

Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and the term "new budget authority" has the meaning given to such term in section 3(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

**SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TAX CUTS.**

It is the sense of the Congress that changes in tax laws which stimulate private investment of savings should be enacted if the deficit reduction targets in this resolution are met.

**SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EMERGENCIES.**

It is the sense of the Congress that Congress should study alternative approaches to budgeting for emergencies, establishing regular procedures and funds for paying for emergencies.

**SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING DEBT REDUCTION.**

It is the sense of the Congress that eliminating the deficit by producing a balanced budget is only the first step toward the ultimate goal of reducing and eventually eliminating the public debt.

**SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TRUST FUND SURPLUSES.**

Congress finds that all recent year Federal budgets, as well as both fiscal year 1996 budget resolutions reported out by the Budget Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, have masked the magnitude of annual deficits by counting various trust fund surpluses. Therefore, it is the sense of the Congress that upon reaching a balance in the Federal budget, the Government should move toward balance without consideration of trust fund surpluses.

**SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING LOCK-BOX.**

(a) It is the sense of the Congress that:

(1) The current practice of reallocating for other spending purposes spending cuts made during floor consideration of appropriations bills should be ended.

(2) A "Deficit Reduction Lock-Box" should be established to collect these spending reductions.

(3) These spending reductions should be used for deficit or debt reduction.

(b) To facilitate Deficit Reduction Lock-Box compliance by the Committees on Appropriations, the Congressional Budget Office shall score all general appropriation measures and have such score card published in the Congressional Record.

**SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FIRE-WALLS.**

It is the sense of the Congress that the discretionary spending totals for defense, international, and domestic spending should be enforced through spending limits for each category with firewalls to prevent funds from being shifted between categories.

**SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.**

It is the sense of the Congress that, in order to ensure that a balanced budget is achieved by 2002 and remain in balance thereafter, strict enforcement should be enacted. Such language should—

(1) require the Federal Government to reach a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 and remain in balance thereafter;

(2) establish procedures for developing honest, accurate, and accepted budget estimates;

(3) require that the President propose annual budgets that would achieve a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 and for each year thereafter, use accurate assumptions;

(4) require the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and Senate to report budget resolutions that achieve a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 and for each year thereafter, using accurate assumptions; [and]

(5) establish a comprehensive system of budgetary enforcement to ensure that the levels of discretionary spending, mandatory spending, and revenues in this resolution are met.

**SEC. 12. INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE COMPLIANCE INITIATIVE.**

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—(1) For purposes of points of order under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and concurrent resolutions on the budget—

(A) the discretionary spending limits under section 601(a)(2) of that Act (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the current fiscal year and each outyear;

(B) the allocations to the Committee on Appropriations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of that Act; and

(C) the appropriate budgetary aggregates in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget,

shall be adjusted to reflect the amounts of additional new budget authority or additional outlays (as defined in paragraph (2)) reported by the Committee on Appropriations in appropriation Acts (or by the committee of conference on such legislation) for the Internal Revenue Service compliance initiative activities in any fiscal year, but not to exceed in any fiscal year \$405,000,000 in new budget authority and \$405,000,000 in outlays.

(2) As used in this section, the terms "additional new budget authority" or "additional outlays" shall mean, for any fiscal year, budget authority or outlays (as the case may be) in excess of the amounts requested for that fiscal year for the Internal Revenue Service in the President's Budget for fiscal year 1996.

(b) REVISED LIMITS, ALLOCATIONS, AND AGGREGATES.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate or the House of Representatives (as the case may be) shall submit to that chairman's respective House appropriately revised—

(1) discretionary spending limits under section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the current fiscal year and each outyear;

(2) allocations to the Committee on Appropriations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of that Act; and

(3) appropriate budgetary aggregates in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget,

to carry out this subsection. These revised discretionary spending limits, allocations, and aggregates shall be considered for purposes of congressional enforcement under that Act as the discretionary spending limits, allocations, and aggregates.

(c) REPORTING REVISED SUBALLOCATIONS.—The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

(d) CONTINGENCIES.—

(1) The Internal Revenue Service and the Department of the Treasury have certified

(2) This section shall not apply to any additional new budget authority or additional outlays unless—

(A) the chairmen of the Budget Committees certify, based upon information from the Congressional Budget Office, the General Accounting Office, and the Internal Revenue Service (as well as from any other sources they deem relevant), that such budget authority or outlays will not increase the total of the Federal budget deficits over the next five years; and

(B) any funds made available pursuant to such budget authority or outlays are available only for the purpose of carrying out Internal Revenue Service compliance initiative activities.

**SEC. 13. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING MEDICAID BLOCK GRANTS.**

It is the Sense of Congress that Medicaid block grants should be distributed based on a formula that takes into account the proportion of individuals with income below the poverty level in each State.

It was decided in the negative ..... Yea ..... 100  
 Nays ..... 325  
 Answered present 1

¶69.13 [Roll No. 342] AYES—100

Abercrombie	Gunderson	Orton
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Pallone
Andrews	Hall (TX)	Payne (VA)
Baesler	Hamilton	Peterson (FL)
Baldacci	Harman	Peterson (MN)
Barrett (WI)	Hayes	Pomeroy
Beilenson	Hefner	Poshard
Bentsen	Horn	Quinn
Bevill	Hoyer	Richardson
Brewster	Jackson-Lee	Roemer
Browder	Jacobs	Rose
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Roukema
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Sabo
Chapman	Kennedy (MA)	Sawyer
Clayton	Kennelly	Schroeder
Clement	Klug	Scott
Clyburn	LaFalce	Sisisky
Condit	Laughlin	Skaggs
Conyers	Lincoln	Slaughter
Cramer	Lipinski	Spratt
Danner	Luther	Stark
Davis	McCarthy	Stenholm
de la Garza	McHale	Tanner
Dicks	McNulty	Tauzin
Dingell	Meehan	Taylor (MS)
Dixon	Meek	Thornton
Dooley	Minge	Upton
Doyle	Montgomery	Vento
Duncan	Moran	Visclosky
Eshoo	Morella	Volkmer
Fazio	Murtha	Watt (NC)
Furse	Oberstar	Wynn
Geren	Olver	
Gibbons	Ortiz	

NOES—325

Allard	Castle	Emerson
Archer	Chabot	Engel
Armey	Chambliss	English
Bachus	Chenoweth	Ensign
Baker (CA)	Christensen	Evans
Baker (LA)	Chrysler	Everett
Ballenger	Clay	Ewing
Barcia	Clinger	Farr
Barr	Coble	Fattah
Barrett (NE)	Coburn	Fawell
Bartlett	Coleman	Fields (LA)
Barton	Collins (GA)	Fields (TX)
Bass	Collins (IL)	Filner
Bateman	Collins (MI)	Flake
Becerra	Combest	Flanagan
Bereuter	Cooley	Foglietta
Bilbray	Costello	Foley
Bilirakis	Cox	Forbes
Bishop	Coyne	Ford
Bliley	Crane	Fowler
Blute	Crapo	Fox
Boehert	Creameans	Frank (MA)
Boehner	Cubin	Franks (CT)
Bonilla	Cunningham	Franks (NJ)
Bonior	Deal	Frelinghuysen
Borski	DeFazio	Frisa
Boucher	DeLauro	Frost
Brown (FL)	DeLay	Funderburk
Brown (OH)	Dellums	Galleghy
Brownback	Deutsch	Ganske
Bryant (TN)	Diaz-Balart	Gejdenson
Bryant (TX)	Dickey	Gekas
Bunn	Doggett	Gephardt
Bunning	Doolittle	Gilchrest
Burr	Dornan	Gillmor
Burton	Dreier	Gilman
Buyer	Dunn	Gingrich
Callahan	Durbin	Gonzalez
Calvert	Edwards	Goodlatte
Camp	Ehlers	Goodling
Canady	Ehrlich	Gordon

Goss	Martini	Saxton
Graham	Mascara	Scarborough
Green	Matsui	Schaefer
Greenwood	McCollum	Schiff
Gutierrez	McCrery	Schumer
Gutknecht	McDade	Seastrand
Hancock	McDemott	Sensenbrenner
Hansen	McHugh	Shadegg
Hastert	McInnis	Shaw
Hastings (FL)	McKeon	Shays
Hastings (WA)	McKinney	Shuster
Hayworth	Menendez	Skeen
Hefley	Metcalf	Skelton
Heineman	Meyers	Smith (NJ)
Herger	Mfume	Smith (TX)
Hilleary	Mica	Smith (WA)
Hilliard	Miller (CA)	Solomon
Hinchee	Miller (FL)	Souder
Hobson	Mineta	Spence
Hoekstra	Mink	Stearns
Holden	Moakley	Stockman
Hostettler	Molinari	Stokes
Houghton	Mollohan	Studds
Hunter	Moorhead	Stump
Hutchinson	Myers	Stupak
Hyde	Myrick	Talent
Inglis	Nadler	Tate
Istook	Neal	Taylor (NC)
Johnson (SD)	Nethercutt	Tejeda
Johnson, E. B.	Neumann	Thomas
Johnson, Sam	Ney	Thompson
Johnston	Norwood	Thornberry
Jones	Nussle	Thurman
Kanjorski	Obey	Tiahrt
Kasich	Owens	Torkildsen
Kelly	Oxley	Torres
Kennedy (RI)	Packard	Towns
Kildee	Parker	Traficant
Kim	Pastor	Tucker
King	Paxon	Velazquez
Kingston	Payne (NJ)	Vucanovich
Klink	Pelosi	Waldholtz
Knollenberg	Petri	Walker
Kolbe	Pickett	Walsh
LaHood	Pombo	Wamp
Lantos	Porter	Ward
Largent	Portman	Waters
Latham	Pryce	Watts (OK)
LaTourette	Quillen	Waxman
Lazio	Radanovich	Weldon (FL)
Leach	Rahall	Weldon (PA)
Levin	Ramstad	Weller
Lewis (CA)	Reed	White
Lewis (GA)	Regula	Whitfield
Lewis (KY)	Reynolds	Wicker
Lightfoot	Riggs	Williams
Linder	Rivers	Wilson
Livingston	Roberts	Wise
LoBiondo	Rogers	Wolf
Lofgren	Rohrabacher	Woolsey
Longley	Ros-Lehtinen	Wyden
Lowe	Roth	Yates
Lucas	Roybal-Allard	Young (AK)
Maloney	Royce	Young (FL)
Manton	Rush	Zeliff
Manzullo	Salmon	Zimmer
Markey	Sanders	
Martinez	Sanford	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kaptur

NOT VOTING—9

Berman	Klecza	Serrano
Bono	McIntosh	Smith (MI)
Hoke	Rangel	Torricelli

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was not agreed to.

After some further time,

69.14 RECORDED VOTE

A recorded vote by electronic device was ordered in the Committee of the Whole on the following amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by Mr. NEUMANN:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.**

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, as

required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, October 1, 1998, October 1, 1999, October 1, 2000, and October 1, 2001:

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

- Fiscal year 1996: \$1,056,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1997: \$1,057,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998: \$1,096,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999: \$1,138,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: \$1,187,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: \$1,240,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: \$1,300,500,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

- Fiscal year 1996: \$13,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1997: —\$26,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998: —\$38,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999: —\$48,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: —\$57,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: —\$70,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: —\$80,500,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

- Fiscal year 1996: \$101,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1997: \$105,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998: \$110,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999: \$115,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: \$120,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: \$125,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: \$130,900,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

- Fiscal year 1996: \$1,219,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1997: \$1,236,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998: \$1,251,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999: \$1,253,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: \$1,275,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: \$1,312,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: \$1,359,600,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

- Fiscal year 1996: \$1,238,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1997: \$1,245,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998: \$1,251,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999: \$1,233,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: \$1,260,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: \$1,302,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: \$1,352,400,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

- Fiscal year 1996: \$182,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1997: \$188,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998: \$154,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999: \$94,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: \$73,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: \$62,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: \$51,900,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

- Fiscal year 1996: \$5,214,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1997: \$5,470,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1998: \$5,697,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999: \$5,896,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000: \$6,081,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001: \$6,157,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002: \$6,216,000,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, October 1, 1998, October 1, 1999, October 1, 2000, and October 1, 2001 are as follows:

- Fiscal year 1996:
  - (A) New direct loan obligations, \$18,200,000,000.
  - (B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$170,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1997:
  - (A) New direct loan obligations, \$17,200,000,000.
  - (B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$167,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
 

- (A) New direct loan obligations, \$16,200,000,000.
- (B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$165,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
 

- (A) New direct loan obligations, \$15,200,000,000.
- (B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$162,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
 

- (A) New direct loan obligations, \$14,200,000,000.
- (B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$159,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
 

- (A) New direct loan obligations, \$14,200,000,000.
- (B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$159,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 

- (A) New direct loan obligations, \$14,200,000,000.
- (B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$159,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 

- (B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$159,400,000,000.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1996 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

- (1) National Defense (050):
  - Fiscal year 1996:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$261,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$260,000,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- Fiscal year 1997:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$260,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$260,000,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- Fiscal year 1998:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$260,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$260,000,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- Fiscal year 1999:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$260,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$260,000,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- Fiscal year 2000:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$260,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$260,000,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- Fiscal year 2001:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$265,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$263,000,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

- Fiscal year 2002:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$270,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$270,000,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.