxis are an effective way to reduce congestion in heavily frequented tourist attractions. The transportation flexibility that ferries provide to communities has been proven time and again. In the most recent San Francisco earthquake, the combined ferry fleets completely took over the functions of the Bay Bridge and kept the Bay Area functioning. During the historic, massive flooding of the Mississippi River, the State of Missouri brought in ferries to replace bridges which had washed away. Time and again, in their quiet way ferries have shown themselves to be an economical, efficient, and effective means of transportation which deserve to be considered in transportation planning.

Let me illustrate what commuter ferry service in the New York Harbor means in my region. Since 1771, there has been a long history and great demand for inter-harbor ferry service. Alexander Hamilton and Aaron Burr ferried themselves here to Weehawken to fight their duel. John Stevens of New Jersey and Robert Fulton of New York competed in developing the steamboat in their efforts to dominate the ferry market and ultimately revolutionized the maritime industry. We have been through many transportation trends since that time: railroads, streetcars, subway, superhighways, and the era of great bridges and tunnels. Everything old is new again. Ferries, one of our oldest forms of transit in our region, is, when combined with the urban core mass transit project on the New Jersey side and the vast New York transit system, a seamless web of transportation options to get our people to their places of work and recreation.

The traffic congestion in our streets and on our bridges can only be reduced by the creative use of alternatives. The New York Harbor is now home to the largest and fastest growing network of commuter ferry services. Ferries connect two locations in Weehawken, three locations in Jersey City, Highlands and Atlantic Highlands in New Jersey with the Manhattan Central Business District, Staten Island, Brooklyn, Hunter's Point and Laggard airport in New York. Ferry ridership now exceeds 2.5 million passengers every year. By 2005, 8.5 million passengers will be using ferries annually.

Building on the vision that began in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA], I am proposing new legislative flexibility to help finance comprehensive ferry programs for the nation. We are reauthorizing the original ISTEA ferry program and creating new options for creative entrepreneurism for the financing and construction of ferry systems. This legislation would establish alternative financing for both public and private resources similar to those now used for mass transit. It directs transportation planners to incorporate ferry service in their regional transportation plans. It encourages public private partnerships, joint ventures and flexible options to maximize low cost efficient service.

ISTEA can be proud of the achievements that have been initiated. In the New York Harbor, the ISTEA ferry program was the source for grants of $1.7 million in loan guarantees for the construction of a new 399-passenger ferry; a total of $9.2 million in grants and loan guarantees provided by the Clinton administration through the ISTEA ferry program to improve commuter transportation in the New York/northern New Jersey metropolitan area. We must build on this legacy. The Ferry Intermodal Transportation Act is the renewal of this commitment. I urge its passage.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' DAY

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, as we honor our Nations' peace officers today, I rise today to honor an outstanding officer in my hometown of Fort Worth. This week, Brad Patterson was recognized as Fort Worth's Officer of the Year at the 45th annual Police Appreciation Dinner.

Brad is an example of an ordinary person doing extraordinary things. A 20-year veteran of the Fort Worth police force, Brad is a forensic crime-scene investigator who has expertise in fingerprint identification and in homicide investigation.

His selection for the award was unanimous. Fort Worth Chief of Police Thomas Windham praised Brad at the ceremony, echoing the strong sense of appreciation for Brad that we all have.

I came to know Brad during my years in the Fort Worth city government, first on the city council and then as mayor. And I can say from personal knowledge that Brad is a wonderful person, and I can't think of anyone more deserving of this award than he. Brad is an officer of courage and commitment, and man of conviction and character.

Brad Patterson, we in Congress salute you today, and peace officers from around the Nation, as we recognize your accomplishments on National Peace Officers' Day.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF EMERGENCY BROADCAST FREQUENCY ASSIGNMENT BILL

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, JULIAN DIXON, and I are frustrated by the failure of the Federal Communications Commission to act on applications from emergency broadcasters to use several unused common carrier frequencies. Because we are persuaded that the allocation of these frequencies is critical to protect the safety of our constituents and our police, we are introducing legislation establishing standards to assign them to emergency broadcasters in Southern California and the State of New Hampshire. In the absence of FCC action or the prospect for any action in the near future, this avenue seems to be the only way left for us to proceed.

The South Bay Regional Communications Authority [SBRCA], one of the petitioners to the FCC, is comprised of law enforcement and public safety agencies in the cities of El Segundo, Gardena, Hawthorne, and Manhattan Beach. Three of these cities are in my Congressional district.

In June 1995, the Authority filed an application with the FCC requesting assignment and authority to use four vacant Public Land Mobile Service [PLMS] channels for critical public safety communications needs.

In an order released April 24, 1996, the Commission denied the application. The Commission cited as its reason an ongoing ''refarming'' proceeding that will presumably benefit the Authority by increasing the number of frequencies devoted to emergency broadcast requirements. SBRCA appealed the decision and filed an application for reconsideration. That application is still pending.

What is disturbing about the decision is the reference to the ''refarming'' proceeding. ''Refarming'' may not be completed for several more years and, once announced, may require emergency broadcasters to purchase new equipment in order to avail themselves of the increased number of frequencies. In the meantime, public safety agencies, including the South Bay Authority, have a critical need for new frequencies. At present, there are no common police and fire voice channels available for interoperability among these agencies and neighboring jurisdictions in the South Bay. According to the police chiefs in my District, interoperability and greater capacity are among the most critical problems facing the Authority now.

Because the public safety cannot wait for the Commission to finalize its ''refarming'' proceeding, on at least two occasions, Mr. Dixon and other members of the LA County Congressional Delegation joined me in requesting

the Commission to review its rules so that the frequencies requested may be awarded to the Authority on a temporary basis.

Such a Commission decision is not unprecedented and occurred, for example, when the Commission granted a waiver to allow New York City area public safety agencies to use vacant UHF television channel 16 for land mobile operations. Granting a similar waiver and assigning additional frequencies would be invaluable to the Authority as it meets its obligations to protect the public safety.

In response, and clearly misunderstanding my reference to the New York City precedent, the Commission replied that the Authority had not requested the use of vacant UHF television channels.

The State of New Hampshire has had a similar request pending before the Commission for more than three years. The State wants to construct and operate a new statewide mobile radio system to serve the public safety needs of its citizens. The petition was denied in May, 1996, the Commission saying that these needs would be addressed in a yet-to-be-issued rulemaking concerning public safety spectrum needs through the year 2010.

Also weighing-in on this matter, and underscoring the importance to law enforcement nationwide, then-Deputy Attorney General Jamie Gorelick wrote to the Commission in support of South Bay's application. In her August, 1996 letter, Ms. Gorelick reiterated that from law enforcement's perspective the Commission's ''solution'' to increase spectrum availability is still several years away. ''In the meantime, law enforcement and public safety agencies in densely populated areas such as that served by South Bay are being faced with immediate and very real problem of insufficient spectrum.''

This should be a simple issue for the Commission. Under the policies outlined in its February 9, 1995 report on ''Meeting State and Local Agency Spectrum Needs Through the Year 2010,'' the FCC said that one of its policies is to handle critical public safety spectrum requirements on a case-by-case basis, including allowing the use of non-public safety frequencies where necessary. This seems to me to be a reasonable, common sense policy. The policy, however, has been implemented only in one recent instance involving a New York City request and, more recently, the FCC Wireless Bureau denied two similar requests, which are the basis of this legislation. This inconsistency raises questions about the adequacy of the FCC's existing policy and whether it is being applied in a fair and evenhanded manner.

Complicating this matter further is the Commission's just-announced plans for the transitioning to digital television and the reallocation for public safety use of 24 MHZ of spectrum—4 existing unused TV channels—in the lightly used Channel 60-to-69 range. Unfortunately, because of the understandable need to accommodate all existing Los Angeles area television stations, it now appears that the plan will not work in Los Angeles and that no channels in the 60-to-69 range will be available for public safety use. This makes the full implementation of the Commission's Policy Statement even more important. As the most spectrum-congested region in the country, the Commission must be in a position to use whatever tools are available to make vacant spectrum available to meet public safety needs in Los Angeles.

If there was ever a circumstance warranting application of Policy Statement's preference for case-by-case waivers, this is that circumstance. But both the New Hampshire and South Bay decisions by the Wireless Bureau seem to be premised on a contrary policy of handling spectrum use matters only through general allocation proceedings.

Let me quote from the decision ''In the Matter of License Communications Services, Inc. and South Bay Regional Public Communications Authority'' in which the FCC said that ''rather than undermine our existing allocations framework by permitting ad hoc private use of commercial spectrum, we believe the public interest is better served by increasing frequency availability through the rulemaking process.''

In the same order the FCC said ''the creation of additional 470–512 MHZ frequencies by the Commission's actions in our 'refarming' proceeding will benefit part 90 licensees, such as South Bay, that seek additional frequencies for system expansion. We, therefore, are denying the South Bay Petition for Waiver.''

Last, let me also quote from a May 1996 letter to me in which the FCC said ''South Bay will have increased opportunities to expand channel capacity within existing frequency allocation as a result of our 'refarming' proceeding.''

The Commission can't have it both ways. How can it square these inconsistent policy statements? How long do public safety agencies have to wait before the FCC makes up its mind as to which policy should prevail? Why can't the Commission grant operating authority, even interim authority, for the frequencies requested by South Bay Regional Communication Authority and the State of New Hampshire?

Mr. Speaker, the answer to these questions may be months, even years, away. Consequently, there is a need for the bill Mr. DIXON and I are introducing today. Emergency broadcasters in southern California and New Hampshire, and the public, have waited long enough.

SEEKING A JUST AND PEACEFUL RESOLUTION IN CYPRUS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cyprus problem has been a matter of concern to the U.S. Congress now in excess of twenty-two years. It is a situation that cries our for just redress and an end to the occupation of Cyprus by foreign troops. Although the world has dramatically changed for the better during this decade, Cyprus remains as a pressing international problem. Indeed Cyprus has almost become a codeword for intractability in the realm of diplomacy.

I have been encouraged, nevertheless, by recent statements from high level officials of the Clinton Administration, including the President himself, that indicate that there may be new willingness on the part of our government to exert its leadership in promoting a solution to the Cyprus problem. I strongly believe that our government should invest some of our prestige in such an effort, because Americans have always supported justice, and because we have significant interests that can be affected by instability in Cyprus.

Over the past year there have been a number of events and incidents that have increased tensions in Cyprus and in the Eastern Mediterranean region. There is a disturbing trend of increased militarization of the island, already one of the most highly militarized parts of the globe. There are, however, also positive developments that could act to catalyze a peaceful and just solution. One of these is the pending negotiation on Cyprus' accession to the European Union that may begin by the end of the year. There has been increased diplomatic activity in Europe and in the U.N. to bring the two sides together.

The Resolution I am introducing today points out the interests and developments regarding the Cyprus situation and urges the President to keep his pledge to give increased attention to Cyprus. I am pleased to be joined by a group of distinguished cosponsors, including Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ENGEL, and Mrs. MALONEY, that have shared an interest in Cyprus and the concern over what may arise from a continued stalemate on the island. It is our hope that this resolution will help spur the resolve of the Clinton Administration to indeed make 1997 the Year of Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, I request that a full text of H. Con. Res. 81 be inserted at this point in the record.

H. CON. RES. 81

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Calling for a United States initiative seeking a just and peaceful resolution of the situation on Cyprus.

Whereas the Republic of Cyprus has been divided and occupied by foreign forces since 1974 in violation of United Nations resolutions;

Whereas the international community, the Congress, and United States administrations have called for an end to the status quo on Cyprus, considering that it perpetuates an unacceptable violation of international law and fundamental human rights affecting all the people of Cyprus, and undermines significant United States interests in the Eastern Mediterranean region;

Whereas the international community and the United States Government have repeatedly called for the speedy withdrawal of all foreign forces from the territory of Cyprus;

Whereas there are internationally acceptable means to resolve the situation in Cyprus, including the demilitarization of Cyprus and the establishment of a multinational force to ensure the security of both communities in Cyprus;

Whereas the House of Representatives has endorsed the objective of the total demilitarization of Cyprus;

Whereas during the past year tensions on Cyprus have dramatically increased, with violent incidents occurring along ceasefire lines at a level not reached since 1974;

Whereas recent events in Cyprus have heightened the potential for armed conflict in the region involving two North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies, Greece and Turkey, which would threaten vital United States interests in the already volatile Eastern Mediterranean area and beyond;

Whereas a peaceful, just, and lasting solution to the Cyprus problem would greatly benefit the security, and the political, economic, and social well-being of all Cypriots, as well as contribute to improved relations between Greece and Turkey;

Whereas a lasting solution to the Cyprus problem would also strengthen peace and stability in the Eastern Mediterranean and serve important interests of the United States;

Whereas the United Nations has repeatedly stated the parameters for such a solution, most recently in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1092, adopted on December 23, 1996, with United States support;

Whereas the prospect of the accession by Cyprus to the European Union, which the United States has actively supported, could serve as a catalyst for a solution to the Cyprus problem;

Whereas President Bill Clinton has pledged that in 1997 the United States will ''play a heightened role in promoting a resolution in Cyprus''; and

Whereas United States leadership will be a crucial factor in achieving a solution to the Cyprus problem, and increased United States involvement in the search for this solution will contribute to a reduction of tensions on Cyprus: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) reaffirms its view that the status quo on Cyprus is unacceptable and detrimental to the interests of the United States in the Eastern Mediterranean and beyond;

(2) considers lasting peace and stability on Cyprus could be best secured by a process of complete demilitarization leading to the withdrawal of all foreign occupation forces, the cessation of foreign arms transfers to Cyprus, and providing for alternative internationally acceptable and effective security arrangements as negotiated by the parties;

(3) welcomes and supports the commitment by President Clinton to give increased attention to Cyprus and make the search for a solution a priority of United States foreign policy;

(4) encourages the President to launch an early substantive initiative, in close coordination with the United Nations, the European Union, and interested governments to promote a speedy resolution of the Cyprus problem on the basis of international law, the provisions of relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions, democratic principles, including respect for human rights, and in accordance with the norms and requirements for accession to the European Union;

(5) calls upon the parties to lend their full support and cooperation to such an initiative; and

(6) requests the President to report actions taken to give effect to the objectives set forth in paragraph (4) in the bimonthly report on Cyprus transmitted to the Congress.

MILITARY HEALTH CARE CHOICE ACT

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce the Military Health Care Choice Act of 1997. Under this bill, the families of our service men and women and military retirees and their families will be able to choose a health plan in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program in lieu of military health care.

This reform is necessary, Mr. Speaker, because for these individuals the military health care system is broken. In 1994, General Shalikashvili acknowledged this. He said the military health care system covering them is—and I quote—''headed toward a cliff.''

Last year, the Civil Service Subcommittee, which I chair, held a hearing on improving access to health care for military families. We heard horror stories describing the problems the current military health care system has caused military families. One witness was the wife of an Air Force Master Sergeant. When she became pregnant, she chose the hospital at Andrews Air Force Base to care for her and deliver her baby. But just 5 weeks before her due date, she was told that Andrews would no longer treat her or deliver her baby. There was a quota on deliveries at Andrews, and hers would be over the limit. She was left on her own to find doctors who were qualified under CHAMPUS and would accept CHAMPUS fees and to make arrangements for the delivery.

Another witness, the widow of a retired marine major, described the substandard care her husband had received under the system for military retirees. Her terminally ill husband was initially denied cancer medication because the VA hospital treating him said it would rather spend $3,000 on aspirin for 3,000 men than on chemotherapy for one. When the witness herself needed surgery for possible breast cancer, she needed the permission of the military base near her home. The base said no, but provided no military alternative. She had the surgery done, but she and her husband had to foot the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the hearing record contains many more such examples. I urge my colleagues to read it.

Just yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I learned of yet another atrocious example from a military retiree. For 3 years, his wife had been treated by a VA hospital for a series of debilitating brain tumors. Then, on a cold, wet, windy night, that hospital refused to treat her when she was seriously ill, and demanded that she go to an army hospital 12 miles away. The VA hospital refused to call an ambulance, and even threatened to have her and her husband arrested for trespassing when he resisted leaving. Her husband drove her the 12 miles to the Army hospital through a raging rain storm.

The Army hospital also refused to treat her, sending her back to the very VA hospital that had turned her away. She was then admitted to that hospital and spent 3 weeks in intensive care.

This retiree also points out that his copayments under the military health care systems can reach as high as $7,500—pretty tough medicine on his $13,000 annual income

When we needed them, these individuals did not ration their devotion to duty and to the Nation. When they need us we must not ration their health care.

I urge Members to join me in making this benefit available to those whom we owe so much.

NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL DAY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National Peace Officers' Memorial Day and pay tribute to our fallen brothers and sisters.

I would especially like to pay tribute to the seven officers in Georgia who made the ultimate sacrifice—giving their lives in the line of duty during the last year. Officers Dennis Cader, Richard Cash, Brett Dickey, George Hester, Victor Pimentel, Durwin Potts, and Scott Smith served their communities with courage and valor while protecting the women and men of Georgia.

Every day the law enforcement community stands on the front line ready to serve and protect you and me. It is only fitting that we pay tribute to them today. We in Congress should support all initiatives that take violent criminals and those who pose a threat off the street. Additionally, the American people should show support and respect for these brave frontline officers. All too often we take law enforcement officers and the job they do for granted. However, much of our peace of mind as we walk our streets is a direct result of the work they do to protect us. With this in mind, I strongly encourage more community law enforcement partnerships.

Officers from all across the country traveled to Washington, DC this week to celebrate National Police Week, which culminates with National Peace Officers' Memorial Day. Hundreds of law enforcement personnel and family members of the fallen officers stood on the west front of the Capitol today to bid a final farewell to their comrades who fell in the last year. They will also stand at the National Law Enforcement Officers' Memorial tomorrow evening to participate in a candlelight vigil to honor and celebrate the lives of these brave officers.

We thank the families who stood and continue to stand by their loved ones while they put their lives on the line for us. Our prayers are with you and we join with you to celebrate their great work. Our Nation is greatly enriched by the contributions of these great men and women.

MY GOOD FRIEND, THE PRESIDENT OF TAIWAN

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, I had the opportunity to visit Taiwan and I became an admirer of President Lee Teng-hui. He was graceful, charismatic, knowledgable, and visionary as well. He deeply impressed me with his firm grasp of world events as he articulated his vision of a modern Taiwan that is economically prosperous, politically free and internationally respected.

President Lee has certainly maintained Taiwan's spectacular economic growth. Politically he has introduced many reforms, including the upcoming debate on Taiwan's constitution. In terms of achieving greater international recognition for Taiwan, I have learned that Foreign Minister John Chang is succeeding in making the world see the injustices of excluding Taiwan, a major economic power, from many important international organizations. As for Taiwan's relationship with the United States, Taiwan certainly has many friends on Capitol Hill due to the efforts of Ambassador Jason Hu and his staff.

Congratulations to my good friend, the President of Taiwan, on the occasion of his

first anniversary of his first elected term of office. He will always have my support and best wishes.

SALUTE TO A FRIEND—JOHN K. MEAGHER

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my congratulations to my great friend, John K. Meagher, who has recently been named the managing director of the newly established Tax & Trade Group at Cassidy and Associates.

John has had a distinguished career which began when he and I served side-by-side on the staff of our own Congressman, former Rep. Alexander Pirnie of New York. We spent 5 years as colleagues and grew to be best friends. We have remained so to this day.

John was always interested in the law and has served with distinction as Republican counsel to the Ways and Means Committee, as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under Secretaries Baker and Brady as a partner in the law firm of Le Boeuf, Lamb, Greene and Mac Rae.

He not only understands the law, he understands the Congress and the executive branch as well. He's been both places as a junior staffer and as a high official. He knows us and how we work.

As he and his colleagues in the Tax & Trade Group embark on their new and exciting venture, I wish my friend well.

IN HONOR OF CHARLES BENDHEIM

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note with great sorrow the passing of Charles Bendheim, philanthropist, Israeli patriot, husband, brother, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. He passed away last Friday at his home in Jerusalem. He will be missed.

Mr. Bendheim was born in Brooklyn, NY, in 1917. During the Israeli War of Independence, he helped the Hagana obtain arms for the new country. He remained deeply involved with the new nation for the rest of his life.

Just before he died, Mr. Bendheim was cited as a Ne'eman Yerushalayim by the city of Jerusalem. This award, making him an ''Honorary Fellow of the City of Jerusalem,'' has been bestowed on only 15 other people. At a special ceremony in the Jerusalem City Hall, Mayor Olmert declared: ''For fifty years you have worked tirelessly for Jerusalem—for its hospitals, educational institutions and the economic development of the city.'' Indeed he did. And he was just as active here in the United States.

Mr. Bendheim served as a member of the board and the executive committee of Yeshiva University. He served as chairman of the board at Manhattan Day School. He was involved in many other charitable organizations in his 79 years—too many to list here.

Mr. Bendheim will be fondly remembered at the schools he helped, at the Shaare Zedek Medical Center in Jerusalem whose new building he helped build as chairman of the board, and the other institutions that his philanthropy benefited. But the way Charles Bendheim will be remembered best is through the family he left behind. Besides his wife and sister, Mr. Bendheim leaves behind 7 children, 45 grandchildren, and 21 great-grandchildren.

By dedicating his life to serving his community, Charles Bendheim became a role model for generations here and in Israel. His children have followed in his footsteps, playing important roles in their communities. The Bendheim family continues to be involved in many schools, hospitals, religious institutions, and numerous other charitable organizations in the United States and Israel.

Mr. Speaker, the world is a little darker this week. The light that was Charles Bendheim has been dimmed. But through his work and family, he will live on forever. He will not be forgotten.

THE LOSS OF THE ''FAMILY HOUR''

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1997

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, where has the ''family hour'' gone? What happened to the wholesome series such as ''The Cosby Show'' and ''Happy Days?'' Vulgar language and sexual material have invaded the time slot between 8 and 9 pm in unprecedented volume, rendering the ''family hour'' nearly obsolete. A February 1997 study which analyzed television shows during a 4-week period found one-third of the programs to contain obscene language and another third to contain sexual references.

I am appalled by the subject material which has become acceptable during the ''family hour.'' But even more than that, I am outraged that the networks have become so concerned with ratings that family values have gone by the wayside in favor of programs focusing on premarital sex, violence, and homosexuality. The fact is that the networks may be misguided thinking that this is what an American audience wants to watch. One of the highest rated shows, Touched by an Angel, focuses on heart-felt themes and teaching good values.

Mr. Speaker, more than 90 percent of Americans believe in God. But when was the last time we saw a television character go to a priest or a rabbi to seek counsel in making one of life's difficult decisions? I can't say that I've ever seen this on prime-time television.

We are inundated by sex and violence on television. I don't feel comfortable sitting down to watch television with my grandchildren anymore. Even with the new television ratings system, programs rated G and PG contain sex and obscenities unsuitable for our children and grandchildren.

The family hour picture is bleaker than ever before. The ratings system is poorly applied and the networks appear to have little desire to clean up their act. The anything goes mentality has come to replace one in which core family values are of central importance. I urge the networks to reevaluate their priorities. A return to the family hour might be just the ticket to both higher ratings and more well-grounded American values.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HIGHWAY RESTORATION ACT

HON. RAY LaHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I along with Congressman LIPINSKI and ten other colleagues are introducing the Highway Restoration Act. This bill will address the tremendous need that has arisen for the maintenance and restoration of our Interstate Highway System.

The National Highway System is second to none in its ability to provide an efficient and safe network of roads, highways, and bridges linking the country together. Its existence has been crucial to our national defense and to interstate commerce. The System that we know today was largely the result of President Eisenhower's leadership and foresight, and just last year, we celebrated its 40th anniversary.

Unfortunately, many pieces of this 42,000-mile system are getting old and in need of repair. Current Federal programs for interstate maintenance and restoration do not adequately address the growing costs and needs associated with our aging highways. That is why I have introduced the Highway Restoration Act of 1997. This bill calls for funding the Discretionary Interstate Resurfacing, Restoration, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Program [I–4R] at $800 million per year. The I–4R Program is the Federal discretionary program responsible for helping States maintain our highways, and it is separate from the Interstate Maintenance Program [IM] which distributes funds to the States based on a formula.

An adequately funded I–4R Program is necessary to ensure the longevity of our Interstate Highway System, because it allows factors, other than lane miles and vehicle miles traveled, to be taken into account when funds are distributed. Such factors for which the I–4R Program is able to account, include: The need to complete a project in a short period of time in order to reduce or minimize traffic disruptions; a particularly costly section of highway; traffic congestion caused by repair work; and delays in construction. The I–4R Program gives States the flexibility they need to effectively manage the repairs and preservation of our highways. Thus, sufficient funding for this program is crucial if we are to prolong the lifespan of our Interstate System, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me as a cosponsor of this important piece of legislation.

HONORING THE QUENTIS B. GARTH FOUNDATION, INC.

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Quentis B. Garth Foundation, Inc., which has served youths in the Chicagoland

community for the past 2 years. This foundation has worked hard to see that the dream of a college education is not out of the grasp of any deserving young student.

From its inception in May 1995, the foundation has granted annual scholarships to academically gifted and underprivileged students pursuing a college education. This year the foundation's $15,000 scholarship award will be granted to 5 academically gifted students in Chicago-area high schools, and another $75,500 will be distributed among 15 1995–96 scholarship awardees, currently pursuing studies at some of the most prestigious universities in the Nation.

These awards have been a blessing to many students and their families, but the benefits of this scholarship program reach far beyond the individual student's home. The surrounding community and our Nation at large will benefit from the quality education and training that these students receive.

It brings me great pleasure to honor the Quentis B. Garth Foundation today. I am certain that their good work will continue to enrich all of our students and our lives for many years to come.

U.S. ASSISTANCE IN SUPPORT OF ECONOMIC REFORM IN ARMENIA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have exchanged correspondence over the past 2 years with the executive branch on the question of how our assistance programs help to promote the United States objective of economic reform in Armenia. In recent months, I have exchanged correspondence with the Agency for International Development [AID], pertaining to its plan to provide a $30 million grant to Armenia during fiscal year 1997 to purchase natural gas. It is my firm belief that U.S. assistance to each of the New Independent States should, whenever possible, be conditioned on the achievement of specific reform objectives.

The text of a March 7, 1997 letter from AID, my reply of March 19, and AID's reply of April 16 follow:

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, DC, March 7, 1997.

Hon. LEE HAMILTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: As a follow-up to staff discussions on January 3, 1997, with Mr. Kupchan on the FY 1997 Armenia natural gas program, I am writing to confirm that our provision of natural gas commodity assistance to Armenia is contingent on significant energy sector reforms.

Ambassador Tomsen has recently communicated to the Prime Minister and Minister of Energy that the provision of FY 1997 natural gas would require: (1) evidence of progress in implementing conditions contained in last year's agreement, e.g., creation of an independent energy regulatory authority; and (2) commitment to new conditions that deepen and broaden the movement to restructure and privatize the energy sector. Furthermore, we are coordinating this position closely with the World Bank as well as introducing elements that go beyond the World Bank's conditions.

If you should require more detailed information, my staff are available to discuss our position and progress in obtaining energy reforms.

Sincerely,

THOMAS A. DINE.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 19, 1997.

Hon. THOMAS DINE,
Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Europe and the NIS, USAID, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DINE: Thank you for your letter of March 7 regarding the Armenia natural gas program and the reforms upon which this agreement would be contingent.

I support your decision not to release the $30 million until: (1) the government of Armenia provides evidence of implementing conditions contained in last year's agreement, and (2) Armenia commits to new conditions which go beyond the World Bank's conditions.

However, I would appreciate receiving more detailed information on both issues before I could support providing another round of funding for fuel. First, what progress has Armenia made, in AID's view, on complying with last years' agreements? According to a letter of April 3, 1996 from Assistant Secretary Barbara Larkin to me, the US was to seek Armenian agreement to increase tariffs in the private sector, pursue energy sector reform in parliament, and reform the gas sector. Your letter of March 7, 1997 mentions creation of an independent energy regulatory authority as a US goal. Where are we on these issues?

Second, if this year's $30 million award goes forward, what specific conditionality *over and above* that already in World Bank agreements, will US assistance be contingent upon? What steps will you insist that Armenia take to deepen and broaden the movement to restructure and privatize the energy sector?

I look forward to working with you on this issue and other matters pertaining to NIS assistance.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Ranking Democratic Member.

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, DC, April 16, 1997.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: We appreciate your continuing interest in the Armenia energy program and wish to reconfirm that our provision of natural gas commodity assistance to Armenia is contingent upon significant energy sector reforms.

As requested in your letter of March 19, 1997, to Assistant Administrator Tom Dine, I would like to highlight some of the significant progress Armenia is making in achieving energy sector reforms. Tariffs have been raised and are on a path to economic cost recovery, a goal that may be reached in early 1998. The Armenian Government recently completed its first round of privatization in the power sector, focused on small hydropower plants. Although the Energy Law has not yet passed, the Law was submitted to Parliament March 31 and should be acted upon shortly. Meanwhile, the Government of Armenia has just issued a presidential decree acceptable to both the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the World Bank establishing an independent energy regulatory body. The new regulatory body will play a critical, catalytic role in further movement toward a financially-viable, market-oriented utility system. According to USAID energy advisors who have worldwide experience, both the decree and the Energy Law are superior to those enacted in other NIS and Eastern European countries.

We have established new covenants in connection with the provision of natural gas in 1997 that go beyond the conditions set by the World Bank. These conditions relate to:

Full implementation of the aforementioned regulatory body;

Establishment of a financial settlement process and procedures for improving cash flow in the power sector;

Consolidation of power distribution companies to a reasonable number;

The formation of power sector joint stock companies with corporate charters;

Development of an action plan for further privatization;

Promotion of a Petroleum Law to encourage foreign investment; and

Implementation of a least-cost power investment plan to provide replacement power for the Armenia Nuclear Power Plant.

We have discussed these covenants with the Government of Armenia and expect them to agree to these covenants in the very near future.

The 1996 delivery of gas to Armenia amounted to $15 million, which purchased 201 million cubic meters or about 33 percent of Armenia's total annual gas use. Due to changes in international gas prices, this year's $30 million should purchase about 290 million cubic meters, which could represent from 25 to 50 percent of Armenia's 1997 gas imports, depending on future industrial demand, next winter's severity, and alternate energy supplies.

If you should require more information, please let us know.

Sincerely,

ROBERT K. BOYER,
Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID HARRIS

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor David Harris of Dixon, CA. David Harris has served as the city manager for the city of Dixon for 19 years, from June, 1978, to July, 1997.

During David Harris' career as city manager to the city of Dixon, he placed the city of Dixon on the map. Dixon grew from a population of 6,031 in 1978 to a population of 13,078 in 1997. Furthermore, the city's area increased from 3.2 square miles in 1978 to 6.5 square miles in 1997.

He served under Mayors Maureen Southwell, Marime Burton-Halloran, Joe Anderson, Richard Brians, and Don Erickson.

David Harris oversaw the planning and development of Dixon City Hall in 1981, the Senior Multi-Use Center in 1987, the Council Chambers in 1988, the Dixon Police Station in 1991, and the Dixon Fire Station in 1997.

In addition, he is credited with creating the city of Dixon's logo, overseeing the planning and development of Northwest Park, and all the major renovations of Hall Park. Under David Harris' leadership, the first traffic signal was installed at the corner of North Adams

Street and West A Street in 1990, and the first computer for the city was purchased.

David Harris was involved in forming the Joint Powers Authority with Solano Irrigation District for Water Service, and was instrumental in developing the Joint Powers Authority with the city of Vacaville, which has resulted in over 1,000 acres being placed in permanent open space. Known as the Vacaville-Dixon Greenbelt, this agreement received statewide recognition for its commitment to preserving agricultural land.

Throughout his years of service to the city, David Harris has seen the adoption of three General Plans, the Central Dixon Redevelopment Project, the Economic Development Plan, the Dixon Downtown Revitalization Plan, Certification of the Housing Element, Specific Plans for various areas of the city, and major infrastructure master plans.

In addition to his successful career as the city manager, David Harris has been an active member of the Dixon community and the entire region. He has served as a board member and past president of the Sutter Davis Hospital for 9 years, has been a member of Rotary for 19 years, and has been active in the Boy Scouts of America. He has raised five children, all of whom have attended local schools.

During his 19 years of service to Dixon, David Harris has been an outstanding city manager, leading the city to achieve countless goals, and implement plans which will benefit future generations of Dixon citizenry. His presence in city hall, and his role as city manager will be truly missed by many members of the Dixon community and surrounding areas.

WEI JINGSHENG: A PRISONER OF CONSCIENCE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with you and my colleagues, my support for the release of Wei Jingsheng, one of the world's most important political prisoners and certainly the strongest voice of China's democracy movement.

Today, Wei Jingsheng continues to serve a 14-year prison sentence because he chose to stand up against tyranny and advocate democracy for China. He chose to be on the side of human rights. He chose to act on his beliefs for the betterment of his people and for that, he has been made to suffer.

I am sure you are familiar with the history behind Wei Jingsheng's imprisonment.

Wei was first imprisoned from 1979 to 1993 on charges of counterrevolutionary propaganda and incitement. He was accused of passing a military secret he had seen in the Chinese news media, to a foreign journalist. He was arrested in conjunction with his participation in the 1979 democracy wall movement, during which he argued that the government's modernization plans were impossible without democratic reform. He was sentenced to 15 years in prison.

In 1993, he was released from prison and continued speaking out for democracy and human rights, advocating an open and peaceful campaign for change. However, in April 1994, Wei was detained again and held in incommunicado detention for 20 months. This would soon be followed by a formal arrest, charges, and after given a 1-day trial, conviction, and sentencing. We cannot allow this injustice to continue.

Wei Jingsheng is the 1994 Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights Award laureate as well as the recipient of last year's Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought which was bestowed upon him by the European Parliament. He received the 1993 Gleitsman Foundation International Activist Award, and since 1995, has been nominated every year for the Nobel Peace Prize.

This week marked the publication of his book, ''The Courage to Stand Alone: Letters from Prison and Other Writings,'' the first book-length collection of Mr. Wei's letters and other writings. How fitting it would be to do the right thing, to do the human thing, and set this man free.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues here in the Congress to do all within its power to grant Wei Jingsheng's release. He should be a prisoner of conscience no more.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AIRLINE PASSENGER SAFETY ACT

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to promote greater safety in commercial aviation. The Airline Passenger Safety Act would require commercial flights to carry adequate medical supplies and equipment to deal with in-flight medical emergencies.

As a frequent traveler of our commercial airlines, I know how important safe air travel is. Yet every year, passengers on U.S. airlines die in the air because the medicine or equipment that could have saved their lives were not on board the plane. Today, we have the technology to deal with in-flight medical emergencies, such as sudden cardiac arrest. But we do not have a requirement that planes carry this life-saving equipment. In fact, we do not even require airlines to keep records of in-flight medical emergencies.

Technology to deal with sudden cardiac arrest has come a long way. Today's automatic external defibrillators [AED's] are smaller, lighter and more durable and with appropriate training, can be used by anyone. This past fall, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration approved the use of these devices for commercial aircraft. To increase passenger safety, we need AED's aboard our commercial airlines.

I am introducing this legislation which would improve the chances of survival for passengers in the case of an in-flight medical emergency, like a sudden cardiac arrest. My bill would require air carriers to establish steps to be taken in the event of an emergency. It would also require airplanes to carry an automatic external defibrillator and require each member of the flight crew to be trained in CPR and in the use of an AED. Since there is no method of recording in-flight emergencies, my legislation would also mandate that air carriers describe what happened and what actions were taken to assist the passenger in the event of an in-flight medical emergency and report the incident to the Secretary of Transportation so the public can be fully aware of the number of in-flight medical emergencies that occur each day. I have also included a ''Good Samaritan'' provision which exempts from liability both the airlines and passengers who step forward to offer assistance during an in-flight medical emergency.

I think it is time that our airlines provide the safest possible travel for all passengers. As a frequent flyer, I think we all deserve to travel on a plane that is stocked with medical supplies and equipment and to travel with a flight crew that is prepared to handle medical emergencies, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING MANUAL HIGH SCHOOL'S BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. RAY LaHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a high school basketball team in my hometown of Peoria, IL. The Peoria Manual Rams won their fourth consecutive Illinois State title, with a final record of 31–1. Consequently, they were recently named the high school boys' basketball national champions by USA Today. In the 90-year history of Illinois high school basketball, no team had ever won four consecutive State championships.

In addition, Manual captain Sergio McClain, a team leader all 4 years, became only the second Peoria area player to win the coveted title of Illinois' Mr. Basketball. This award recognizes not only his athletic skills, but also the inspiration and leadership he provided his team throughout the year.

The team is led by head coach Wayne McClain, and All-American center Marcus Griffin, All-State guard Frank Williams, and Mr. Basketball Sergio McClain. The other title winners on the team are: Greg Andrews, Marlon Brooks, Creston Coleman, Drake Ford, Jerron Hobson, Robert Johnson, Jerral Page, Alphonso Pollard, and Alex Stephens.

The city of Peoria is very proud of the Manual Rams, only the second Illinois team to win the national title. Coach McClain and the Rams have proven that teamwork, dedication, and sportsmanship are still an important part of high school athletics. Perhaps we can all learn from their example.

AWARD WINNING STUDENTS OF WOODBRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, on April 26–29, 1997, outstanding people from 50 schools throughout the Nation came to our Nation's Capital to compete in the national finals of the We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution program. I am proud to announce that the class from Woodbridge High School in Bridgeville represented Delaware. These young scholars worked diligently to reach the

national finals by winning local competitions in their home State.

The distinguished members of the team representing Delaware are: Stephanie Adams, Gwen Bishop, Janelle Cannon, Josh Chaney, Mark Curlett, Sonya Dean, Maria Diaz, Jammie Dougherty, Leslie Elliott, Jane Kroeger, Stephanie Lane, Melissa Moore, Doug Neal, Jared Pinkerton, Justin Pinkey, Tammi Quillen, Billy Rust, Daniel Stogner, Allison Tatman, Randi Toomey, Christy Vanderwende, Roy Walder, and Crystal Yoder.

I would also like to recognize their teacher, Barbara Hudson, who deserves much of the credit for the success of the team. The district coordinator, Diane Courtney, and the State coordinator, Lewis Huffman, also contributed a significant amount of time and effort to help the team reach the national finals.

The We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution program, supported and funded by Congress, is the most extensive educational program in the country developed specifically to educate young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The 3-day national competition simulates a congressional hearing in which students' oral presentations are judged on the basis of their knowledge of constitutional principles and their ability to apply them to historical and contemporary issues.

Administered by the Center for Civic Education, the We the People . . . program, now in its 9th academic year, has provided curricular materials at upper elementary, middle, and high school levels for more than 60,000 teachers, 22,000 schools, and 22 million students nationwide.

The We the People . . . program provides an excellent opportunity for students to gain an informed perspective about the history and principles of our Nation's constitutional government. I wish these young constitutional experts the best of luck and look forward to their future participation in politics and government. Congratulations again to the team from Woodbridge High School of Bridgeville, DE.

A NEW POLICY NEEDED FOR CUBA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention my monthly newsletter on foreign affairs from April 1997 entitled ''A New Policy Needed for Cuba.''

I ask that this newsletter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

A NEW POLICY NEEDED FOR CUBA

For more than three decades, the United States has embargoed Cuba in an unsuccessful effort to force Fidel Castro from power. Last year, in the wake of Cuba's brutal shoot down of private U.S. planes in international airspace, Congress passed the Helms-Burton law, which tightened the economic sanctions. Opponents of the law feared it would hurt the Cuban people, not Castro. A year's experience shows they were right. Helms-Burton has helped Castro, weakened his opponents, brought more misery to ordinary Cubans and damaged relations with our closest allies and trading partners. We need a new policy to promote a peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba.

HELMS-BURTON'S REACH

The Helms-Burton law tightens the noose on Cuba in two key ways. First, it grants U.S. citizens the right to bring suit in U.S. courts against foreign companies that have invested in or profited from expropriated properties in Cuba. (President Clinton has delayed the effect of this provision.) Second, the law bars from the United States corporate officers, principals, and shareholders (and their families) of any company that invests in expropriated property in Cuba. This law and U.S. policy limits sharply all contact between the United States and the Cuban people.

By isolating Cuba and tightening sanctions, Helms-Burton is supposed to move Cuba toward democracy. Rather than promoting peaceful change in Cuba, the law is hurting the Cuban people. Castro wants to stay in power, and this law helps him: Using the law as justification, Castro has cracked down on journalists and dissidents, solidifying his own position while suppressing the opposition. Cuba's dissidents refer derisively to it as the Helms-Burton-Castro Act.

Helms-Burton also gives Castro a new scapegoat for his economic failures. It eases pressure on him to open up the state-run economy. Modest reforms in Cuba before Helms-Burton have since been stymied. Cuba is not moving toward democracy and free markets—it is moving in the opposite direction.

HUMANITARIAN IMPACT

Helms-Burton is also hurting ordinary Cubans. The embargo, tightened in the 1992 Cuban Democracy Act and codified and reaffirmed in Helms-Burton, has had a negative impact on the health of the Cuban people. Licensing requirements and outright prohibitions of sales to Cuba have drastically limited Cuban access to U.S.-produced medicines and medical equipment. According to recent studies, the health of women and children in particular has suffered as a result of Cuba's inability to obtain medicines. While Cuba's health problems are mostly the fault of Castro's disastrous policies, the U.S. denial of medicines and medical supplies has contributed to Cuba's deteriorating health.

Donations from the American people—who donate more to Cuba than anyone in the world—are also inhibited by current U.S. policy. Humanitarian missions to Cuba must fly through third countries. American citizens cannot send prescriptions or money to their family members in Cuba without an export license. In a country so clearly in need, it cannot be in the interest of the United States to delay or inhibit the provision of humanitarian supplies to Cubans.

RIFTS IN RELATIONS

No country in the world follows the U.S. embargo of Cuba. While Helms-Burton was intended to isolate Castro, it has isolated the United States, creating great rifts with our closest friends and allies. The European Union (EU), Latin America and Canada have condemned Helms-Burton. All object to the extraterritorial application of U.S. law, under which their citizens and companies are subject to penalty in the United States for their actions in Cuba.

Helms-Burton also spurred a challenge to the United States in the new World Trade Organization (WTO). The United States has persuaded the EU to back away from a WTO case for now and seeks to resolve the dispute through direct negotiations. But if these talks fail, proponents of Helms-Burton want the United States to walk away from any WTO proceeding by arguing Helms-Burton is a national security matter over which the WTO has no jurisdiction. This approach would weaken the international trading system, which benefits the United States, and set a dangerous precedent: Any country could cite national security to justify protectionism, which costs U.S. jobs.

Helms-Burton has created other tensions. Canada and Mexico—our nearest neighbors and first and third largest trading partners—are contemplating a case against the United States under NAFTA.

RETHINKING CUBA POLICY

The United States should learn from its successful engagement with Eastern Europe. Communist regimes there fell not because they were isolated, but because they were penetrated by people, new ideas, and commerce. Our policy of engagement with China is based on the same view, and we should follow the same approach with Cuba. The Pope, who is traveling to Cuba early next year, is right to engage the Cuban people directly, as he did the people of Eastern Europe. He is not trying to isolate them or coerce them. Washington would be wise to follow. We should repeal Helms-Burton, restart direct flights, lift travel and currency restrictions, and begin exchanges, dialogue and humanitarian relief for the Cuban people. Step by step, we should lift the embargo in response to positive change in Cuba.

CONCLUSION

Helms-Burton has been a mistake. It has not brought change to Cuba. Instead, it has strengthened Castro and inhibited a peaceful transition to democracy and free markets. It has brought hardship to the Cuban people by denying them food and medicine. It has split us from the rest of the hemisphere, and forced us into fights with our allies and trading partners. It has threatened our leadership in the international trading system. Most important of all, it has made it more likely that change, when it comes to Cuba, will neither be peaceful nor democratic.

ISLANDERS OF THE YEAR

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. UNDERWOOD Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Latte Magazine's Islanders of the Year, Mr. and Mrs. Jose and Rufina Tainatongo of Piti, Guam. Mr. and Mrs. Tainatongo were nominated by other Guam residents for this recognition based on their 13-year commitment in helping house foster children on Guam. Mr. & Mrs. Tainatongo have long been active in their community. In fact, Mr. Tainatongo ran a recent campaign for mayor of Piti.

The following is the text of a story based on an interview with the Tainatongos. This story was published in the April 1997 edition of Latte magazine.

[From Latte Magazine, April 1997]

JOSE AND RUFINA TAINATONGO

In 1984, a Child Protective Services worker told Jose and Rufina Tainatongo the agency desperately needed foster parents, and asked them to consider taking in kids.

Rufina was still deciding on her answer when the worker brought a couple of kids to her door two weeks later. She decided then and there: ''The Lord says let the children come to me. I (couldn't) say no.''

Thirteen years later, the Piti couple have been parents to 47 foster children. In their

late 50's they also have five kids of their own ranging in age from 21 to 36.

''We consider (the foster children) our very own as well,'' says Rufina. Their biological children treated the foster kids as siblings with the usual ups and downs of childhood, she says. It hasn't always been easy; a one time they had 12 foster children at once!

Some of the foster children measure their stay in weeks, others in months, and a few others in years. One 16 year-old girl currently living with them has been with them for 10 years. The children all call them mom and dad, and Rufina proudly carries their pictures in her wallet. Some of the foster children now have kids of their own, and the Tainatongo count five of them as their foster grandchildren.

While they do receive some compensation from the government as foster parents. ''My payment is when the children appreciate what I've done,'' Rufina says. ''The best (part of being a foster parent) is when the kids appreciate and remember you, they talk to you about their experiences.''

Asked where she gets the patience to deal with all those children. Rufina replies with a beatific smile, ''The Blessed Mother.''

Mr. Speaker, Latte Magazine should be commended for honoring the Tainatongos and the other finalists for Islanders of the Year. These included the following individuals:

Tom Ahillen, the general manager for Matson Guam actively serves on the Gift of Life, a non profit organization created to facilitate blood donations for the local hospital.

Anita Sukola, a local Guam attorney provides pro-bono legal representation to disadvantaged persons, many of them victims of abuse.

Dr. Carolyn Hilt, a longtime island educator is the co-founder of the Micronesian Evangelical Mission and the Evangelical Christian Academy, now a premier educational institution on Guam.

Sister Eileen Mearns, the director of the Alee Shelter, a shelter for abused women and children on Guam, is unwavering in her support and advocacy for her clients. Many of them come to her in desperation and in need of protection and assistance.

I know that these individuals serve as fine examples of the generosity and dedication that many in our country still have. I hope that others take notice of their contributions to society and follow in their example. Congratulations to them all.

TRIBUTE TO HON. NOEL WATKINS

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable Noel Watkins. Mr. Watkins is retiring from his position as superior court judge of Tehama County, CA.

Mr. Watkins was born in Alturas, CA, in October 1932, a descendent of pioneer ranchers. In his early years he attended public school in Chico and continued on to Chico State College where he received a bachelor's degree in political science with honors. After graduation he married Mary Jane Carpenter, native of Tehama County. His academic pursuits led him on to the University of California at Berkeley, Boalt Hall School of Law, where in 1957 he was admitted to the California Bar.

Mr. Watkins returned to his northern California roots where he entered into private practice with Rawlins Coffman in Red Bluff. One year later he was appointed as deputy district attorney for Tehama County. This was to be only the beginning of a long career of public service. Over the next 38 years Mr. Watkins continued to serve the people of Tehama County. As the justice court judge for Red Bluff Judicial District while maintaining his own private practice. By 1975 he was elected to serve as superior court judge of Tehama County. His seat remained unchallenged for the duration of his career.

Judge Watkins will always be remembered as a man of honesty and integrity. His knowledge and expertise earned him a position on the California Judges Association's executive board as well as his receipt of their ''25-Year Service to the Bench Award.'' It is with great honor that I recognize this man and his commitment to public service. Noel Watkins is a statesman whose service to this county is synonymous with justice.

On December 31, Judge Watkins will step down from the Bench. He will join his wife Mary Jane and their two children Laura Lazar and Charles Watkins and extended family to begin a new phase of life. Although more time may be spent hunting and fishing, it is without a doubt that law will be a part of that future.

His absence will be a loss to the community. I offer my best wishes for his retirement and look forward to acknowledging his future accomplishments in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO THE SURVIVORS AND FAMILIES OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE TUSKEGEE SYPHILIS STUDY

HON. BOB RILEY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the House to today's White House ceremony in which President Clinton will issue a formal apology today to the eight survivors of the Tuskegee syphilis study.

From 1932 to 1972, the U.S. Public Health Service conducted a study, the ''Tuskegee Study of Untreated Syphilis in the Negro Male,'' in which they withheld treatment to 399 syphilis patients in Macon County, AL.

The intent of the study was to determine if syphilis caused cardiovascular damage more than neurological damage and if the natural course of syphilis differed between races. Treatment was given in the initial stages of the study but then withheld after the original study failed to produce any significant data. Even penicillin was denied to the infected participants when it became available in 1947.

It wasn't until a health worker went public in 1972 that the study was called into question.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that more than 100 of the participants, who were all impoverished sharecroppers from Macon County, died of tertiary syphilis. The Ad Hoc Advisory Panel that was appointed in 1972 to review the study determined that the Tuskegee study was ethically unjustified. They further concluded that the amount of knowledge gained was minimal in comparison to the risks that the study posed for the participants.

I am outraged that such an experiment was conducted in the United States. In 1974, the National Research Act created the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, which ensured that basic principles of research were established and followed from that point forward.

These actions, of course, are too little, too late for the victims of the Tuskegee syphilis study. In fact, the survivors and families of the participants have never received a formal apology until today. Now, 65 years after the start of this unethical study, the survivors will finally receive the long, overdue apology.

I consider this tragedy a dark chapter in our Nation's history. My thoughts and prayers go out to the victims and their families and hope that at least a small part of their pain may be relieved by today's ceremony. If nothing else, I hope today's apology helps bring closure to this national disgrace.

We must work to ensure that atrocities like that Tuskegee syphilis study will never again happen in the United States.

TRIBUTE TO JAKE STOCK

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who blessed this world with his music. Jake Stock, who for more than 50 years was a permanent fixture on the American jazz scene, died recently at the age of 86. He will be remembered by all those whom he touched with his sax and song.

Born in Savannah, GA, on July 10, 1910, and having lived an exciting life since, Mr. Stock moved to Monterey in my congressional district from Los Angeles in 1938 with his wife, Grace. He quickly started making music. Offered a job at the Oasis Club in Salinas, Mr. Stock assembled his prized Abalone Stompers, a jazz ensemble that entertained thousands for decades to come. The group, composed of anywhere from 5 to 15 players, performed in a variety of festivals and clubs throughout California and the west coast. In 1958, they opened the Monterey Jazz Festival and shared the stage with Dizzie Gillespie and Louie Armstrong.

Throughout his career, Mr. Stock was the recipient of numerous honors. The inspiration for famed central coast author John Steinbeck's ''Sweet Thursday,'' he was named Citizen of the Year by Monterey's Parade of Nations in 1982. Mr. Stock was also honored by Monterey's Pacheco and Paisano clubs with a dinner called the ''Jake Bake.'' Until recently, he was a featured Sunday played at Big Sur's River Inn.

He is survived by four sons: Jay of Pasadena; Phil of Murphys; Jackson of Los Angeles and Peter of Portland; three daughters: Judy Cooper of Lake Havasu City, AZ; Katy Stock of Carmel and Sally Beckett of Carlsbad; his brother, Morgan Stock of Monterey and five grandchildren.

DeLAURO HONORS THE ''AMISTAD'' AND CONNECTICUT'S ROLE IN THE UNDERGROUND RAILROAD

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join nearly 60 of my colleagues to introduce the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom bill. This important measure will help to preserve historic stops on the Underground Railroad throughout the country so that we can remember and celebrate the courage of those who used the Underground Railroad in search of freedom from tyranny and oppression.

Slavery is not an easy chapter in our Nation's history to remember. But it should not be forgotten. And the Underground Railroad is especially important to remember and memorialize, because it helps us all to deal with this dark chapter in American history when men and women fought against the institution of slavery to further the cause of freedom, even at their own peril.

There are African-American churches in my hometown of New Haven, CT, such as the Varick AME Episcopal Church and the Dixwell Avenue Unitarian Church of Christ, that were waystations for escaped slaves traveling through the Underground Railroad. Many slaves passed through New Haven as they traveled toward freedom in more northern points such as Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Canada. But many children growing up in New Haven today do not know of the role their town played in this chapter of our history.

In particular, New Haven was thrust into the center of the dispute between the forces supporting slavery and those working for freedom when the sailing ship *Amistad* arrived in the Long Island Sound in the summer of 1839. The *Amistad* was a slave ship that set sail from Havana, Cuba, on June 28, 1839, with 53 Africans who had been kidnapped from their homeland and were on their way to another Cuban port and a lifetime of slavery.

These brave Africans, led by Sengbe Pieh, fought for their lives and freedom. They took control of the ship and forced its Spanish owners to sail toward Africa, using the sun as their compass. However, the Spaniards sailed northward at night, hoping to come ashore in a Southern slave State. Instead, the ship entered the waters of the Long Island Sound and was taken into custody by the U.S. Navy.

The Africans were put in a New Haven jail while a court battle was waged to determine if they would be slaves or free men and women. This dispute forced the country to consider the moral, social, religious, and political questions surrounding slavery. Many members of the New Haven community pulled together to work to secure the Africans' freedom, including the congregation of the Center Church on Temple Street and students and faculty at the Yale University Divinity School. Finally, in February 1841 the Africans—who were defended by former President John Quincy Adams—were declared free by the U.S. Supreme Court.

In March 1841 the Africans of the *Amistad* moved to live in Farmington, CT, while funds were raised to finance their return to the area that is now Sierra Leone in Africa. The 37 surviving Africans finally reached their homeland in January 1842.

There are several memorials in New Haven commemorating the *Amistad* and the story of the brave Africans who fought for their liberty on its decks. A statute of Sengbe Pieh, who is also known as Joseph Cinque, sits in front of the city hall. Plans are underway for a life-size working replica of the ship to be docked on long wharf, with exhibitions and programs on African-American history and the long fight for true freedom.

I am glad to see this important part of Connecticut's history recognized. I am so proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill which will ensure that the monuments of the Underground Railroad's route in Connecticut and throughout the country will be protected and preserved so that future generations can remember this remarkable time in our history.

REVEREND DR. EDDIE ROBERT WILLIAMS, JR. HONORED

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to pay tribute to a man of inspirational vision and stellar commitment. This is a man who has dedicated his life to the service of his community, and to the work of the Baptist Church. The man I am here to honor is the Reverend Dr. Eddie Robert Williams, Jr.

The work of Reverend Williams has touched the lives of area residents in many ways over the past 28 years. He assisted in the design, renovation, and development of new church facilities, and in the development and management of multifamily and senior citizen housing. In his professional life, Reverend Williams has been equally active in the service of his community. He reached tenure as a member of the Northern Illinois University [NIU] faculty in 1976, and has also achieved the rank of captain as the Navy's campus liaison officer at NIU.

Last but definitely not least, I am proud to announce that Reverend Williams will be installed as pastor of the South Park Baptist Church in Chicago, IL. I, along with several of his family and friends, will celebrate this joyous event later on this week. I am certain that Reverend Williams will follow in the footsteps of his father, the last Rev. Eddie Robert Williams, Sr., who was also pastor of South Park Baptist Church and a bedrock of our city, State, and Nation.

I am pleased to be here today to stand for Reverend Williams and to highlight his tireless work before the Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 136 I was erroneously recorded as voting ''aye.'' I had intended to vote ''nay.'' I would ask that the RECORD reflect that fact.

GREAT BRITAIN TO REJOIN UNESCO

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 14, 1997, the Queen of England, in her speech at the opening of the British Parliament, announced that her Government will rejoin the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO].

This move by the new British Government demonstrates the further isolation of the United States from cooperative world efforts which seek to address common problems. The United Kingdom has left its longtime ally, the United States, alone among the industrial nations of the world, as a nonmember of UNESCO.

My colleagues may remember that 12 years ago, Great Britain joined with its longtime ally, the United States, and quit the Paris-based U.N. body in a protest orchestrated by the Reagan administration. The decision to quit UNESCO, in this Representative's opinion, reflected the then Reagan and Thatcher government's scorn for multilateralism and for consensus building. Building upon their distrust of the United Nations, lobbied by such groups as the Heritage Foundation, the Reagan administration set in motion a policy of what I call schoolyard diplomacy: You play by my rules or I take my ball home.

U.S. supporters of this withdrawal, explained that this move was based upon allegations of inefficiency and Third World bias. Their strategy was to bring about UNESCO reform by denying the organization U.S. dues funding and participation.

Those of my colleagues who have followed UNESCO progress know that a brilliant and innovative new Director General, Federico Mayor brought about the reforms which formed the premise for the withdrawal. You also know that the U.S. response was to remain outside of UNESCO, in spite of the profound changes enacted. The current reason given by the Clinton administration for continuing to remain outside of UNESCO is that ''we don't have the money.''

No world leader believes this contention. The world understands, instead, that the United States has lost its will to participate in the activities which link our educational, scientific and cultural leaders in common purpose with those of the UNESCO members. Perhaps more to the point, this administration appears to have given in to the right-wing paranoid of the Republican revolutionaries, who see black helicopters and conspiracies against our national sovereignty behind every effort to work cooperatively with members of the United Nations. Nervous about its coming conflict with the Majority party in Congress over United Nations reform issues, this administration has no stomach to face the potential which UNESCO offers this Nation, instead it hides behind protestation of poverty.

What is it that this Country loses because we are not a member of UNESCO? Recently, UNESCO Director General Federico Mayor personally went to Bilbao, Spain, last week to present the UNESCO/Guillermo Cano World Press Freedom Prize to an imprisoned Chinese journalist. We let Mr. Mayor face the threats of retaliation from China without our

Country's support for his courageous act. Ironically, and apparently taking a page from the Reagan UNESCO strategy book, the Beijing government is reportedly considering withdrawal from the organization or ceasing to participate in its activities because of this award to a journalist whose work brought risk or punishment to herself.

Finally, I would call my colleague's attention to a review which appeared recently in ''The Journal of Developing Areas'', published by Western Illinois University and written by Victor Margolin. This is a review about a UNESCO report of the World Commission on Culture and Development, entitled Our Creative Diversity, it rethinks the process of development itself, and articulates a broad concept of human well-being as the aim of development to replace the more limited focus on economic progress alone.

This rethinking, and rearticulation of the very process of development was produced by a Commission headed by former U.N. Secretary-General Perez de Cuellar and was comprised of 14 members—none of whom were Americans. This bold new vision of development was developed without active U.S. participation and input because the United States is not a member of UNESCO.

My colleagues, the United States is not participating actively in the debates on global development that are taking place within UNESCO, and consequently in not a player in the implementation of this agenda.

I recommend that my colleagues read Victor Margolin's excellent review, to learn of the consequence of our decision not to participate in a debate which will reshape thinking about the goals and strategies of development.

If we hold pretenses of world leadership than we must participate in the primal debates of this age. Sadly, our failure to comprehend the losses which accompany apparently casually reached decisions, such as our continuing intention to remain outside of UNESCO, will cost us the world respect and counsel which we need to address our own internal problems.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend the attached article to my colleagues and urge that they rethink our current decision to remain outside of the UNESCO structure. Great Britain, a country which shares our concerns for achieving U.N. reforms has set the proper pace and priority: Give credit to the one U.N. agency which has led the way in terms of implementing meaningful reforms, showcase UNESCO's achievements by becoming a full participating member.

OUR CREATIVE DIVERSITY: REPORT OF THE WORLD COMMISSION ON CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT

(By Victor Margolin)

In 1992 the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, and the Director-General of UNESCO; Federico Mayor, jointly created the World Commission on Culture and Development. Its charge was to rethink the process of development itself, taking into account recent proposals by the United Nations Development Program and other organizations for a broad concept of human well-being as the aim of development to replace the more limited focus on economic progress alone.

The Commission, part of a larger initiative, the World Decade for Culture and Development, which began in 1988 and will end in 1997, was headed by former United Nations Secretary-General Javier Pérez de Cuéllar and was comprised of 14 members. No Americans were among them although one member from Great Britain, Keith Griffin, is a professor of economics at the University of California Riverside. Among the honorary members were Derek Walcott and Elie Wiesel, both world-renowned writers and activists who reside in the United States.

The rethinking of the development process which the Commission was charged to undertake had been stimulated within UNESCO by several representatives of the Nordic countries who were inspired by the Bruntland Report on environmental issues, ''Our Common future,'' as well as by discussions on the environment that took place at the Rio Summit in 1993. Where the Bruntland Report had alerted the international community to the necessary relation between ecological issues and economic planning, those supporting a Commission on Culture and Development believed that a comparable link between the latter two entities was long overdue.

''Our Creative Diversity,'' the report produced by the Commission, was published in November 1995 and has since circulated widely around the globe and on the World Wide Web. In ten chapters, followed by an International Agenda, it presents a rethinking of the development process that includes a range of new issues such as the rights of women and children, the recognition of indigenous people, and the preservation of the world's cultural heritage. The report posits a bold vision of global development that attends to the needs of many cultural groups. It cites anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss's vision of world civilization as ''a world-wide coalition of cultures, each of which would preserve its own originality'' (p. 29). The argument for the autonomy of multiple cultural voices presents a significant challenge to traditional strategies of geopolitics and calls for extended discussions and debates on a global scale. It is supported by the report's acknowledgement of more than 10,000 distinct societies in roughly 200 nations.

Because the relation of culture to development is so important and UNESCO is the principal international organization where its discussion is taking place, one finds it unfortunate that the United States was not actively involved with the Commission's work. In fact, the United States has not been a member of UNESCO since 1984. American withdrawal from the organization occurred in December of that year during the administration of Ronald Reagan. It was based on charges of UNESCO's fiscal irresponsibility and lack of respect for the institutions of a free society. The latter complaint was a response to debates within UNESCO about a New World Information and Communication Order, which was perceived by the Reagan administration as a challenge to the basic American tenets of press freedom.

* * * * *

In the chapter on gender, the Commission finds unacceptable the paucity of women in governmental and parliamentary positions worldwide as well as the widespread exploitation of women in the labor force. In particular it condemns the ''unscrupulous brokers and middlemen'' who profit from the illicit traffic in prostitutes and bar girls. Whereas much of the past literature on development policy has treated all members of a culture as equal beneficiaries of the development process, the Commission notes that women are frequently discriminated against in this process by virtue of reduced access to paid employment, less pay for the same work as men, and other factors. ''The fact is,'' states the report, ''that a number of cultures now invoking traditional laws or religious freedom show more concern with the defence of men's existing privileges than with the preservation of women's rights'' (p. 133).

The rights of children and young people are also addressed in the report, which notes that this group will comprise more than 50 percent of the population in developing countries at the beginning of the next millennium. The Commission's strongest recommendation to improve their situation is to put compulsory universal primary education above economic growth where children are concerned. This, the report asserts, will provide the foundation for a skilled work force and contribute to the elimination of child labor. The Commission takes the strong position that ''respect for different cultures should not be used to deny children their basic human rights in the name of cultural diversity'' (p. 156).

The report's stance on the role of media in development is perhaps the trickiest to maneuver because it addresses the imbalance of media control that prevents many of the cultural voices deemed important by the Commission from being heard. Where other indictments against injustice are more specific, the report exposes the global media imbalance in only the most general terms.

''Many people still remain voiceless or unheard. Control of some of the most powerful new media tools is still concentrated in the hands of a few, whether nationally or internationally, in private or public ownership or under governmental monopoly. Such dominance raises the specter of cultural hegemony: a fear of 'homogenization' is widespread and widely expressed'' (p. 106).

What is not mentioned specifically here is the power of private media companies, especially those in the United States, to dominate the content of programs that are broadcast around the world. The Commission has no simple solution to helping the ''have-nots of the information revolution,'' although it does link deficiencies of national infrastructures such as the lack of electricity in thousands of communities to the communication disadvantages of those communities' inhabitants.

Although the report takes on numerous hard-to-resolve issues like the unequal distribution of media control, the oppression of women, and the injustices of child labor, it also puts forth many suggestions for change that are easier to implement. One area of concern is the preservation of cultural heritage by documenting languages, developing archives, and sustaining handicrafts. The report highlights the need for conservationists, librarians, and curators to create archives and exhibitions to preserve and commemorate the world's many cultural groups. These efforts, it argues, should be incorporated into ''larger concerted heritage policies,'' a goal of UNESCO's ''Memory of the World'' program which was launched in 1992.

The report also urges more government support for nonmarket initiatives in all parts of the world to counter the tendency of commercial enterprise to shape tastes in food, fashion, music, and media. In this regard, the arts have a particularly strong contribution to make. To oppose tendencies toward cultural homogenization, the report calls as well for nations to recognize diversity by creating ''[a] multi-ethnic policy, a multi-language policy, a policy representing different religious points of view'' (p. 234).

''Our Creative Diversity'' concludes with a ten-item agenda whose primary objective is to sustain a continuing public forum on culture and development. As with many reports of this type, research is high on the list of things to be done. The authors recommend the preparation of an annual report on culture and development, closer cooperation between UNESCO and other United Nations agencies, and the creation of an inventory of

cultural rights that are not protected by existing international laws. Particularly thorny is the problem of media violence and pornography, discussion of which the Commission defers to an international forum of the future.

Most radical of the Commission's recommendations, however, is its call for a World People's Assembly, modeled on the European Parliament, whose members would be directly elected by ordinary citizens around the world. As the Commission argues: ''Not only development strategies should become people-centered: so should all institutions of global governance'' (p. 286).

This recommendation is a grand conclusion to a document that alternates the highest aspirations to human justice and welfare with a sense of reality that exposes the obstacles to their achievement. Rather than simply end with a call for more research and future conferences to perpetuate the cycle of discourse divorced from action, the Commission presents a challenging proposal that may well be taken up by more than one nongovernmental organization or citizen's group in the years to come. The report rightly recognizes the growing power of such groups as new forms of communication like the Internet make regular contact over large distances easy and relatively inexpensive.

The Clinton administration, like others before it, has been able to downplay the issue of rejoining UNESCO because the American public has little sense of what not belonging to this organization implies. ''Our Common Diversity'' makes it clear that global development policy is being rethought without our official participation, a fact that contributes to the progressive erosion of American leadership in global affairs. While the United States continues to wield power in the economic and military spheres, its image as a nation concerned with human welfare on a global scale is sadly tarnished. It is not just its lack of participation in UNESCO that has caused this but also the extreme cutbacks in foreign aid, the low profile accorded to international educational and cultural affairs within the government, and the reduced impact of the Peace Corps.

Hillary Clinton's concern for the children of the world has been articulated far more forcefully by the World Commission on Culture and Development. How much more impressive her own engagement with these issues would be if it were part of a larger international effort and how much weaker it becomes when one recognizes that the United States government does not even participate in the most important debates on global development where such issues are foregrounded.

The scope of the problems addressed in the ''Our Creative Diversity'' and the cogency of the report's call for remedies to global injustice should make clear how important it is for the United States to be involved in such efforts as the World Commission on Culture and Development. But, as Pérez de Cuéller said, governments are only one audience for its report. ''Our Creative Diversity'' can serve as an excellent guide for anyone who wants to improve their understanding of culture's role in the development process.

This review appeared in ''The Journal of Developing Areas'' vol. 31 no. 1 (Fall 1996). The journal is published by Western Illinois University.

TRIBUTE TO LOIS A. CALLAHAN

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the extraordinary educational career of Lois A. Callahan, the chancellor of the San Mateo Community College District. After 27 years of service to the San Mateo Community College District, Ms. Callahan will retire at the end of this academic year as chancellor.

The necessity of higher education has become increasingly apparent in our competitive society. People of all ages realize that happiness and success are often tied to a college education. Invaluable teachers—such as Lois Callahan have risen to the challenge of preparing Americans to be a part of a highly educated and skilled work force.

Like most dedicated educators, Lois Callahan's career in—and commitment to—education started at an early age. In 1954 she graduated from Southwest Missouri State University, with a degree in business and education. Lois continued her education at California State University, Chico, were she earned a master's degree in business education. She received a doctorate in higher education administration at the University of Southern California in 1973. Lois also earned certificates in educational programs at Harvard and Stanford.

Lois Callahan's teaching career started at the College of San Mateo in 1968 as an instructor of business. She taught at UC Berkeley and Santa Cruz as well as California State University, Hayward. Ms. Callahan returned to the College of San Mateo, and taught there until 1974 as a professor in the School of Business.

Lois Callahan moved on into the field of education administration, becoming the dean of Education at San Jose City College in 1974. She was the first woman to hold this post in the California community college system. She did not forget her dedication and commitment to the College of San Mateo, however, and she became dean of Instruction in 1976 and eventually president in 1978. In 1991 Ms. Callahan became the chancellor-superintendent of the San Mateo County Community College District.

Mr. Speaker, beyond her outstanding career in education, Lois Callahan has made a magnificent contribution to our community. She is a member of the board of directors of the United Way and the San Mateo County Mental Health Association, and she serves as chair of the San Mateo County Leadership Council. Lois is an active and dedicated member of numerous other organizations throughout the bay area.

Lois Callahan is an outstanding member of our community and an inspiration to all of us on the peninsula. She has received many awards, including the U.S. Department of Education Secretary's Award, and she was inducted into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame. Lois Callahan has dedicated her life to our community. She will be sorely missed, but we wish here a happy and fulfilling retirement.

TRIBUTE TO BETTY JEAN STANLEY SEYFERTH

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a wonderful woman and a good friend, who recently passed away. Betty Jean Stanley Seyferth, who devoted much of her life to the people and causes of California's beautiful central coast, will be remembered as much for what she contributed to those around her, as who she was and what she stood for.

You see, for as much as Betty was a model citizen, she was a model person. Selfless and kind, she brought a smile to those around her. I can remember that as Monterey County Supervisor, I had the honor of naming Betty to the Monterey County Housing Authority. She subsequently went on to serve as commissioner, vice chairwoman, and chairwoman, until her resignation in 1994.

Prior to this, Betty attended Whittier College and received a bachelor's degree in psychology and education from San Jose University. She earned a certificate in human services from the University of California at Santa Cruz. Betty was a social worker for many years, working for Santa Clara County, Alameda County, and Monterey County. She retired from the Monterey County Department of Social Services in 1977.

Besides her own work, Betty also worked with her husband Harold in the real estate business, developing shopping centers and housing developments in Santa Clara County. The couple owned and operated Boone Chance Kennels in Hollister and ranches in Santa Clara and San Benito counties.

Betty was a member of a string ensemble and two piano ensembles as well as a skilled piano and organ instructor. She was an accompanist for vocalists, an organist for her church and belonged to numerous community and philanthropic organizations, including: the Railroad Brotherhood Auxiliary, the Order of the Eastern Star, several Parent Teacher Associations, the League of Women Voters, the California Federation of Woman's Clubs, the Girl Scouts of America, the Doris Day Pet Foundation, and the YWCA.

Mr. Speaker, all who knew Betty Seyferth, miss her tremendously. She was an outstanding person and a fabulous wife, mother, and friend. I wish her husband, Harold, her daughter, Mimi, and the rest of her family the very best during these trying days.

SECURE ASSETS FOR EMPLOYEES [SAFE] PLAN ACT OF 1997

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] and I are introducing the Secure Assets for Employees [SAFE] Plan Act of 1997.

Ever since enactment of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 [ERISA],

layer upon layer of complex rules and regulations has been adopted seriously frustrating the ability of small businesses to maintain retirement plans for their employees. According to a recent GAO study, a whopping 87 percent of workers employed by small businesses with fewer than 20 employees have absolutely no retirement plan coverage. The news is only slightly better for workers at small businesses with between 20 and 100 employees where 62 percent of the workers have no retirement plan coverage. By contrast, 72 percent of workers at larger firms—over 500 employees—have some form of retirement plan coverage.

This is particularly troubling given that small business provides most of the new jobs in today's workforce. In fact, according to the Small Business Administration 75 percent of the 2.5 million new jobs created in 1995 were created by small business. However, because of the impediments to small business retirement plan coverage, these workers often find themselves without the opportunity to meaningfully save for retirement.

The present-law roadblocks to small business retirement plan coverage have a particularly harsh effect on small business defined benefit plans. Most retirement experts agree that defined benefit plans—which guarantee a specified benefit at retirement—provide a better and more secure benefit for retirees. However, according to the Department of Labor between 1987 and 1993 the number of small businesses with defined benefit plans dropped from 108,221 to 41,780. That is over a 60-percent decline in just 7 years.

Last year, hoping to improve retirement plan coverage for small business employees the Congress created SIMPLE plans for small business. However, despite the success of the SIMPLE plan, retirement plan coverage for small business employees continues to be inadequate because of the limitations on contributions to the SIMPLE plan. Many small business employees who are baby boomers and have not previously been covered under retirement plans will not be able to save enough under the SIMPLE plan or a 401(k) plan to provide an adequate retirement income. Small business needs a defined benefit retirement plan that is easy to administer and will provide small business employees, including baby boomers, a sufficient retirement benefit.

The Secure Assets for Employees [SAFE] Plan Act of 1997 creates a new safe harbor defined benefit retirement plan for small business which will provide all small business employees with a secure, fully portable, benefit they can count on without choking small business with complex rules and regulations small business cannot afford.

A description of our bill follows:

FULLY FUNDED AND SECURE RETIREMENT BENEFIT

SAFE plan retirement benefits will be totally secure because they will be funded either through an individual retirement annuity (''SAFE Annuity'') issued by regulated financial institutions or through a trust (''SAFE Trust'') whose investments will be restricted to registered investment securities or insurance company products.

SAFE plans will always have to be fully funded so that there will be no shortfall in case of plan termination.

SAFE plans will be required to use specified conservative actuarial assumptions to ensure the minimum retirement benefit.

MINIMUM DEFINED BENEFIT WITH POSSIBLE HIGHER BENEFIT

SAFE plans will utilize the best features of both defined benefit and defined contribution plans by providing a fully funded minimum defined benefit with a higher benefit if investment returns exceed conservative expectations.

At a minimum, employees will receive a benefit equal to 1%, 2%, or 3% of compensation for each year of service. For example, if an employee whose average salary was $40,000 has 25 years of service for an employer who elects a 3% benefit, the employee will retire with a minimum $30,000 annual benefit (which could be higher depending on investment performance). The percentage benefit in any year must be the same for all employees.

In order to allow baby boomers to catch-up with their retirement savings, employees will be able to elect to credit benefits for up to 10 prior years of service, provided such benefits are credited to all employees eligible when the plan is adopted.

An employee's benefit will be 100% vested at all times.

FULLY PORTABLE RETIREMENT BENEFIT

Employees participating in the SAFE Annuity who separate from service will automatically hold an individual retirement annuity that will pay them at least the benefits they have earned (and possibly a higher benefit) upon retirement. Employees participating in the SAFE Trust will have their retirement benefits automatically converted to a SAFE Annuity, or, if they elect, have the cash balance in their account transferred to an individual retirement account (a ''regular IRA'').

The benefit in a SAFE Annuity may be rolled over to another SAFE Annuity without restriction. However, in order to ensure adequate benefits for retirement, benefits in a SAFE Annuity and SAFE Trust will be subject to substantial distribution restrictions.

EASIER TO ADMINISTER

SAFE plans will have simplified reporting requirements.

SAFE plans will not be subject to complicated nondiscrimination rules or plan limitations. However, so that plan benefits are distributed fairly to all employees, SAFE plans, like SIMPLE 401(k) plans, will be subject to the current-law annual limit on employee compensation ($160,000).

Since SAFE plans will be fully funded using conservative actuarial assumptions, expensive Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation (PBGC) insurance premiums will not be necessary.

COMPLEMENTS THE SIMPLE PLAN

SAFE plans could be used with SIMPLE plans or 401(k) plans.

Employer eligibility, employee eligibility, and the definition of compensation will be the same under the SAFE plan as under the SIMPLE plan.

As with SIMPLE, employers using a SAFE Annuity could designate a single financial institution to issue the SAFE Annuity.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the baby boom generation represents a retirement savings time bomb. We are indeed fortunate that so many employees of large companies enjoy retirement coverage. Those who work for small and independent businesses deserve no less. I would encourage my colleagues to join Mr. POMEROY and me in working toward passage of this much-needed initiative.

TRIBUTE TO ALABAMA AVIATION HALL OF FAME INDUCTEES

HON. TERRY EVERETT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, today, four residents of the second congressional district will be inducted into the Alabama Aviation Hall of Fame. Alabama holds a special place in the history of aviation as the site of the world's first flight school. These distinguished Americans occupy a special place in the Aviation Hall of Fame due to their valor and intrepid mastery of the skies.

William R. Lawley, Jr., colonel, USAF retired, of Montgomery earned his position in aviation history for his courage under fire as a B–17 bomber pilot in World War II. His bravery and loyalty to a wounded comrade enabled him to stay with his aircraft in the face of an overwhelming enemy attack. For his meritorious service, he received the Medal of Honor for Heroism.

N. Floyd McGowin, Jr., of Chapman served his nation in the Marine Corps and Reserve in the 1950's. An expert in forest management, he pioneered a technique for aerial mapping of forests. McGowin is a lover of flying, beginning at the age of 16. To date, he has logged 13,000 hours in at least 58 aircraft, and currently manages McGowin Field, in Chapman.

Michael J. Novosel, chief warrant officer, USA retired, of Enterprise is well known to the Army aviation community in the Wiregrass for his brave helicopter rescue of 29 American soldiers while under a hail of enemy fire in Vietnam. This risk of his own life earned him the Medal of Honor for Heroism. Novosel shepherded more than 5,500 soldiers to safety while a medical evacuation pilot in Vietnam. His remarkable military and aviation career extends 44 years including service as a B–29 bomber pilot in World War II.

William S. Wilson, Jr., of Dothan began his aviation experience as a cadet in the U.S. Army Signal Corps in 1918. He served as an executive officer in the 96th Bomber Squadron at Langley Field, VA. Wilson was among the first pilots to fly crosscountry at night in formation, and he was a flight instructor to Carl Ben Eielson, the first pilot to fly across the Arctic Ocean in 1928.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate these fine Alabamians for their achievements as pillars of the aviation community. They are true patriots.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT WEEK

HON. ELLEN O. TAUSCHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Law Enforcement Week to honor the brave police men and women throughout our country and in my district who put their lives on the line on a daily basis to protect our families, our friends, and our children. Many of these men and women have paid the ultimate price . . . losing their lives in the line of duty. In 1996 alone, 115 officers were killed nationwide. Their deaths are

a reminder to us all that the officers who don a badge and patrol our streets are heroes and true public servants who risk injury and death to provide greater safety and protection for us all.

In recognition of the efforts of these officers, I want to express my continued and strong support for the effective anti-crime COPS Program which has put more officers on our streets—more than 150 in my district alone. Effective programs like this which support our peace officers and reduce crime are true living memorials for our fallen heroes who have sacrificed their lives in the line of duty. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

CENTENNIAL CONGRESS OF THE AOA

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, thousands of doctors of optometry will be convening in St. Louis, Missouri on June 11–15, 1997 to celebrate the Centennial Congress of the American Optometric Association [AOA]. During the proceedings of this annual convention, Dr. Michael D. Jones of Athens, TN, will be sworn in for the 1997–98 term as the association's 76th president. I would like to take a few moments to congratulate Dr. Jones on achieving this high honor and to commend him for his professional and civic achievement.

Dr. Jones is a graduate of Southern College of Optometry in Memphis, TN, and has practiced optometry in Athens since 1971. He is a past president of the Tennessee Optometric Association and the Hiwassee Optometric Society. In 1992, Dr. Jones was honored as Tennessee's Optometrist of the Year. And, in 1993, he was named Optometrist of the South.

In Athens, Dr. Jones has served as president of the Kiwanis Club, treasurer of the Jaycees, and on the boards of the United Fund and the YMCA. He also founded the community's Explorer Scouts program of the Boy Scouts of America.

Dr. Jones was first elected to the AOA's board of trustees in 1992 and has served the board in a number of capacities. The AOA is the professional society for the Nation's 31,000 optometrists. As president, Dr. Jones will lead the association in working to improve vision care in the United States.

Dr. Mike Jones has distinguished himself as an outstanding leader. I join his many friends and colleagues in offering him best wishes for a successful term as president of the AOA.

THE TRAGEDY OF ALCOHOL-RELATED DEATHS ON OUR NATION'S HIGHWAYS

SPEECH OF

HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1997

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a very tragic situation that afflicts one person every 30 seconds—this problem is drinking and driving. This week Mothers Against Drunk Driving is sponsoring a National Youth Summit on Underage Drinking in the hopes of educating our young people about how dangerous and destructive driving is under the influence—and let me remind everyone this danger is not just to oneself, but to anyone else who may be on the road. I commend the organizers and participants in the summit for taking steps to educate Americans on the perils of driving under the influence.

Last week, I was watching the news and I saw the parents of a young college girl discussing the death of their daughter due to a drunk driving accident. This young, bright girl, with all of her hopes and dreams just starting to take form, lost these dreams when a drunk driver hit her car and in an instant everything was gone.

Friends, this is a serious problem and we need to do more to educate everyone—teens and adults alike—on the consequences of drinking and driving. Let me share some startling statistics not commonly discussed. In 1994, 40.8 percent of all traffic fatalities were accounted for by drunk driving accidents, and that number has risen since then. And do not think this could not happen to you because two of every five Americans will be involved in an alcohol-related accident in their lifetime. I am the father of five healthy beautiful children and I can not bear to think that unless we work to stop this, two of my five children will be affected by a drinking and driving accident.

It is crucial that we get the word out and take preventive measures to assure these senseless deaths stop. In my home State of Oklahoma, the State legislature just passed a law stipulating any underage driver caught drinking automatically loses his license until he reaches 21. I am glad Oklahoma is taking steps to prevent wreckless behavior, but I want to stress, that we need to educate more than our kids because this is everyone's responsibility and problem.

There is a powerful poem written through the eyes of a young girl who didn't drink and drive because her mom had said it was dangerous, and the pride she took in obeying her mother. But when she got in her car to go home she was killed by a drunk driver. The last line reads, ''I have one last question, Mom, before I say good bye. I didn't drink and drive, so why am I the one to die?''

This question goes straight to the heart of the matter, and I sincerely hope if someone is going to drink they would have enough respect for the priceless gift of human life, not to get in a car and drive. This is a problem that affects everyone and I hope we would all take responsibility and work to end these tragic accidents that turn human lives, hopes, and dreams into statistics.

Congratulations to the youth who are participating in the underage drinking summit for making a commitment to be responsible and to protect other lives as well. We need your help in raising the awareness about the dangers of drunk driving.

THE MOUNT ST. HELENS NATIONAL VOLCANIC MONUMENT COMPLETION ACT

HON. LINDA SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Mr. Speaker, on the morning of May 18, 1980, Mount St. Helens erupted in an awesome display of nature's power. The 250 miles per hour avalanche and high winds destroyed almost 150 square miles of forest and sent a plume of ash toward eastern Washington like a slow-moving tidal wave.

In 1982, Congress enacted legislation establishing the Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument, protecting the 110,000 acres around the volcano for recreation, education, and research. The monument preserves this extraordinary event of natural history for future generations, and it also provides a living classroom where young and old alike can learn about nature's slow but steady process of healing.

Since the monument was created, new camping and picnic areas, trails, and visitor centers have been added as the number of visitors keeps climbing. Every year thousands of people trek to the rim of the crater to see firsthand a live volcano.

To make sure that the monument is protected now and for future generations, the 1982 act required the Federal Government to consolidate all the land and interests within its boundaries. The exchange of the surface rights was promptly accomplished. Unfortunately, however, the Federal Government has yet to finish obtaining all the privately owned mineral and geothermal resources within the monument boundaries. Even though the 1982 act mandated that all the private property be acquired by 1983, some still remains 15 years later.

Today, I am introducing the Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument Completion Act. This measure fulfills the requirements of the original 1982 act by establishing a process for the monument to obtain the remaining private geothermal and mineral rights. A companion measure is pending in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the work begun in 1982 needs to be finished. The Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument Completion Act will allow us to complete that work, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

TRIBUTE TO VIRGINIA STATILE

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Virginia Statile, a woman whose dedication to and compassion for the sick, elderly, and disabled of Hudson County is unmatched. She has given over 33 years of service to the community as executive director of the Visiting Homemaker Service of Hudson County.

Mrs. Statile began working as Visiting Homemaker's executive secretary on a part-

time basis. In a short time, her enthusiasm and devotion earned her the position of executive director. In that capacity of Visiting Homemaker Service of Hudson County, Mrs. Statile has spearheaded the growth of the organization from 25 Homemaker home health aides in 1964 to over 900 presently.

Mrs. Statile's accomplishments in the health care field are numerous. She has developed, and secured funding for, a large number of programs for senior citizens, including Meals on Wheels, Emergency Chore Service, Youth in Elderly Service, respite care, short term and long term senior care programs, and Senior Community Independent Living Service. Additionally, Mrs. Statile helped secure financing for a number of other community oriented ventures including: Child Abuse Service in an Emergency [C.A.S.E.], Families in Crisis, the Teaching Homemaker Intervention Program, and the Child Care Food Program.

Mrs. Statile's interest in helping her fellow Hudson County residents have led to memberships on a number of boards and committees which include: the North Jersey Home Care Association, the Hudson Hospice, the Hudson Commission on Human Relations, the Hudson County Coalition of Non-Profit Organization, the New Jersey Home Care Council, and the New Jersey Department of Human Services Home Care Advisory Committee.

The multitude of programs Mrs. Statile has developed and helped expand along with her active involvement in various humanitarian programs demonstrate that she is a person who goes above and beyond the call of duty. Her activities demonstrate a willingness to work selflessly and with great compassion for those less fortunate. AIDS patients, abused children and adults, and Alzheimer's patients are all people whose lives were touched by the extraordinary efforts of Mrs. Statile.

It is an honor to have such an exceptional woman working on behalf of the residents of my district. Mrs. Statile's desire to give so much time and effort to helping others should serve as an example for all of us. I ask that my colleagues join me in paying tribute to this compassionate and dedicated woman.

HEMISPHERIC LEADERS DISCUSS CHALLENGES AHEAD

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to my colleagues' attention the attached statement on conclusion of "The Agenda for the Americas for the 21st Century". On April 28 and April 29, a group of leaders of the nations of the Western Hemisphere, that included former Presidents Ford and Carter, gathered in Atlanta to address the challenges facing the Americas in the 21st century.

As the attached statement attests, these leaders tackled the critical problems that must be addressed if we are to consolidate the impressive gains we have made in building a hemisphere that is resoundingly dedicated to free markets and democracy. The participants in this meeting are to be commended, and their conclusions merit serious consideration.

I ask that the attached statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"THE AGENDA FOR THE AMERICAS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY"

We, the members of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government, have met in Atlanta, Georgia on April 28–29, 1997 to assess the state of western hemispheric relations and to offer our views and recommendations on ways to help achieve the goals that we share—the pursuit of peace; the end of illegal drug trafficking; the reinforcement, deepening, and extension of democracy; the promotion of a free trade area of the Americas; and social justice.

The Council was established at The Carter Center after a Consultation on "Reinforcing Democracy in the Americas" in November 1986 by many of us. Since then, within the western hemisphere, we have worked to reinforce democracy at critical moments, including by monitoring and mediating 15 electoral processes in nine countries in the Americas. We have lent our support to freer trade, including by urging the U.S. Congress to approve the North American Free Trade Agreement. We have worked hard to reduce the region's debt and bring peace to Central America.

For these past two days, we have reviewed a wide agenda confronting the nations of the hemisphere—trade, drug trafficking, poverty, and issues related to security and democracy. Our council of 29 current and former Presidents and Prime Ministers of most of the nations of the Western Hemisphere bring diverging perspectives to the table, which we found sometimes helps us to consider different approaches to an issue.

We found ourselves in agreement on the basic goals, many of which were enunciated by the Western Hemisphere leaders in the Declaration of the Summit of the Americas in December 1994.

The Americas should conclude a Free Trade Area of the Americas by the year 2005 while making sure that the benefits of freer trade are shared by all the peoples of the hemisphere.

We should seek to eliminate the scourge of illegal drugs.

The remaining territorial disputes of the hemisphere should be resolved soon.

We should curb the purchase and sale of arms.

The benefits of democracy should be extended to all the nations of the hemisphere, and we should deepen democracy, protect press freedom, and eliminate corruption and the disproportionate influence of money in the politics of all our nations.

While we are committed to those goals, we have to express our great disappointment at the lack of progress in achieving them, and so we concentrated most of our time on how to translate those general statements into concrete steps forward. Let us identify, now, with greater precision what it is that we hope the leaders of the hemisphere should strive to achieve.

First, some general principles:

The issues on the agenda require cooperation and partnership, not unilateral dictation and paternalism.

Most of the difficult issues on the agenda have two sides—supply and demand on drugs, commodities, arms, bribery—and an effective strategy requires dealing with both sides.

The moral basis of the new community of the Americas is democracy. Freer trade will enhance the ties between our democratic nations.

1. TRADE, INTEGRATION, AND POVERTY

We support the Summit Declaration to reach a Free Trade Area of the Americas by the year 2005. There has been great progress on negotiating bilateral and subregional free trade agreements, but thus, far, little progress toward the Summit goal of an FTAA. To attain that goal, the governments will need to move more quickly than they have during the past two years.

All of our nations will benefit from freer trade, but that doesn't mean that everyone will benefit. The best defense of those people who suffer the increased competition of freer trade is not protectionism, but rather additional mechanisms to ensure that the benefits of freer trade are more widely shared and that those who lose the competition can be helped to adjust.

1. Fast-track: It is vitally important that the U.S. government obtains fast-track negotiating authority as soon as possible in order to begin serious trade negotiations. We were very encouraged in our discussions with U.S. leaders that there seems to be grounds for a workable compromise. The AFL–CIO wants adequate protections for workers and the environment in the trade agreement. In our intensive discussions with Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, the Speaker told us that he would support rapid passage of fast-track negotiating authority which included provisions for protecting labor rights and the environment, provided they are trade-related. We view this as a significant development that potentially goes beyond the existing NAFTA and hope Congress and President Clinton reach agreement on this as soon as possible.

2. Caribbean Basin Enhancement: It is vitally important that a Caribbean Basin Enhancement law is passed by Congress as early as possible to grant wider access to the U.S. market by the smaller and more vulnerable nations in the Caribbean Basin. These provisions will permit these countries to make the adjustment over an extended period of time to enter a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA). ("Caribbean Basin" includes Central America and the Caribbean.)

3. Paths to FTAA: We explored several different ideas as to the best way to pursue an FTAA. Some believe that the U.S. and other countries should negotiate bilaterally; others would like for negotiations to proceed between subregional groups. We propose an alternative: the nations of the hemisphere should define clear and specific criteria through their talks within the 11 working groups set up at the Denver Ministerial, and nations or groups would become members of a growing FTAA as they meet these criteria. Special transitional provisions might have to be made for the smaller economies. Governments should encourage their private organizations to participate in this process.

4. Caribbean Basin Commodities: Several small Caribbean Basin nations are very dependent on a few commodities, such as bananas and sugar, whose markets are restricted. We urge the United States and Europe to expand market access to these products.

5. Reducing Poverty and Inequality: It is urgent to reduce poverty and injustice through development strategies and investments that contribute to social, economic, and fiscal justice through health, education, job training, housing, and support for small and medium enterprises.

Inasmuch as trade promotes growth, expanding trade can reduce poverty and inequalities as has been seen in Chile and the East Asian countries. But additional steps are necessary in order to compensate those who are hurt by the increased competition that comes from trade. Such steps would include increased productivity, technological transfer, and increasing annual rate of growth to more than 3% by generating more savings. Governments should also make education universal and higher quality for elementary school students and remove barriers to access by poor people to credit, land and education.

2. A NEW HEMISPHERIC APPROACH TO ILLEGAL DRUG TRAFFICKING

The hemisphere needs a new cooperative approach to combat illegal drug trade because so many of our countries are both producers and consumers of illegal drugs. Mutually recriminatory approaches distract from the real enemy: illegal drugs. If we recognize this, our efforts to fight the enemy can become a unifying rather than a divisive force for democratic governments in the hemisphere. It is time to change the relationship from an adversarial one to a partnership.

The 1994 Miami Summit made explicit a new hemispheric-wide recognition of the seriousness of the drug problem and the shared responsibility among consumer, trafficker, and producer countries. We applaud the ratification at the 1994 Summit of three existing agreements against drug trafficking and money laundering, but these lack time schedules for implementation and meaningful enforcement measures. The political will to combat illegal drugs clearly exists, but political capacity is weak in many countries. The U.S. has filled the enforcement vacuum with its certification policy.

With respect to the existing method of U.S. certification, the process should entain prior notification to the responsible authority within each foreign capital as to any concerns that have arisen and permit the opportunity of meaningful dialogue before the final assessment is made. There should be close coordination among U.S. officials in dealing with other nations.

It is now time to replace the unilateral certification policy with a multilateral strategy which includes monitoring and enforcement of efforts to reduce demand as well as supply. We were very encouraged by our conversation with Speaker Newt Gingrich, Senator Paul Coverdell, General Barry McCaffrey, and Chairman of the House International Relations Committee, Benjamin Gilman—all recognized the need for a new approach to this issue.

Speaker Gingrich described the certification policy as ''offensive and senseless'' and urged its replacement with a hemispheric-wide approach to the issue. He called for a dialogue among the nations of the Americans to develop a plan for a drug-free Western Hemisphere. We propose a multilateral forum, either through the OAS (CICAD) or the new blue-ribbon commission, that would devise a hemispheric-wide plan and strategies for each country. In addition, the group needs to develop standards (what constitutes success?) and measures of performance and assess each country's performance. The group could use standards developed in the 1988 UN Convention. The group could be modelled on the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, which is widely respected and competent.

The plan should pursue each link in the drug-trafficking chain: production, processing, transportation, consumption, and money-laundering. The U.S. Administration should give more attention and resources to the treatment and education (demand) side of the problem because that is the most cost-effective way to attack the problem.

The work of this group would be separate from the decisions made by the U.S. on aid, although we hope that the certification policy would be phased out as this group comes into being.

The illicit traffic in arms, ammunition, explosives, and other dangerous materials is a concomitant of the illegal trade in drugs. Effective measures, requiring meaningful collaboration between nations of the hemisphere, will be required to combat this menace.

We discussed the possible relationships to global efforts to control money-laundering and drug trafficking; specifically, coordinating with the UN's Durg Control Program and participating in a Global Narcotic's Conference. We also discussed the idea of a regional court of the Americas that could handle drug, arms trafficking, money-laundering, and other transnational crimes. Appeals from such a court could be sent to the Hague.

We discussed the need to strengthen alternative development strategies based on trade reciprocity agreements for the Caribbean Basin and enhanced capacity of the IFIs to replace bilateral aid programs. Drug policy should not become a non-tariff barrier that will impede the continuing opening of markets and borders.

3. RESOLVING THE REGION'S TERRITORIAL DISPUTES

We agreed that although some of the long-standing border disputes have been dormant for long periods, they still remain a source of tension and a rationale for an unaffordable arms race. And, in some cases, they can erupt into conflict. The movement toward democracy and the end of the Cold War has diminished tensions in the region, and we do not mean to imply that the region is in turmoil. Quite the opposite. Democracy and peace is the norm, and we also believe that regional economic integration is a useful instrument for reducing security tensions.

Still, territorial disputes remain potential problems. We therefore believe that the time has arrived to try to resolve definitively these territorial disputes. We discussed a number of strategies for accomplishing that, and rather than recommend a single strategy, we thought it would be far more useful to propose several ideas.

The first question is who should mediate these disputes? The options are: (1) third-country governments; (2) institutions outside the hemisphere, like the Pope or the King of Spain; (3) the OAS; (4) a Commission of Mediators or Facilitators made up of a group of senior statesmen; or (5) The Carter Center or the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government. Still, another alternative would be for the Hague Court to arbitrate the dispute.

The second question is how should such mediators gain legitimacy for pursuing these issue. The options are: (1) the disputed states could invite; (2) the OAS could pass an ''umbrella resolution'' that would require all states with disputes to submit them to some mediation that could be chosen by the states; (3) the Presidents of the Americas could address this issue at the Summit of the Americas in Santiago in March 1998; or (4) the OAS or UN Secretary General could designate senior statesmen to undertake an assessment and feasibility mission to determine whether the governments were ready to settle the dispute—a kind of prenegotiation session.

Whichever of these options are chosen, we recommend the OAS Secretary General and other leaders in the region become much more actively engaged into trying to resolve these problems.

4. A REGIME TO RESTRAIN ARMS SALES AND PURCHASES

Although Latin America spends relatively less on defense than most other regions, expenditures on expensive weapons systems divert scarce foreign exchange from more effective investments, including for education. They also compel neighbors to spend more on defense and, by doing so, generate international tensions.

Moreover, we are concerned about the possibility of an arms race in Latin America, and we urge the governments in the region to pause before embarking on major arms purchases. Latin America has served as a model for nuclear non-proliferation with the Treaty of Tlatelolco, and we believe that it ought to embark on a conventional arms restraint agreement. The agreement needs to be multilateral—not unilateral, and it should involve purchasers as well as sellers.

We recommend, as a first step, that the governments of Latin America pledge to accept a moratorium of two years before purchasing any sophisticated weapons. During that time, they should explore ideas to restrain such arms. We encourage them to look at the recent accord between Brazil and Argentina, which called for a region free of an arms race. At the same time, we call on the U.S. and other governments that sell arms to affirm their support for such a moratorium.

Time is of the essence. Delay would be very costly to all of our nations. We urge the nations of the region to move quickly to implement a moratorium and to begin serious negotiations on ways to translate a moratorium into an agreement.

In considering future agreements, governments should consider making a distinction between modernization and acquisition of new weaponry. We also suggest studies on banning landmines from the region and better regulations on the trade in firearms.

We also urge hemispheric governments to sign a regional and an international Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers, which prohibits or restricts sale and transfer of weapons to: (a) states in international conflict; (b) states with internal conflicts and/or human rights abusers; (c) non-democratic states; (d) violators of international law; (e) states in which expenditures on health and education are less than for defense.

We also recommend that all states agree to mandatory weapons export and acquisition reporting to the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms. States should also agree to participate in the Standardized International Reporting of Military Expenditures.

5. A HEMISPHERIC APPROACH TO EXTENDING, REINFORCING, AND DEEPENING DEMOCRACY

The hemisphere has reached an unprecedented moment in which all nations but one have held competitive elections. Elections are only one crucial element of democracy, however. We identified three issues for hemispheric cooperation on democratization: extending democracy to Cuba, deepening democracy by removing undue influence of money in campaigns and guaranteeing press freedoms, and eliminating corruption.

Extending democracy to Cuba: The most appropriate and effective way to bring democracy to Cuba is through a policy of engagement rather than isolation. The Helms-Burton law is counterproductive because it causes greater problems for U.S. relations with its friends in Canada, Latin America, and Europe than it causes problems for Fidel Castro. We urge the U.S. Congress and President to repeal or significantly modify that law and to cooperate with Latin America in drafting a hemispheric-wide approach to facilitating democracy and civil society in Cuba. The extra-territorial aspect of the law is particularly objectionable. Cuba should be invited to participate in hemispheric events, provided that the government is prepared to accept the standards of human rights and democracy as enunciated in the American Convention on Human Rights, the Santiago Commitment, and the Managua Declaration.

Deepening democracy. Democracy is a work in progress. Nowhere is it perfect. Existing campaign finance practices have tended to erode popular support for democracy even in countries like the United States. We discussed this issue along with access to the media for political candidates and concluded that reforms are necessary to restore confidence in the election process.

We urge governments and parties throughout the hemisphere to remove the disproportionate influence of money in politics. Each country will devise their own systems to provide for equity, transparency, and accountability in their electoral processes, but in our review of a number models in this hemisphere and in Europe, we found that shorter campaigns, limits on expenditures, tax deductible small contributions, publicly subsidized media time, and effective monitoring all increased transparency and competitiveness of elections. Canada may be the best model in the hemisphere; the United States and Colombia might be among the worst.

Freedom of the press from harassment, censorship and intimidation is vital to a thriving democracy. We unanimously endorse the Declaration of Chapultepec and urge all hemispheric leaders who have not yet done so to sign.

Corruption: In 1995, this hemisphere constructed the first anti-corruption convention in the world. It is now time for all governments in the region to follow the lead of Bolivia, Paraguay, and Peru and ratify the Inter-American Anti-Corruption Convention before the 1998 Summit of the Americas.

Transnational bribery is a negative consequence of the growing trade and investment relationships and privatization efforts of the hemisphere. We urge prospective bidders and government procurement agencies to sign Anti-Bribery Pacts. We applaud the initiative of the Inter-American Development Bank to require such transparency on their own projects, and we urge the World Bank to do likewise. We support the establishment of a strong OAS anti-bribery working group to provide legislative and technical assistance and to monitor national performance.

We call on the OECD Ministerial meeting next month to follow the lead of the United States and the Inter-American Anti-Corruption Convention in criminalizing transnational bribery and ending tax deductibility for bribery.

We intend to bring these issues to the attention of the leaders of the hemisphere, beginning with our three colleagues on this panel, who are incumbents—President Leonel Fernandez of the Dominican Republic, Prime Minister P.J. Patterson of Jamaica, and President Gonzalo Sanchez de Lozada of Bolivia. After our press conference, we will be meeting privately with Vice President Gore to discuss these issues, and he will have an opportunity to state his response and U.S. policy tonight.

We are heartened that U.S. President Bill Clinton will be visiting Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean in a week, and will visit South America next October. Thomas ''Mack'' McLarty attended part of our meetings along with officials from the State Department and the National Security Council. The President's trip offers a real possibility of translating the general goals of the Summit of 1994 into something that would benefit the people of the hemisphere.

We are pleased by the active participation of Ambassador Juan Martabit, who has been charged by Chilean president Eduardo Frei to coordinate all of the work of the Summit of the Americas that will be held in Chile in March 1998. He commented that ''our meeting had awakened the hopes that had diminished after the 1994 Summit.'' We therefore see our work these last two days as a kind of a bridge between two Summits.

AGENDA FOR THE AMERICAS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY COUNCIL OF FREELY ELECTED HEADS OF GOVERNMENT—APRIL 29, 1997

Former President Jimmy Carter, United States.

Former President Gerald Ford, United States.

President Leonel Fernández, Dominican Republic.

Prime Minister P.J. Patterson, Jamaica.

President Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada, Bolivia.

Former President Oscar Arais Sánchez, Costa Rica.

Former President Patricio Aylwin, Chile.

Former President Rodrigo Carazo, Costa Rica.

Former President Marco Vinicio Cerezo, Guatemala.

Former Prime Minister Joe Clark, Canada.

Former President Osvaldo Hurtado, Ecuador.

Former President Luís Alberto Lacalle, Uruguay.

Former President Carlos Andrés Pérez, Venezuela.

Former Prime Minister George Price, Belize.

Former Prime Minister Erskine Sandiford, Barbados.

Former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, Canada.

Vice President Carlos Federico Ruckauf, representative of Council member President Carlos Saúl Menem, Argentina.

Amb. Ronaldo Sardenberg, Minister of Strategic Affairs and representative of Council member President Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Brazil.

Rodolfo Terragno, President, National Committee, Unión Cívica Radical Party, and representative of Council member Raúl Alfonsín, Argentina.

Dr. Robert Pastor, Executive Secretary of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government and Director of the Latin American and Caribbean Program.

TRIBUTE TO LOIS AND DOW WILLEY

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Lois and Dow Willey. Mr. and Mrs. Willey will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary on Saturday, May 24, 1997.

Friends and family from all over the California area will be on hand for the anniversary celebration. Notably, their sons Brent and Larry will be in attendance as well as eight grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

Lifelong residents of California, Lois and Dow met over 50 years ago in Lemoore, CA. After marrying, the couple moved to the central coast where Dow was a deputy sheriff in Morro Bay. Life in the small coastal town was very family oriented. Lois was devoted to her family and worked inside the home, while Dow often worked more than one job at a time, demonstrating to his family the importance of a strong work ethic and paying your own way through life.

As the children grew up and moved away, Dow and Lois decided to move back to the Central Valley. Now living in Fresno, the two remain actively involved in the community. Lois maintains strong relationships with her grandchildren and great-grandchildren and is a member of the 19th District Senior Advisory Council. Dow works for his son Larry at Willey Tile in Fresno. The two still remain active in their local church, which they claim to be the foundation of their strength and success in life.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have Mr. and Mrs. Willey as constituents and friends in the 19th Congressional District. I congratulate them on 50 wonderful years of marriage, and ask my colleagues to join me in wishing them every success for the years to come.

MARKING 104 YEARS OF SERVICE TO CALIFORNIA AND THE UNITED STATES

HON. JAMES E. ROGAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is built upon a foundation of great patriots. We owe our liberty to the sacrifices of these men and women. The great experiment that has become our Nation sets the standard by which all others are judged. As we look back on our history, we must not forget those who sacrificed to build our country.

Paying tribute to these patriots is the role of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of California. Founded in 1893, the California chapter was established by California residents whose relatives served as Revolutionary War soldiers, delegates to the Continental Congress, and as early American patriots.

Membership roles in the Sons of the Revolution read like a who's who in American history. Members have served their Nation as Members of Congress, Senators, State supreme court justices, high-ranking military officials, and as two U.S. Presidents.

Even more important than the members themselves is the service they provide to the general public. Their work in preserving our Nation's heritage by providing research facilities and archives for the public are a tremendous asset.

In my district, we are fortunate to have the Sons of the Revolution Library. Located in Glendale, CA, this library contains over 30,000 volumes of genealogical material, Revolutionary history, and texts of life in early America. This is one of the largest research libraries of its type in California.

Although their work centers on the study of our past, the Sons of the Revolution continue to look forward. The group has established one of the most complete on-line reference services available to the public. Their web site allows the public to trace their genealogy via computer. Their work in providing up-to-date information is revolutionary in its own rite. This service is an invaluable resource to anyone interested in early American history.

Mr. Speaker, as we stand on the verge of a new century one cannot help but think of our history. As we make decisions which will undoubtedly affect our future, I think of a passage from Shakespeare, ''past is prologue.'' That is certainly no more true than today. Our history as a nation has taught the world many great things. For more than 100 years the Sons of the Revolution in the State of California have carried on the legacy of the American Revolution. For their service and their patriotism we offer our respect and sincerest thanks.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on May 16, 1997, for rollcall vote 138, which was final passage of H.R. 1385, the Employment, Training, and Literacy Enhancement Act of 1997. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.'' I support this legislation, which will reform and streamline job training programs by consolidating over 60 Federal programs into three block grants to States and localities. I request that the RECORD reflect my position on this vote.

RECOGNIZING DEMOCRATIC SUCCESS IN TAIWAN

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate President Lee Teng-hui and Vice President Lien Chan of the Republic of China on Taiwan on the occasion of their first anniversary in office, which is May 20, 1997.

Since entering office on May 20, 1996, President Lee and Vice President Lien have maintained a strong economic growth for their country, advanced democracy at home, and expanded Taiwan's official and unofficial ties abroad.

Today Taiwan stands as a dynamic economic power in the world. It ranks as the world's 14th trading nation, with a global trade of nearly $200 billion in 1996. Under the leadership of President Lee and Vice President Lien, Taiwan has progressed rapidly towards democratization, providing a shining example for other nations striving to establish governments based on fundamental human rights.

With a diverse economy, low unemployment, and a commitment to establish itself as a democratic nation, Taiwan has a bright future. I wish Taiwan the very best as it prepares to celebrate this important anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO ALTHEA GIBSON

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives a very special charitable event, the Second Annual Golf and Tennis Classic sponsored by the East Orange General Hospital Foundation.

This annual charitable event, which will be held on June 12, 1997, will honor Althea Gibson, one of the most highly recognized women in the world today. She is a pioneer in sports and is revered as one of the greatest tennis players of all time and recognized as a world class golfer.

Ms. Gibson was the first African-American to play tennis at the U.S. Open—1950—and Wimbledon, England—1951. She set the stage for women in sports when beginning in 1957 she won the U.S. women's singles championship, followed by a three time championship in women's doubles at Wimbledon beginning 1956 and culminating with Ms. Gibson winning the coveted Wimbledon Women's Singles Championship in 1957 and 1958.

As a star athlete and a woman of character, integrity, and dedication, Ms. Gibson was undaunted in her quest for excellence in sports. She met challenges head on and broke down barriers so that others could enjoy the sport of tennis.

In addition to her worldly accolades Ms. Gibson has been a longtime resident of the city of East Orange, serving as director of recreation and cultural affairs. Ms. Gibson is a role model, an author, an athlete, an outstanding woman of courage and dignity. We are proud to be her neighbor, and her friend. Today, we salute Althea Gibson for her courage, her tenacity, her spirit, and for setting the stage for a Zina Garrison and a Martina Navratilova, a Lori McNeil and a Billie Jean King, a Monica Seles and a Steffi Graff, and for other girls and young women of all ages, colors, and creeds who have a tennis racket in their hands and a love for the sport in their hearts.

As the Representative of East Orange in Congress, I am proud of the accomplishments of Ms. Gibson, and I applaud the work of the East Orange General Hospital Foundation. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in expressing our appreciation to Althea Gibson for her numerous outstanding contributions to humankind. She truly is a 20th century pioneer.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ELECTION OF PRESIDENT LEE TENG-HUI IN TAIWAN

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is a most significant anniversary—an anniversary, we, in the Congress, wholeheartedly join in celebrating. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the first anniversary of the direct election of Lee Teng-Hui as President of the Republic of China on Taiwan. One year ago the people of Taiwan went to the polls to cast their ballots for President in a free and open democratic election. One year ago, we witnessed a great triumph for democracy—a triumph in the face of threats and intimidation.

As my colleagues recall, 1 year ago, the people of Taiwan faced the threat of military attack by the People's Republic of China which conducted missile tests less than 50 miles off the coast of Taiwan. Beijing combined aggressive statements with threats of military action in a determined effort to coerce the people of Taiwan into abandoning their democratic aspirations. Despite these serious attempts at intimidation, voters turned out in the Presidential election in heavy numbers. President Lee was elected overwhelmingly in a race between three candidates in an election that was—by every account—free and fair and democratic.

Mr. Speaker, President Lee's election is important to remember today because this marks the first time a Chinese head of state has ever been elected by popular vote. It also marks the culmination of a 10-year process of transforming Taiwan into a vibrant market-oriented democracy. In 1986 the Republic of China on Taiwan embarked on a mission to empower all of its citizens to decide freely and democratically who would be the leaders of their government. That process led to the election of city councilmen, municipal officials, and national legislators, and it reached its ultimate conclusion in the first Presidential election last year.

Mr. Speaker, during President Lee Teng-Hui's first term as democratically elected President, Taiwan saw its economy remain strong and its stock market soar. I am certain that my colleagues join me in commending and congratulating President Lee on a most successful first year, and we wish him and all of the people on Taiwan continued peace and prosperity.

TRIBUTE TO THE SELDEN MIDDLE SCHOOL CONCERT BAND

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to pay tribute to the Selden Middle School concert band led by band director Roy Hull. I am proud to announce to the House of Representatives that the Selden Middle School concert band, won the Superior/first place trophy and the overall Junior High/Middle School concert band award at the Festivals of Music competition in South Carolina.

Festivals of Music, part of the Educational Programs Network, holds 126 festivals in the United States and Canada. It is one of several organizations sponsoring such competitions. The trophies awarded to the Selden Middle School concert band carry with them the glory and pride of playing better than approximately 250 other schools that have participated in the Festivals of Music competition this year. Scott Dickson, program director for the Festivals of Music competition claimed that Selden's band score was so phenomenal. They were the first group to perform in the morning, and they set the tone for the day. The judges the others would come up to their level. They were such a spectacular group. Two musical pieces—''Eoncomium'' by Stan Pethel, and ''All Glory Told'' by James Swearingen were the selections that led Selden to victory.

Selden's victory at the Festivals of Music competition is well deserved and hard-earned. The students practiced 2½ hours a week for 5 months to prepare for this competition. The 135 eighth-graders and their parents raised $63,000 to pay for the trip so that no money from the middle country school district was used. They organized car washes, a craft fair, a raffle, and more to make competing in the Festivals of Music a reality.

I congratulate the Selden Middle School concert band on their prestigious accomplishment.

TRIBUTE TO THE DINUBA ROTARY CLUB, DINUBA, CA

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Dinuba Rotary Club of Dinuba, CA. The Dinuba Rotary Club observed its 75th anniversary on May 16, 1997, at a hosted gala reception.

The Dinuba Rotary has been involved in Rotary International for three-quarters of a century. Operating under the slogan, ''Service Above Self,'' the organization has been working with communities throughout northern Tulare County on a wide variety of community service projects and programs.

Rotarians in Dinuba have been instrumental in a wide array of community service projects. At a city and county level, they have been responsible for securing a new branch of the Tulare County Library for Dinuba. They have also equipped and supplied the Dinuba Police Department with a radio-controlled car as an educational tool to help the children in the community say ''no'' to drugs. Finally, the group has erected a plaque honoring the sons and daughters of northern Tulare County who made the supreme sacrifice of serving our country at times of war in this century.

Since its inception 75 years ago, the Dinuba Rotary has made its biggest impact in the field of education. Dinuba Rotary has provided scholarships for deserving graduates of local high schools. Recognizing that agriculture is the foundation of Tulare County's economy, Dinuba Rotary has also provided scholarships for its members of the Future Farmers of America to pursue their education at both the high school and college level.

Dinuba Rotary has been instrumental in bringing exchange students from foreign countries to Dinuba High School and has helped send Dinuba High School students to study abroad. The Dinuba Rotary has sent senior students from Dinuba High School to Camp Royal, a leadership camp sponsored by Rotary Clubs in central California. The organization also annually sponsors a spelling bee for students in elementary schools in northern Tulare County to promote literacy among its students.

Mr. Speaker, the Dinuba Rotary is an excellent example of individuals working together to create a stronger and more supportive community. I commend the Dinuba Rotary for their community activism and the contributions that they have made over the last 75 years. I ask my colleagues to rise and join me in congratulating them as they celebrate this milestone in the Dinuba community.

THE SUCCESS STORY OF REDWATER HIGH SCHOOL

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes today to commend a school in my district that has bucked the trend, thwarted conventions, achieved the unlikely, and taken great leaps to eradicate drug use among its students. The school is Redwater High School in Redwater, TX, a suburb of Texarkana. Members from all quadrants of the community have come together in unified support of this program and of their teenagers who are struggling against a sea of drugs and gangs.

In a sincere attempt to preempt the spread of drugs through their community and schools, businesses have given money and endorsements, parents have given their time and their hearts, and students have given their word and their enthusiasm. The result is that 100 percent of the class of 1997 at Redwater High School has volunteered to be tested for drugs and every one of them has tested drug free.

Four fathers in the Redwater community, concerned for their children's health and well-being, initiated this unique program, called DADS, which stands for Dads Against Drugs in School. They decided that, since there are so many incentives for students to do drugs in society today, from peer pressure to movie glamorization, they should offer students greater incentive to stay drug free and a chance to prove that they are drug free.

The program gives all Redwater students a chance for a voluntary free drug test at school with random followup tests. If they test drug-free, they receive a DADS photo ID card, which entitles the student to discounts at area businesses such as restaurants and clothing stores. No students who test positive for drugs will be criminally prosecuted as a result of their drug test. Instead, the students receive counseling from the school and, when appropriate, mentoring from volunteer fathers. As Redwater Superintendent Joe Dan Lee says, ''This program will reverse the peer pressure attitude among kids by giving them something to show for being drug free.''

To me this program represents many aspects of what is right in our communities today. They used only $5,000 in government grant money for the program and funded the rest of the effort with community time, dollars, and concern. Through this program, the community has dedicated themselves to becoming a drug-free community, set high expectations and standards, and taken important steps toward protecting their children from the dangers of drugs.

They have done this without cracking down, threatening their students, hiring more police officers, or punishing more children. Instead of frightening them away from drugs, the parents, teachers, and community leaders have strengthened the support network for students and given them reasons to stay off of drugs, averting trouble before it begins.

I don't want the experience of Redwater High School to be an isolated incident. Schools across the Nation can replicate this effort if parents, teachers, businesses, and community leaders join efforts to help our children combat the peer pressure to become drug users. Keeping our students off drugs is one of our most worthwhile causes and an effective method of keeping our students away from a variety of other troubles.

If, with this program, we keep just one student from the downward spiral of drug use to delinquency, I would consider it a success. I think, with 100 percent of the seniors testing drug free, that the first year of this program was an enormous success.

I am proud of this community for their initiative, ingenuity, and determination. I am proud to see so many members of the community come together to work for this cause. Most of all, I am proud of the Redwater High students and especially the Redwater High graduating class of 1997 for being 100 percent tested and certified drug free.

TRIBUTE TO DICK CARLSON

HON. W.J. (BILLY) TAUZIN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the stellar work of Dick Carlson, who within the near future will complete 5 years as president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Dick Carlson headed CPB during a time of turbulence and challenge, and has proven to be a steady guide.

People in my part of the country can tell you that a Louisiana bayou is both a beautiful and dangerous place. The same might be said of the job Dick Carlson has filled for the last 5 years. Fortunately for all of us who love public broadcasting, Dick brought the experience to know when to wade in, and when to stay in the boat. His communications skills and instincts are honed and have benefited the corporation.

Dick is an award-winning print and television journalist and anchor who served as director of the Voice of America for many years, as Ambassador to the Republic of Seychelles, and as an executive in the banking industry before taking over CPB. He's been a champion of commonsense reform, and we in Congress appreciated his strong leadership at a time when the very existence of publicly funded television and radio was under attack.

Those challenges will continue to arise. So, it is with sadness that we congratulate Dick Carlson for a job well done. And we wish him every success in his new endeavors.

A SPECIAL SALUTE TO DR. MARVIN FISK—1997 CONGRESSIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN INTERN

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, each year during the month of May, our Nation celebrates National Senior Citizen Month. In communities throughout the United States, senior citizens are recognized for their contributions to their communities and the Nation. In conjunction with Senior Citizen Month, seniors are also gathering on Capitol Hill for the annual Congressional Senior Citizen Intern Program.

The Senior Citizen Intern Program provides seniors with a firsthand look at their Government in action. During their stay in Washington, DC, they attend meetings, workshops, and issue forums on topics which impact the elderly population in particular. The program also provides an opportunity for extensive dialog with congressional leaders, members of the Presidential Cabinet, and other policymakers.

I take price in saluting Dr. Marvin Fisk, who has been selected as my congressional senior

citizen intern for 1997. Dr. Fisk is an outstanding individual whom I look forward to welcoming to our Nation's Capitol. I rise to share with my colleagues some biographical information on Dr. Fisk.

Dr. Marvin Fisk is a highly respected member of the medical community. He is an alumni of Howard University in Washington, DC. For the past 16 years, Dr. Fisk has been on staff at the Mt. Sinai Medical Center. He was previously employed at Forest City Hospital. Dr. Fisk's resume also includes faculty appointments at the Howard University College of Dentistry and the Case Western Reserve Dental School. He has also been assigned as an examining dentist and school clinic dentist by the Cleveland Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Fisk's professional memberships include the American Dentist Association, Ohio Dental Association, Fellow of the International College of Dentistry, and the Greater Cleveland Dental Society, just to name a few. He is the former president of the Ohio Dental Association; former president of the Greater Cleveland Dental Society; and the former president of the Academy of General Dentistry. He is currently a member of the board of trustees for Howard University. Further, Dr. Fisk serves as vice president for the Retired Senior Volunteer Program.

In addition to his assignment at the Mt. Sinai Medical Center, Dr. Fisk is an active member of various civic organizations throughout the Cleveland community. They include the Phyllis Wheatley Association, Boy Scouts of America, the Fraternal Order of Police, the NAACP, and Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity. Dr. Fisk is also a member of Mt. Zion Congregational Church.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Marvin Fisk is the recipient of numerous awards and citations which recognize his leadership and commitment. He received the Outstanding Leadership Award from the Howard University Alumni Association, and the Distinguished Dentist Award from the Howard University Dental School. Further, Dr. Fisk is the recipient of the Outstanding Leadership Award from the American Dental Association.

Mr. Speaker, I take special pride in saluting Dr. Marvin Fisk. He is an exceptional individual who has earned the respect of his colleagues and others throughout the community. I have also benefited from our close working relationship on issues which impact the Greater Cleveland community. I am certain that Dr. Fisk will do an outstanding job as a congressional senior citizen intern. I want to congratulate him and express my appreciation for his participation in this important program.

INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1997

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of H.R. 5, the Individuals with Disabilities Act Amendments of 1997, Congress has vastly improved the ability of and access for children with disabilities to receive a free appropriate public education. With this reauthorization, Congress has built upon the successes of IDEA and made modifications where experiences over the 22 years of the act's existence has necessitated change.

Prior to the enactment of what was then the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 2 million children were excluded from receiving their right to a public education. On top of this gross injustice, another 2½ million children were receiving totally inadequate educational instruction. Fortunately, my predecessors in Congress recognized this terrible injustice and passed IDEA's predecessor. This civil rights initiative has served our Nation's children with disabilities well throughout its 22 years.

During the 104th Congress, attempts were made to reauthorize IDEA. Unfortunately, the partisan atmosphere of the Presidential elections and the inability to fashion a document which could gain the support of the act's many constituencies essentially doomed these efforts to failure. With the commencement of the 105th Congress, I realized the importance of fashioning a bill which could gain the support of both sides of the aisle, and called on the majority to recognize this fact during the first hearing the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families had on IDEA reauthorization. Fortunately, Chairman GOODLING saw the wisdom in this suggestion and joined together with Senator JEFFORDS and Senate Majority Leader LOTT in proposing that we negotiate a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation with significant input from groups and individuals who are affected and served by the act. This process commenced on February 20, and has led us to House and Senate consideration of this measure.

The current IDEA statute consists of 3 formula grant programs that assist States to serve children with disabilities in different age ranges, and 14 special purpose programs that support early intervention and special education research, demonstrations, technical assistance, and personnel training. Of the formula grant programs, two are permanently authorized—the grants to States program, better known as part B, and the preschool program. Despite part B, the heart of the act which mandates that children with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education, being permanently authorized, modifications were necessary to strengthen the acts protections, safeguards and enforcement means. In addition, interpretations by the courts of various aspects of part B has necessitated that Congress clarify its intent.

Among the modifications made by H.R. 5 to the act is a provision which specifically states that educational services for children with disabilities who are suspended or expelled cannot be ceased. Since the inception of the act, the Department of Education has interpreted current law to allow schools to use disciplinary proceedings on children with disabilities, including explusion. However, the Department's interpretation of the law is that these procedures cannot result in a cessation of educational services. Unfortunately, this interpretation of the statute was called into question by a recent case before the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals—Virginia Department of Education versus Riley. In the Virginia case the court held that the department's interpretation of the statute was incorrect and that services could be ceased to children with disabilities in certain circumstances.

In order to clarify congressional intent, the bill codifies the long held interpretation of the department with language that would require a free appropriate public education for all children with disabilities, including those who are suspended or expelled. This will end the shortsighted practice of leaving children with disabilities without the educational tools they need to become active and successful members of society.

Another modification to current law contained in H.R. 5 is the provisions regarding the policies and procedures each State must have in effect with respect to personnel standards in order to be eligible for part B funding. The language contained in section 612(a)(15)(C) sets forth parameters by which a State may deal with a documented shortage of qualified personnel. In subparagraph (C), I want to clarify that the reference ''consistent with state law,'' is intended to be applicable to the laws governing the profession or discipline. This policy should be applied to the most qualified individuals, who shall be supervised by qualified personnel within that profession or discipline, for each position—in other words, on a case by case basis. Further, shortages must be documented by any agency applying this new policy.

H.R. 5 also amended current law in the area of least restrictive environment. This bill codifies recent cases (*Greer* v. *Rome City School District*, 950 F.2d 688 (11th Cir. 1991); *Oberti* v. *Board of Education*, 995 F.2d 1204 (3d Cir. 1993); *Sacramento City Unified School District* v. *Holland*, 14 F.3d 1398 (9th Cir. 1994)) regarding the inclusion of children with disabilities in the general education classroom. This principle of inclusion is so fundamental and central to the purpose and principles of the bill and always has been. The bill underscores the strong presumption in the law recognized by innumerable courts, that children with disabilities should be educated with children without disabilities in the general education classroom. All children, whether or not disabled, benefit from such education. This is surely the best approach to eradicating the prejudice which has kept people with disabilities out of the work force and out of our communities generally—and surely the best way to guarantee equal educational opportunity for all children.

Research technology and experience with integration in the last two decades has flourished. It has demonstrated that children with the full range of disabilities can successfully be taught in the general education classroom—whether or not they are at grade level and whether or not they have disabilities that require them to partially complete tasks or participate in activities differently from other students. Educators have learned a great deal about modifying and adapting curriculum so that children like Rachel Holland with developmental disabilities are successfully receiving all of their education in the general education classroom. This bill is intended to further dismantle the walls of segregation.

Last, I would like to comment on the provisions in the bill which pertain to the provision of FAPE to juveniles who have been adjudicated as adults and are incarcerated in adult correctional facilities. Once this bill is signed into law by the President, States will be permitted to transfer the responsibility for educating juveniles with disabilities placed in adult correctional facilities from State and local educational agencies to other agencies deemed appropriate by the Governor and to allow for the modification of an individualized education

plan [IEP] and the least restrictive environment provision for bona fide security reasons and compelling penological reasons. In addition, the bill will permit public agencies to not serve juveniles who are incarcerated in adult correctional facilities who have not been identified or did not have an IEP in their last educational placement.

In exercising these new authorities, public agencies should remember that children with disabilities who are incarcerated in adult correctional facilities will be more likely to return to prison after their initial release if they do not have the educational tools to survive in life after prison. The small savings gained by not serving these children while they are in adult correctional facilities will pale in comparison to exorbitant future costs of additional prison time or reliance on social welfare programs.

In ensuring compliance with the act, the appropriate education and/or prison official will have the obligation to determine if a youth entering the prison system had been previously identified as eligible for special education services. The prison officials should develop a system for making this determination that includes: interviews with each incoming youth under the age of 22 regarding prior special education participation, notice to each youth under the age of 22 regarding the special education process, and a procedure for contacting educational authorities, including those in correctional or juvenile institutions, to determine special education eligibility and to obtain prior special education records.

BOB DEVANEY'S LEGACY LIVES ON

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, Bob Devaney has left a tremendous legacy that extends across the State of Nebraska and continues to touch coaches, players, and fans with whom he came into contact. As a football coach, he instilled a sense of pride in his players and their fans and helped make Nebraska a winner both on and off the field.

It is clear from the statistics that Bob Devaney was an exceptional football coach. He took a team with a history of losing and instantly transformed it into a victorious powerhouse with a national reputation for success. The turnaround was dramatic. Since his first year as head coach, the team has not had a losing record. During Devaney's tenure as coach, the Nebraska Cornhuskers won or shared eight Big Eight championships and were crowned as National Champion twice. His teams compiled an impressive record of 101–20–2. As a coach, Devaney was a skilled motivator and teacher.

However, Devaney's influence on Nebraska extended far beyond the football field. He created a unifying experience for the State's citizens which is unrivaled in the Nation. Devaney created a positive bond that was obvious not only on football Saturday, but during the week and throughout the year. He drew together east and west; urban and rural; man, woman, and child.

The State was fortunate to have the benefit of Devaney's leadership and expertise not only as a coach but also as athletic director for the University of Nebraska. In that capacity, he helped establish quality facilities programs for women and men, and established a winning attitude throughout the athletic department.

Bob Devaney earned the respect of his coaches, his players, and fans across the State and throughout the Nation. He demonstrated what can be accomplished through collegiate athletics. With his competitive spirit, lively sense of humor, and genuine concern for his players, Devaney set a positive example of success and good sportsmanship which lives on in Nebraska's football program and throughout the lives of Nebraskans.

This Member would like to commend to his colleagues the following editorials from the Omaha World-Herald and the Lincoln Journal-Star. The editorials highlight the importance of Bob Devaney to the State of Nebraska and his legacy that will always endure.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, May 11, 1997]

BOB DEVANEY, BUILDER OF PRIDE

Bob Devaney.

The name unleashes a flood of symbols and memories. Johnnie the Jet. Gotham Bowl. The Game of the Century. Tagge-Brownson. Back-to-back national football championships. Tom Osborne. Expansion after expansion of Memorial Stadium. A sea of helium-filled red balloons, released by thousands of football fans on Nebraska's first touchdown of the game, hanging in the air above Lincoln on a brilliant fall day.

Even before Devaney's death on Friday, it had been been an often-repeated cliche that Devaney's impact on Nebraska went far beyond football, that he brought Nebraskans together, east and west.

But like most other cliches, this one is backed by solid evidence. A stumbling athletic program wasn't the only negative that greeted Devaney when he accepted the head coaching job in 1962. The state's spirit in general had been bruised by events of the previous five years. The Starkweather mass murders were still fresh in people's memories. A governor had recently died in office. Angry debates over tax policy and school financing, gathering steam since the 1940s, were dividing urban and rural Nebraska interests.

Nebraskans were ready for a little good news. Devaney gave it to them. Under him, the Cornhuskers played with noticeably greater verve. They won games that they would have lost in earlier years. They began appearing in the national ratings. Then the Top 10. Finally, in 1970 and 1971, they were national champions.

Interstate 80 was pushing westward across Nebraska in those days. Westerners sometimes asked what good it was. Devaney's success gave people in Hyannis, Kimball and Scottsbluff a reason to use the new superhighway. Cowboy boots and Stetsons, often bright red, became a familiar sight in Lincoln on autumn Saturdays.

Lincoln's economy benefited. East-west friendships grew stronger. The financial success of the football team made it possible for Nebraska to have a high-caliber women's athletic program. The classy Devaney football teams gave the university national visibility.

Some people say that too much is made of college athletics, and they're right. Devaney knew that. Remember, he told fans before a game in 1965, there are 800 million people in China ''who don't give a damn whether Nebraska wins or loses.'' There are bigger things in life than whether the team wins.

Devaney never seemed driven or angry. He respected his opponents. His spirit of good sportsmanship lives on in the Memorial Stadium fans who traditionally applaud Nebraska's opponents at the end of each game, even when Nebraska loses.

Devaney never set out to transform Nebraska. He would have laughed if someone in 1962 said he was responsible for propping up the self-esteem of an entire state. He was just a man with something he could do very, very well. But excellence on the football field inspired excellence in other walks of life. Devaney's success, and the positive influence his accomplishments had on his adopted state, constitutes a memorial that will long bring honor to his name.

[From the Lincoln Journal-Star, May 14, 1997]

BOB DEVANEY TAUGHT US ALL TO REACH FOR BEST THAT'S IN US

From Scottsbluff to Omaha, Nebraskans tip their hats to Bob Devaney, who will be honored with fondness and gratitude at an unprecedented statewide funeral observance today.

The funeral services in Lincoln will be telecast live over the statewide educational television network, allowing Nebraskans across the state to participate in the event.

Devaney's enduring gift to Nebraska was an awakening of unity and possibility and pride. He left behind more than those two national football championships and 101 Husker victories.

He brought a whole state to its feet, not only to cheer a winning football program that is still winning 35 years after his arrival, but ultimately to look and reach and achieve beyond that. As thrilling and satisfying as the football success has been, there is more to the Devaney legacy. He showed us the possibilities. He removed the limits. He extended our reach. He raised the bar.

Devaney established new standards. He did not stop at saying we could be better. He said we could be the best, and then he went out and did it. And the lesson began to dawn on us: If this small prairie state could be best in football, it could be best in other endeavors as well.

He showed us excellence. And if he could achieve it with hard work and an iron will, each of us might be able to achieve it in our own pursuits as well.

Devaney came our way from Wyoming in 1962, and immediately turned Nebraska's long slumbering football program around. The success was so instantaneous that it was stunning. The Huskers went from 3–6–1 in 1961 to 9–2 and their first bowl victory in 1962. They have not had a losing season since.

After Devaney's 1970 and 1971 national championships, he turned over the coaching reins to Tom Osborne and set about building the university's entire athletic program into one of the strongest in the country. That also stands as testimony to him today.

So, most vividly, does the red-splashed, sold-out Memorial Stadium of autumn Saturdays in Lincoln. It truly is the house that Bob built, Devaney Bowl. Its seating capacity when he came here in 1962 was 36,000. Four additions more than doubled the stadium's capacity during Devaney's football tenure.

Bob Devaney. Builder. Winner.

And a good-natured Irish wit. He also brought us the pleasure of joy and laughter, and he will be remembered with a smile today all across the state.

Perhaps Osborne knows best the measure of the man. When Devaney turned the football program over to his young assistant in 1973, he stepped back out of the spotlight and

tried to keep his shadow off Nebraska's new coach. Devaney told Nebraskans they had a better football coach now. And through the years, he gave Osborne his total support, never failing to praise him, never getting in the way.

It was a tough job following in the footsteps of Devaney at Nebraska. But it would have been even tougher for Osborne if Devaney had not worked so hard to smooth the way. Tom Osborne is another of Bob Devaney's legacies.

We're proud of you, Coach Devaney. We salute you. You gave us more than football victories and national championships. You showed us how to dream and do.

What we give back to you today is our gratitude—and the promise that we will cherish you now in memory and legend.

JONNA LYNNE CULLEN

SPEECH OF

JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Michigan, Mr. UPTON, for taking this time to recognize a very special young woman, Jonna Lynne Cullen, for her service to the Rules Committee and to this House. Jonna Lynne—or "J.L." to her friends—was an outstanding staff member for the Rules Committee for many years. I got to know her when I came on the Rules Committee in 1975. She was already a seasoned staffer, working first for Chairman Colmer, then later for TRENT LOTT. She always had a great smile, a quick wit, and a ready comeback for anyone who cared to take her on. She had a real sense of what was going on, and served her party well with strategy and technical advice. She knew the rules of the House, how to make them work, how to make things happen. But she could also bridge the gap and work with those of us on the other side of the aisle. Her friendship had no political boundaries. For my part, J.L. is someone whose word you can trust and whose judgment is sound.

These past few years have been a challenge. But, as might be expected, she has lived in the face of grave illness with courage and an unfailing sense of humor. I want to join my colleagues today in extending to her our best wishes, our prayers, and our great thanks for the service she has provided to this institution.

EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING, AND LITERACY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 16, 1997

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1385) to consolidate, coordinate, and improve employment, training, literacy, and vocational rehabilitation programs in the United States, and for other purposes:

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my colleague, Mr. OWENS' amendment to H.R. 1385. I have always been a strong supporter of the Summer Youth Employment Program and believe that it should not be eliminated.

The Employment, Training and Literacy Enhancement Act of 1997 does not include a provision which would continue the excellent work achieved by the many at-risk youths who take full advantage of the opportunities provided by the Summer Youth Employment Program.

Summer Youth Employment provides millions of low-income youth their first vital lesson in the work ethic. Young people are reached at a critical time in their lives, helping them stay in school and graduate. In many ways, SYEP has proven to be an anticrime program by affording youths the opportunity to become productive citizens and staying off the streets of depressed areas.

This program has faced significant reductions in resources over the years. And if we do not make the program a top priority, I am afraid that it will simply be forgotten through H.R. 1385 in its current form.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote for Mr. OWENS' amendment which would preserve this very important program.

AMENDMENT TO BUDGET RESOLUTION TO SAVE AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a matter of urgency regarding the budget resolution we will be asked to approve tomorrow and its potential impact on surface transportation infrastructure, pending ISTEA reauthorization, and the trust of the American people in the transportation trust funds.

While the budget resolution is a major step toward balancing the Federal budget and curbing runaway spending, it contains a major flaw: it would provide woefully inadequate funding for highways and transit programs that are so vital to American jobs and the economy even though Americans are already paying for those programs at the gas pump.

During consideration of the budget resolution, I and ranking Democrat on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee JIM OBERSTAR, joined by Chairman TOM PETRI of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee and subcommittee ranking Democrat NICK RAHALL, will offer a bipartisan perfecting amendment. The details on this amendment follow, but the key point is that it is fully consistent with the goal of a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 and it would be paid for by a just-over-one-third-percent reduction in domestic discretionary spending and tax cuts currently contemplated in the budget resolution. I am also providing an estimate of spending levels by budget function that would result from our amendment.

Mr. Speaker, our amendment reflects a modest, yet essential commitment to the Nation's surface transportation system. It is essentially the first step we will be taking in reauthorizing ISTEA. It will not, however, be our last major step in putting the "trust" back into the four transportation trust funds.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting the modest, reasonable amendment.

BIPARTISAN AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET RESOLUTION BY THE LEADERSHIP OF THE TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

THE PROBLEM

The budget deal is a bad deal for transportation. The Budget Agreement developed by the Administration and the Congressional Leadership continues the dishonest practice of using transportation trust fund revenues to mask deficit spending elsewhere in the budget. It also provides woefully inadequate funding levels for aging transportation infrastructure.

Trust Fund balances would skyrocket. Supporters of the balanced budget agreement say that their budget is good for transportation, but the fact is that highway and transit programs would be underfunded by about $13 billion below the amount of revenue that will accrue to the trust fund! This means that the $24 billion balance that has been allowed to accumulate in the Highway Trust Fund will soar to $37 billion (or over 55%) by the year 2002. Furthermore, the balances in the 4 transportation trust funds will skyrocket from $33 billion to $65 billion during that period.

The will of the House is ignored. The agreement also fails to reflect the will of the House on the subject of taking the transportation trust funds off budget and freeing up their revenues to be used for their intended (and promised) purpose. In the 104th Congress, legislation to accomplish this passed the House overwhelmingly, by a vote of 284–143. Building on this mandate, in the 105th Congress, H.R. 4, the "Truth in Budgeting Act" already has 239 cosponsors.

THE SOLUTION

An honest, fair, balanced budget. Chairman Shuster and Ranking Democratic Member Oberstar, Subcommittee Chairman Petri and Subcommittee Ranking Member Rahall will offer an amendment to the budget resolution when considered on the House floor to begin correcting the long-standing misuse of Highway Trust Fund moneys. The amendment—

Will be fully consistent with achieving a balanced budget by making modest, perfecting adjustments to the Budget Agreement.

Will address future highway/transit balances honestly, restoring "trust" to the Highway Trust Fund.

Will provide adequate funding to address the most pressing surface transportation crisis.

Modest proposal. The Shuster-Oberstar-Petri-Rahall amendment will only prevent growth in Trust Fund balances in the future. It will not draw down the $24 billion balance that has already accumulated and it will not spend the existing 4.3 cents-per-gallon gas tax that was created for deficit reduction.

THE AMENDMENT

Here's what the amendment does

Increases Highway Trust Fund spending so that outlays during the 5-year period of the Budget Resolution equal revenues into the fund during the same period.

Outlays would be increased by a total of $12 billion above Budget Resolution assumptions—from $125 billion over the 5-year period to $137 billion.

Spending in FY 1998 would be the same as the Budget Resolution assumption; increases would be phased-in from FY 1999 to FY 2002.

Since outlays equal revenues over the period, trust fund balances will remain stable.

Offsets the increased spending on a year-by-year basis with small across-the-board reductions in discretionary spending and the proposed tax cuts.

Total 5-year discretionary spending and proposed tax cuts would be reduced by 0.0039 (just over one-third of 1 percent). This amounts to about $11 billion over of $2,800 billion in spending and just over one-half billion out of $135 billion in tax cuts.

In FY 1998, there would be no reductions in spending or tax cuts.

In FY 1999, spending and tax cuts would be reduced by 0.001 (one-tenth of 1 percent). This amounts to about $750 million out of $559 billion in spending and $24 million out of $18 billion in tax cuts.

Safeguards Trust Fund monies to ensure they will be used for their intended purposes.

Modifies transportation reserve fund in the Budget Resolution to give first priority to restoration of the spending and tax cut offsets.

Here's what the amendment does not do

Does not interfere with balancing the Budget by FY 2002.

Does not change any of the annual deficit targets.

Does not make any cuts in entitlement programs.

Does not draw down Highway Trust Fund balances.

Does not spend any of the 4.3 cents gas tax currently going to the general fund.

Does not take the trust fund off-budget.

THE PRICE OF FAILURE

Bad for American economy and jobs. Transportation accounts for over $1 trillion in commerce annually; for every $1 billion in investment in highways, 42,000 jobs are created. If funding is inadequate, our highway and transit infrastructure will continue to decline, resulting in congestion, increased pollution, increased fatalities and injuries and reduced international competitiveness.

Bad for American taxpayers. Gas taxes paid to build and repair highway and transit projects will continue to be used to mask the size of the deficit and to justify deficit spending elsewhere.

Surface transportation legislation jeopardized. The reauthorization of ISTEA, now pending before the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee, will not be able to adequately: (1) address donor state equity; (2) fund international trade corridors and border infrastructure; (3) address transit and clean air needs in congested urban areas; (4) repair unsafe bridges and other safety hazards; (5) reconstruct aging segments of the Interstate System; and (6) respond to other high priority needs.

ESTIMATED BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS, TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

		Fiscal years				
		1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
National defense (050)	BA	268.197	270.245	273.216	279.276	286.770
	O	265.978	265.415	267.263	268.416	270.505
International relations (150)	BA	15.909	14.871	15.654	15.965	16.184
	O	14.558	14.544	14.900	14.635	14.673
General science (250)	BA	16.237	16.164	15.849	15.688	15.473
	O	16.882	16.506	15.944	15.763	15.550
Energy (270)	BA	3.123	3.450	3.152	2.907	2.807
	O	2.247	2.439	2.272	2.019	1.833
Natural Resources (300)	BA	23.877	23.178	22.430	21.985	21.905
	O	22.405	22.673	22.869	22.583	22.151
Agriculture (350)	BA	13.133	12.783	12.194	10.951	10.639
	O	11.892	11.289	10.647	9.470	9.079
Commerce and Housing (370)	BA	6.607	11.076	15.157	16.057	16.657
	O	−0.920	4.295	9.801	12.113	12.521
Transportation (400)	BA	46.402	50.023	51.590	53.181	54.438
	O	40.933	41.974	43.763	44.821	45.437
Community and reg. deve. (450)	BA	8.768	8.408	7.741	7.619	7.922
	O	10.387	10.887	10.939	11.279	8.365
Education (500)	BA	60.020	60.238	61.409	62.559	62.968
	O	56.062	59.273	60.526	61.632	61.949
Health (550)	BA	137.799	144.905	153.901	163.229	171.973
	O	137.767	144.911	153.840	162.981	171.543
Medicare (570)	BA	201.620	212.069	225.528	239.619	251.528
	O	201.764	211.544	225.525	238.764	250.749
Income security	BA	239.032	254.030	269.375	274.872	286.623
	O	247.758	258.009	267.984	277.006	284.930
Social Security (650)	BA	11.424	12.055	12.777	13.001	14.359
	O	11.524	12.192	12.852	13.023	14.374
Veterans benefits (700)	BA	40.545	41.438	41.654	41.974	42.143
	O	41.337	41.675	41.829	42.101	42.301
Administration of Justice (750)	BA	24.765	25.075	24.039	24.166	24.682
	O	22.609	24.444	25.133	25.740	24.692
General Government (800)	BA	14.711	14.424	13.915	13.593	13.014
	O	13.959	14.347	14.674	14.057	13.014
Net interest (900)	BA	296.547	304.558	305.075	303.833	303.728
	O	296.547	304.558	305.075	303.833	303.728
Allowances (920)	BA	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	O	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Undistributed (950)	BA	−41.841	−36.949	−36.937	−39.151	−51.124
	O	−41.841	−36.949	−36.937	−39.151	−51.124

VICTIM OF MINDLESS VIOLENCE DIES

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1997

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the horrifying loss of a very important public servant. The Congress has always felt that our veterans are special people, and that those who serve them are special too. Today, it is my sad duty to inform the Congress that one of these special servants of America's veterans has fallen victim to what appears to be an act of mindless violence. On Friday, May 9, 1997, Mr. William Reese was shot at the Finn's Point National Cemetery in Salem, NJ, where he had worked as a caretaker for 18 years.

Mr. Reese was a dedicated husband to his wife, Rebecca, and a loving father of his son, Troy. As a caretaker in a national veterans cemetery, Mr. Reese was one of the hundreds of unsung heroes who make our national cemeteries places of honor, beauty, and solace. As chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Benefits, I am sure I speak for all the Members of Congress in wishing the Reese family every comfort in this trying time and our hope that they find some small consolation in the dedication William Reese has shown to his veterans.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, May 20, 1997, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 21

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to review a General Accounting Office report on management and program weaknesses at the Department of Transportation.
SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366

Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on programs designed to assist Native American veterans.
SR–485

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Air Force programs.
SD–192

Finance
To hold hearings to examine the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan as a model for Medicare reform.
SD–215

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on United States implementation of prison labor agreements with China.
SD–419

2:00 p.m.
Armed Services
To continue hearings on the Quadrennial Defense Review, focusing on its impact on the future years defense program.
SH–216

Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. Res. 57, to support the commemoration of the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, S. 231, to establish the National Cave and Karst Research Institute in the State of New Mexico, S. 312, to revise the boundary of the Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Site in Larue County, Kentucky, S. 423, to extend the legislative authority for the Board of Regents of Gunston Hall to establish a memorial to honor George Mason, S. 669, to provide for the acquisition of the Plains Railroad Depot at the Jimmy Carter National Historic Site, and S. 731, to extend the legislative authority for construction of the National Peace Garden memorial.
SD–366

Finance
Social Security and Family Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation relating to child welfare reform.
SD–215

Judiciary
Administrative Oversight and the Courts Subcommittee
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD–226

MAY 22

9:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings on the nominations of James A. Harmon, of New York, to be President, and Jackie M., Clegg, of Utah, to be First Vice President, each of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.
SD–538

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold oversight hearings on the professional boxing industry.
SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources
To resume a workshop to examine competitive change in the electric power industry, focusing on the financial implications of restructuring.
SH–216

Labor and Human Resources
Public Health and Safety Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the activities of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD–430

Rules and Administration
To resume hearings to review legislative recommendations on certain revisions to Title 44 of the U.S. Code which authorizes the Government Printing Office to provide permanent public access to Federal government information.
SR–301

10:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review whether China's most-favored-nation status is an effective foreign policy tool.
SD–419

Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD–226

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on international affairs.
SD–138

11:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings on electronic funds transfer and electronic benefit transfer and the effect of these programs on Federal benefit recipients.
SD–538

2:00 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 442, to establish a national policy against State and local government interference with interstate commerce on the Internet or interactive computer services, and to exercise Congressional jurisdiction over interstate commerce by establishing a moratorium on the imposition of exactions that would interfere with the free flow of commerce via the Internet.
SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold a workshop on the proposed ''Public Land Management Responsibility and Accoutability Act''.
SD–366

Governmental Affairs
International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine Russian case studies on proliferation.
SD–342

Judiciary
Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the antitrust implications of the college bowl alliance.
SH–216

Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.
SH–219

JUNE 3

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To resume hearings to examine the Federal Communications Commission implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, focusing on efforts to implement universal telephone service reform and FCC proposals to assess new per-minute fees on Internet service providers.
SR–253

JUNE 4

9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold oversight hearings on the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.
SD–226

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on the nomination of Michael J. Armstrong, of Colorado, to be an Associate Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.
SD–406

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Defense.
SD–192

JUNE 5

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine instances of contaminated strawberries in school lunches.
SR–332

JUNE 10

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold hearings on miscellaneous water and power measures, including S. 439, H.R. 651, H.R. 652, S. 725, S. 736, S. 744, and S. 538.
SD–366

JUNE 11

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the Stateside of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.
SD–366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Defense.
SD–192

JUNE 12

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To resume a workshop to examine competitive change in the electric power industry, focusing on the benefits and risks of restructuring to consumers and communities.
SH–216

JULY 23

9:00 a.m.
Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To hold hearings with the Caucus on International Narcotics Control on the threat to U.S. trade and finance from drug trafficking and international organized crime.
SD–215

JULY 30

9:00 a.m.
Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To resume hearings with the Caucus on International Narcotics Control on the threat to U.S. trade and finance from drug trafficking and international organized crime.
SD–215

POSTPONEMENTS

MAY 20

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on NASA's international space station.
SR–253

Daily Digest
Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4663–S4690

Measures Introduced: Two bills and one resolution were introduced as follows: S. 763–764, and S. Con. Res. 27. **Page S4677**

Measured Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. Con. Res. 27, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

William P. Greene, Jr., of West Virginia, to be an Associate Judge of the United States Court of Veterans Appeals for the term of fifteen years.

20 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Page S4690

Messages From the House: **Page S4676**

Measures Referred: **Page S4676**

Communications: **Pages S4676–77**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S4677–82**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4682–83**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S4683**

Authority for Committees: **Page S4683**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4683–90**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 noon, and adjourned at 5:37 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Tuesday, May 20, 1997. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4690).

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

1998 BUDGET

Committee on the Budget: Committee ordered favorably reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

ELECTRIC AND MAGNETIC FIELDS RESEARCH

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy Research and Development, Production and Regulation concluded hearings on H.R. 363, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1998 for the Electric and Magnetic Fields Research and Public Information Dissemination Program of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, after receiving testimony from Robert Brewer, Senior Advisor, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy; and Richard M. Loughery, Washington, D.C., on behalf of the Edison Electric Institute, the American Public Power Association, National Electrical Manufacturers Association, and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

MEDICARE REFORM

Special Committee on Aging: Committee held hearings to examine ways to restructure the current Medicare payment system to insure greater choice and equity, focusing on managed care plans, receiving testimony from William J. Scanlon, Director, Health Financing and Systems Issues, Health, Education, and Human Services Division, General Accounting Office; David C. Colby, Deputy Director, Physician Payment Review Commission; Steve Brenton, Association of Iowa Hospitals and Health Systems, Des Moines; Doug Dillon, Providence Health Plans, Portland, Oregon; Susan Bartlett Foote, Coalition for Fairness in Medicare, Washington, D.C.; Kenneth E. Thorpe, Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, New Orleans, Louisiana; and Hans Running, Hillsboro, Oregon.

Committee recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 1 public bill, H.R. 1660, was introduced. Page H2882

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

Filed on May 18, H. Con. Res. 84, 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 (H. Rept. 105–100);

H.R. 911, to encourage the States to enact legislation to grant immunity from personal civil liability, under certain circumstances, to volunteers working on behalf of nonprofit organizations and governmental entities, amended (H. Rept. 105–101 Part I); and

H. Res. 152, providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 84, 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 (H. Rept. 105–102). Page H2882

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Pease to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H2877

Recess: The House recessed at 2:42 p.m. and reconvened at 8:08 p.m. Page H2881

Amendments: Amendments printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H2883–H2925.

Quorum Calls—Votes: No quorum calls or recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today.

Adjournment: Met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Committee Meetings

NASA'S MISSION AND AMERICA'S VISION—FUTURE OF SPACE EXPLORATION

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs and Criminal Justice continued hearings on Defining NASA's Mission and America's Vision for the Future of Space Exploration, Part II. Testimony was heard from the following Astronauts: Buzz Aldrin; Scott Carpenter and Gene Cernan; and public witnesses.

CONCURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FY 1998

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a modified closed rule on H. Con. Res. 84, 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 rule waives all points of order against the resolution and against its consideration. The rule provides for five hours of general debate (including one hour on the subject of economic goals and policies) equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and 20 minutes controlled by Representative Minge or his designee. The rule provides for the consideration of those 5 amendments in the nature of a substitute designated in section 2 of the resolution, if printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose, which may be offered only in the order designated, may be offered only by a Member designated, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes (except as specified in the rule) equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order are waived against the amendments designated in section 2. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. The rule provides that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to achieve mathematical consistency. The rule further provides that the concurrent resolution will not be subject to a demand for a division of the question of its adoption. Finally, the rule provides that rule XLIX (establishment of statutory limit on the public debt) shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998. Testimony was heard from Chairman Kasich, Representatives Hobson, Smith of Michigan, Shuster, Doolittle, Sam Johnson of Texas, Doggett, Thompson, Minge, Brown of California, Oberstar, Peterson of Minnesota, DeFazio, Waters, Boyd, and Turner.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 20, 1997

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Department of the Interior, 9 a.m., SD–124.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for the Capitol Police Board and the Congressional Budget Office, 10 a.m., S–128, Capitol.

Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1998 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on international financial institutions, 2:30 p.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services, to hold hearings on the Quadrennial Defense Review, focusing on the impact of its recommendations on national security entering the 21st century, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Governmental Affairs, business meeting, to mark up S. 261, to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government, S. 207, to review, reform, and terminate unnecessary and inequitable Federal subsidies, and S. 307 and H.R. 680, bills to authorize the transfer to States of surplus personal property for donation to nonprofit providers of assistance to impoverished families and individuals, and to consider the nominations of David J. Barram, of California, to be Administrator of General Services, and Kenneth M. Mead, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Transportation, 4 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration, to hold hearings on proposed legislation granting lawful residence to Christophe Meili, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Labor and Human Resources, to hold hearings to examine the quality of various health plans, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Select Committee on Intelligence, to hold hearings on the Zona Rosa massacre, 10 a.m., SH–216.

NOTICE

For a listing of Senate committee meetings scheduled ahead, see pages E976–77 in today's Record.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Forestry, Resource Conservation, and Research, hearing to review the financing of National Forest roads, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing on H.R. 1277, Department of Energy Civilian Research and Development Act of 1997, 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, oversight hearing regarding the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, oversight hearing regarding visa fraud and immigration benefits application fraud, 9:30 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, oversight hearing on the agreement reached by the United States, the environmental community and the mining industry in the New World Mine proposed buyout, 1:30 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 60, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to the Casa Malpais National Historic Landmark in Springerville, AZ; H.R. 951, to require the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands located in Hinsdale, CO; H.R. 822, to facilitate a land exchange involving private land within the exterior boundaries of Wenatchee National Forest in Chelan County, WA; H.R. 1198, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the City of Grants Pass, OR; and H.R. 960, to validate certain conveyances in the City of Tulare, Tulare County, CA, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider H.R. 408, International Dolphin Conservation Program Act, 11 a.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Empowerment, hearing on regulatory, tax, licensing incentives and impediments to empowerment in rural and impoverished communities, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Joint Meetings

Conferees, on H.R. 1469, making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, 11 a.m., S–5, Capitol.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, to resume hearings to examine the process to enlarge the membership of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), 10 a.m., SD–538.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, May 20

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10 a.m.), Senate may resume consideration of H.R. 1122, Partial-Birth Abortion Ban.

Senate may also begin consideration of the Fiscal Year 1998 Concurrent Budget Resolution.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10:30 a.m., Tuesday, May 20

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of 6 Suspensions:

1. S. Con. Res. 26, permitting the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony honoring Mother Teresa;

2. H.R. 1650, to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Mother Teresa;

3. H. Res. 147, expressing the Sense of the House that the House of Representatives should participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States;

4. H.R. 1306, Riegle-Neal Clarification Act of 1997;

5. H. Res. 121, expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives regarding the March 30, 1997 terrorist grenade attack in Cambodia;

6. H.R. 956, Drug-Free Community Act; and

Consideration of H. Con. Res. 84, Concurrent Budget Resolution for FY 1998 (modified closed rule, 5 hours of debate).

NOTE.—A recorded vote is expected at 12:00 noon.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bereuter, Doug, Nebr., E973
Bilirakis, Michael, Fla., E952
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E956
Boehlert, Sherwood L., N.Y., E957
Borski, Robert A., Pa., E953
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E956
Castle, Michael N., Del., E959
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E962
Duncan, John J., Jr., Tenn., E966
Ehrlich, Robert L., Jr., Md., E952
Everett, Terry, Ala., E965
Farr, Sam, Calif., E961, E964
Fazio, Vic, Calif., E958, E961
Forbes, Michael P., N.Y., E970
Gejdenson, Sam, Conn., E957
Gekas, George W., Pa., E970
Gillmor, Paul E., Ohio, E953
Gilman, Benjamin A., N.Y., E955
Granger, Kay, Tex., E954
Hamilton, Lee H., Ind., E958, E960, E967
Harman, Jane, Calif., E954
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E953
Johnson, Nancy L., Conn., E964
Kennelly, Barbara B., Conn., E959
LaHood, Ray, Ill., E957, E959
Lantos, Tom, Calif., E964, E970
Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E952
Martinez, Matthew G., Calif., E972
Menendez, Robert, N.J., E954, E966
Mica, John L., Fla., E956
Miller, George, Calif., E951
Moakley, John Joseph, Mass., E974
Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E962
Packard, Ron, Calif., E957, E970
Payne, Donald M., N.J., E970
Quinn, Jack, N.Y., E974, E975
Radanovich, George P., Calif., E969, E971
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E959
Riley, Bob, Ala., E961
Rogan, James E., Calif., E969
Rush, Bobby L., Ill., E957, E962
Sandlin, Max, Tex., E971
Shuster, Bud, Pa., E974
Smith, Linda, Wash., E966
Stokes, Louis, Ohio, E971
Tauscher, Ellen O., Calif., E965
Tauzin, W.J. (Billy), La., E971
Torres, Esteban Edward, Calif., E962
Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E960
Watts, J.C., Jr., Okla., E966

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $150.00 for six months, $295.00 per year, or purchased for $2.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.