

# One Hundred Fifth Congress of the United States of America

## AT THE FIRST SESSION

*Begun and held at the City of Washington on Tuesday,  
the seventh day of January, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-seven*

## Concurrent Resolution

Establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

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

(a) **DECLARATION.**—The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

#### **TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

- Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
- Sec. 102. Social Security.
- Sec. 103. Major functional categories.
- Sec. 104. Reconciliation in the Senate.
- Sec. 105. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

#### **TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING**

- Sec. 201. Discretionary spending limits.
- Sec. 202. Allowance for the IMF.
- Sec. 203. Allowance for section 8 housing assistance.
- Sec. 204. Separate environmental allocation.
- Sec. 205. Priority Federal land acquisitions and exchanges.
- Sec. 206. Allowance for arrearages.
- Sec. 207. Intercity passenger rail reserve fund for fiscal years 1998–2002.
- Sec. 207A. Intercity passenger rail reserve fund in the Senate for fiscal years 1998–2002.
- Sec. 208. Mass transit reserve fund in the Senate for fiscal years 1998–2002.
- Sec. 209. Highway reserve fund in the Senate for fiscal years 1998–2002.
- Sec. 210. Deficit-neutral reserve fund in the House for surface transportation.
- Sec. 211. Sale of Government assets.
- Sec. 212. Determinations of budgetary levels; reversals.
- Sec. 213. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

#### **TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS, HOUSE, AND SENATE PROVISIONS**

##### **Subtitle A—Sense of the Congress**

- Sec. 301. Sense of the Congress on repayment of the Federal debt.
- Sec. 302. Sense of the Congress on tax cuts.
- Sec. 303. Sense of the Congress that the 10-year revenue loss from the tax relief package shall not exceed \$250,000,000,000.

##### **Subtitle B—Sense of the House**

- Sec. 306. Sense of the House on Commission on Long-Term Budgetary Problems.

## H. Con. Res. 84—2

- Sec. 307. Sense of the House on corporate welfare.
- Sec. 308. Sense of the House on baselines.
- Sec. 309. Sense of the House on family violence option clarifying amendment.

### Subtitle C—Sense of the Senate

- Sec. 311. Sense of the Senate on long term entitlement reforms, including accuracy in determining changes in the cost of living.
- Sec. 312. Sense of the Senate on tactical fighter aircraft programs.
- Sec. 313. Sense of the Senate regarding children's health coverage.
- Sec. 314. Sense of the Senate on a Medicaid per capita cap.
- Sec. 315. Sense of the Senate that added savings go to deficit reduction.
- Sec. 316. Sense of the Senate on fairness in Medicare.
- Sec. 317. Sense of the Senate regarding assistance to Lithuania and Latvia.
- Sec. 318. Sense of the Senate regarding a National Commission on Higher Education.
- Sec. 319. Sense of the Senate on lockbox.
- Sec. 320. Sense of the Senate on the earned income credit.
- Sec. 321. Sense of the Senate supporting long-term entitlement reforms.
- Sec. 322. Sense of the Senate on disaster assistance funding.
- Sec. 323. Sense of the Senate on enforcement of bipartisan budget agreement.
- Sec. 324. Sense of the Senate regarding the National Institutes of Health.
- Sec. 325. Sense of the Senate regarding certain elderly legal aliens.
- Sec. 326. Sense of the Senate regarding retroactive taxes.
- Sec. 327. Sense of the Senate on Social Security and balancing the budget.
- Sec. 328. Sense of the Senate supporting sufficient funding for veterans programs and benefits.
- Sec. 329. Sense of the Senate on family violence option clarifying amendment.
- Sec. 330. Sense of the Senate regarding assistance to Amtrak.
- Sec. 331. Sense of the Senate regarding the protection of children's health.
- Sec. 332. Sense of the Senate on depositing all Federal gasoline taxes into the Highway Trust Fund.
- Sec. 333. Sense of the Senate on early childhood education.
- Sec. 334. Sense of the Senate concerning Highway Trust Fund.
- Sec. 335. Sense of the Senate concerning tax incentives for the cost of post-secondary education.
- Sec. 336. Sense of the Senate on additional tax cuts.
- Sec. 337. Sense of the Senate regarding truth in budgeting and spectrum auctions.
- Sec. 338. Sense of the Senate on highway demonstration projects.
- Sec. 339. Sense of the Senate regarding the use of budget savings.
- Sec. 340. Sense of the Senate regarding the value of the Social Security system for future retirees.
- Sec. 341. Sense of the Senate on economic growth dividend protection.
- Sec. 342. Sense of the Senate supporting Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers.
- Sec. 343. Sense of the Senate regarding parental involvement in prevention of drug use by children.

## 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: \$1,199,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,241,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,285,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,343,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,407,600,000,000.

(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: \$ – 11,100,000,000.

H. Con. Res. 84—3

Fiscal year 2000: \$—22,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$—22,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$—19,900,000,000.

(C) The amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$113,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$119,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$125,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$130,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$136,800,000,000.

(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: \$1,386,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,440,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,486,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,520,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,551,600,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,372,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,424,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,468,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,500,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,515,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$—173,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$—182,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$—183,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$—157,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$—108,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$5,593,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$5,841,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$6,088,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$6,307,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$6,481,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$34,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$33,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$34,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$36,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$37,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$315,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$324,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$328,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$332,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$335,300,000,000.

**SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.**

(a) **SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.**—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302, 602, and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$402,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$422,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$442,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$461,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$482,800,000,000.

(b) **SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302, 602, and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 1998: \$317,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$330,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$343,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$358,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$372,500,000,000.

**SEC. 103. 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, \$266,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$270,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$265,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$274,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$268,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$1,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$281,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$270,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$1,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$289,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$272,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

H. Con. Res. 84—5

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$1,100,000,000.
- (2) International Affairs (150):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,600,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$12,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,600,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$13,100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$15,000,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$13,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,800,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$13,800,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$16,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,800,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$14,200,000,000.
- (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$16,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$16,900,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$16,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$16,500,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$16,000,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$15,900,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$15,700,000,000.

H. Con. Res. 84—6

- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (4) Energy (270):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$3,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,200,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$3,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,400,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$3,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,300,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$2,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$2,000,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$2,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$1,900,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,200,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$23,900,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$22,400,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$23,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$22,700,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$22,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$23,000,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$22,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$22,700,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$22,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$22,300,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (6) Agriculture (350):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.

H. Con. Res. 84—7

(B) Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$6,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,300,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$6,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$6,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, \$9,500,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$6,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,100,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$6,700,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$245,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$253,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$258,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,700,000,000.

H. Con. Res. 84—8

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$259,900,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$46,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$40,900,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$200,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$46,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$41,300,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$47,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$41,400,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$48,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$41,300,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$49,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$41,200,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$8,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$10,400,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,900,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$2,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$8,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,900,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$2,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$7,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,000,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$2,400,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$7,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$11,400,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$2,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$7,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$8,400,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,200,000,000.



H. Con. Res. 84—9

- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$2,500,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services  
(500):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$60,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$56,100,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$12,300,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$20,700,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$60,500,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$59,300,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,100,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$21,900,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$61,700,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$60,700,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,900,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$23,300,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$63,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$61,900,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$14,700,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$24,500,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2002:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$63,300,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$62,300,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,400,000,000.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$25,700,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):
  - Fiscal year 1998:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$137,800,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$137,800,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments,  
\$100,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 1999:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$145,000,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$144,900,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2000:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$154,100,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$153,900,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2001:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$163,400,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$163,100,000,000.
    - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
    - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
  - Fiscal year 2002:

H. Con. Res. 84—10

- (A) New budget authority, \$172,200,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$171,700,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (12) Medicare (570):
- Fiscal year 1998:
- (A) New budget authority, \$201,600,000,000.
  - (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, \$212,100,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$211,500,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:
- (A) New budget authority, \$225,500,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$225,500,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:
- (A) New budget authority, \$239,600,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$238,800,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:
- (A) New budget authority, \$251,500,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$250,800,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (13) Income Security (600):
- Fiscal year 1998:
- (A) New budget authority, \$239,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$247,800,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:
- (A) New budget authority, \$254,100,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$258,100,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:
- (A) New budget authority, \$269,600,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$268,200,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
- (A) New budget authority, \$275,100,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$277,300,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
- (A) New budget authority, \$286,900,000,000.

H. Con. Res. 84—11

- (B) Outlays, \$285,200,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$200,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.
- (14) Social Security (650):
- Fiscal year 1998:
- (A) New budget authority, \$11,400,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$11,500,000,000.
  - (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, \$12,200,000,000.
  - (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, \$12,900,000,000.
  - (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, \$13,000,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:
- (A) New budget authority, \$14,400,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$14,400,000,000.
  - (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, \$40,500,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$41,300,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,000,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$27,100,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1999:
- (A) New budget authority, \$41,500,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$41,700,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,100,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$26,700,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2000:
- (A) New budget authority, \$41,700,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$41,900,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,200,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$26,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2001:
- (A) New budget authority, \$42,100,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$42,200,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,200,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,600,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
- (A) New budget authority, \$42,300,000,000.

H. Con. Res. 84—12

- (B) Outlays, \$42,400,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,100,000,000.
- (16) Administration of Justice (750):
- Fiscal year 1998:
- (A) New budget authority, \$24,800,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$22,600,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:
- (A) New budget authority, \$25,100,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$24,500,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:
- (A) New budget authority, \$24,200,000,000.
  - (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, \$24,400,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$25,900,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:
- (A) New budget authority, \$24,900,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$24,900,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (17) General Government (800):
- Fiscal year 1998:
- (A) New budget authority, \$14,700,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$14,000,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- Fiscal year 1999:
- (A) New budget authority, \$14,400,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$14,400,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2000:
- (A) New budget authority, \$14,000,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$14,700,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2001:
- (A) New budget authority, \$13,700,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$14,100,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2002:
- (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, \$13,100,000,000.
  - (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
  - (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (18) Net Interest (900):

H. Con. Res. 84—13

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$296,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$296,500,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$304,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$304,600,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, \$305,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$305,100,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, \$303,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$303,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$303,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$303,700,000,000.
- (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, -\$41,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$41,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

H. Con. Res. 84—14

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$36,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$36,900,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$36,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$36,900,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$39,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$39,200,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$51,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$51,100,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

**SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.**

(a) RECONCILIATION OF SPENDING REDUCTIONS.—Not later than June 13, 1997, the committees named in this subsection shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY.—The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to increase outlays by not more than \$300,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 and by not more than \$1,500,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit \$434,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 and \$1,590,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit \$14,849,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 and \$26,496,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$6,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 and \$13,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction—

(A) that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$40,911,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 and \$100,646,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002; and

(B) to increase the statutory limit on the public debt to not more than \$5,950,000,000,000.

(6) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit \$1,769,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 and \$5,467,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES.—The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$1,057,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 and \$1,792,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$681,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 and \$2,733,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(b) RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS.—Not later than June 20, 1997, the Senate Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction necessary to reduce revenues by not more than \$20,500,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 and \$85,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(c) TREATMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL PAY-AS-YOU-GO.—For purposes of section 202 of House Concurrent Resolution 67 (104th Congress), legislation which reduces revenues pursuant to a reconciliation instruction contained in subsection (b) shall be taken together with all other legislation passed pursuant to the reconciliation instructions contained in this resolution when determining the deficit effect of such legislation.

(d) CHILDREN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE.—

(1) DEFICIT NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENTS.—After the reporting of reconciliation legislation pursuant to subsection (a), or after the submission of a conference report thereon, and if the Committee on Finance reduces outlays by an amount greater than the outlay reduction that is required by subsection (a)(5)(A), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, with the concurrence and agreement of the ranking minority member, may submit in writing appropriately revised (A) reconciliation instructions to the Committee on Finance to reduce the deficit, (B) allocations, (C) limits, and (D) aggregates.

(2) FLEXIBILITY ON ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments made pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed \$2,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 and \$16,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal

years 1998 through 2002 and shall not cause an increase in the deficit levels in this resolution.

**SEC. 105. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to provide for two separate reconciliation bills: the first for entitlement reform and the second for tax relief.

(b) **SUBMISSIONS.**—

(1) **ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.**—Not later than June 13, 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 14, 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 \$179,884,000,000 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 —\$32,743,000,000 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, \$507,150,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$2,259,294,000,000 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 \$89,528,000,000 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 \$375,722,000,000 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 \$88,711,000,000 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 \$117,959,000,000 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: \$397,581,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$506,522,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$2,257,912,000,000 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 \$6,358,388,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(C) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the statutory limit on the public debt to not more than \$5,950,000,000,000.

(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 \$179,884,000,000 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 -\$32,743,000,000 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, \$507,150,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$2,259,294,000,000 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 \$89,528,000,000 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 \$375,722,000,000 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 \$88,711,000,000 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 \$117,959,000,000 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: \$397,581,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998, \$506,522,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and \$2,257,912,000,000 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 \$6,273,388,000,000 in revenues in fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(C) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the statutory limit on the public debt to not more than \$5,950,000,000,000.

(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 II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING**

### **SEC. 201. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.**

(a) DISCRETIONARY LIMITS.—In the Senate, in this section and for the purposes of allocations made for the discretionary category pursuant to section 302(a) or 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the term “discretionary spending limit” means—

(1) with respect to fiscal year 1998—

(A) for the defense category \$269,000,000,000 in new budget authority and \$266,823,000,000 in outlays; and

(B) for the nondefense category \$257,857,000,000 in new budget authority and \$286,445,000,000 in outlays;

(2) with respect to fiscal year 1999—

(A) for the defense category \$271,500,000,000 in new budget authority and \$266,518,000,000 in outlays; and

(B) for the nondefense category \$261,499,000,000 in new budget authority and \$292,803,000,000 in outlays;

(3) with respect to fiscal year 2000, for the discretionary category \$537,193,000,000 in new budget authority and \$564,265,000,000 in outlays;

(4) with respect to fiscal year 2001, for the discretionary category \$542,032,000,000 in new budget authority and \$564,396,000,000 in outlays; and

(5) with respect to fiscal year 2002, for the discretionary category \$551,074,000,000 in new budget authority and \$560,799,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted for changes in concepts and definitions and emergency appropriations.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider—

(A) a revision of this resolution or any concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such a resolution) that provides discretionary spending in excess of the discretionary spending limit or limits for such fiscal year; or

(B) any bill or resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such bill or resolution) for fiscal year

H. Con. Res. 84—20

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 that would cause any of the limits in this section (or suballocations of the discretionary limits made pursuant to section 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) to be exceeded.

(2) EXCEPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply if a declaration of war by the Congress is in effect or if a joint resolution pursuant to section 258 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 has been enacted.

(B) ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY LIMITS IN FISCAL YEAR 1998.—Until the enactment of reconciliation legislation pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of section 104 of this resolution—

(i) subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) shall not apply; and

(ii) subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to fiscal year 1998.

(c) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(d) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the concurrent resolution, bill, or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, new entitlement authority, revenues, and deficits for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

**SEC. 202. ALLOWANCE FOR THE IMF.**

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—In the Senate, for fiscal year 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002, and in the House of Representatives, for fiscal year 1998 or 1999, after the reporting of an appropriations measure (or after the submission of a conference report thereon) that includes an appropriation with respect to paragraph (1) or (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the appropriate allocations, budgetary aggregates, and, in the Senate only, discretionary limits, by the amount of budget authority in that measure that is the dollar equivalent, in terms of Special Drawing Rights, of—

(1) an increase in the United States quota as part of the International Monetary Fund Eleventh General Review of Quotas (United States Quota); or

(2) any increase in the maximum amount available to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 17 of the Bretton Woods Agreement Act, as amended from time to time (New Arrangements to Borrow).

(b) COMMITTEE SUBALLOCATIONS.—The Committee on Appropriations may report to its House appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 following the adjustments made pursuant to subsection (a).

**SEC. 203. ALLOWANCE FOR SECTION 8 HOUSING ASSISTANCE.**

(a) ADJUSTMENT FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—For fiscal year 1998, after the reporting of an appropriation measure (or after the submission of a conference report thereon) that includes an appropriation for the renewal of expiring contracts for tenant- and project-based housing assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the appropriate allocations in this resolution by the amount provided in that appropriation measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$9,200,000,000 in budget authority and the appropriate amount of outlays.

(b) COMMITTEE SUBALLOCATIONS.—The Committee on Appropriations may report to its House appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 following the adjustments made pursuant to subsection (a).

**SEC. 204. SEPARATE ENVIRONMENTAL ALLOCATION.**

(a) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—After the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure report a bill (or after the submission of a conference report thereon) or in the Senate, after the Committee on Environment and Public Works reports a bill (or after the submission of a conference report thereon) to reform the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of hazardous waste sites that does not exceed—

- (1) \$200,000,000 in budget authority for fiscal year 1998,
- (2) \$200,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, and
- (3) \$1,000,000,000 in budget authority for the period of

fiscal years 1998 through 2002, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of that House may increase the appropriate allocations of budget authority in this resolution by the amounts provided in that bill for that purpose and the outlays flowing in all years from such budget authority.

(b) PRIOR SURPLUS.—In the Senate, for the purposes of section 202 of House Concurrent Resolution 67 (104th Congress), legislation reported (or the submission of a conference report thereon) pursuant to subsection (a) shall be taken together with all other legislation passed pursuant to section 104 of this resolution.

**SEC. 205. PRIORITY FEDERAL LAND ACQUISITIONS AND EXCHANGES.**

(a) ADJUSTMENT FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—For fiscal year 1998, after the reporting of an appropriation measure (or after the submission of a conference report thereon) that provides \$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 of each House shall increase the appropriate allocations by that amount of budget authority and the outlays flowing from such budget authority to the Committee on Appropriations of that House.

(b) COMMITTEE SUBALLOCATIONS.—The Committee on Appropriations may report to its House appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the

Congressional Budget Act of 1974 following the adjustments made pursuant to subsection (a).

**SEC. 206. ALLOWANCE FOR ARREARAGES.**

(a) **ADJUSTMENT FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.**—(1) In the Senate, for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002, or in the House of Representatives, for the period of fiscal years 1998 and 1999, after the reporting of an appropriations measure (or after the submission of a conference report thereon) that includes an appropriation for arrearages for international organizations, international peacekeeping, and multilateral development banks during that fiscal year, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the appropriate allocations, aggregates, and, in the Senate only, discretionary spending limits, in this resolution by an amount provided for that purpose in that appropriation measure.

(2) In the Senate, the adjustments described in paragraph (1) for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002 may not exceed \$1,884,000,000 in budget authority and the outlays flowing in all years from such budget authority.

(b) **COMMITTEE SUBALLOCATIONS.**—The Committee on Appropriations shall report to its House appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 following the adjustments made pursuant to subsection (a).

**SEC. 207. INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL RESERVE FUND FOR FISCAL YEARS 1998–2002.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If legislation is enacted which generates revenue increases or direct spending reductions to finance an intercity passenger rail fund and to the extent that such increases or reductions are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted if such adjustments do not cause an increase in the deficit in this resolution. Necessary authorizing reforms and additional funding contained in this reserve fund for intercity passenger rail should both occur in this Session, and if such funds are appropriated before the enactment of such reforms, such appropriated funds shall not be made available until the enactment of such reforms.

(b) **ESTABLISHING A RESERVE.**—

(1) **ADJUSTMENTS TO CAPTURE SAVINGS.**—After the enactment of legislation described in subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may submit revisions to the appropriate allocations and aggregates by the amount that provisions in such legislation generates revenue increases or direct spending reductions.

(2) **DETERMINATION OF MAXIMUM DISCRETIONARY ALLOWANCE.**—Upon the submission of such revisions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall also submit the amount of revenue increases or direct spending reductions such legislation generates and the maximum amount available each year for adjustments pursuant to subsection (c).

(c) **ADJUSTMENTS FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.**—

(1) **REVISIONS TO ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—After either—

(A) the reporting of an appropriations measure, or after a conference committee submits a conference report thereon, that appropriates funds for the National Railroad

Passenger Corporation and funds from the intercity passenger rail fund; or

(B) the reporting of an appropriations measure, or after a conference committee submits a conference report thereon, that appropriates funds from the intercity passenger rail fund (funds having previously been appropriated for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for that same fiscal year),

the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may submit increased budget authority allocations, aggregates, and, in the Senate only, discretionary limits, for the amount appropriated for authorized expenditures from the intercity passenger rail fund and the outlays in all years flowing from such budget authority.

(2) REVISIONS TO SUBALLOCATIONS.—The Committee on Appropriations may submit appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(d) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The revisions made pursuant to subsection (b) shall not be made—

(A) with respect to direct spending reductions, unless the committee that generates the direct spending reductions is within its allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Budget Act in this resolution (not including the direct spending reductions envisioned in subsection (b)); and

(B) with respect to revenue increases, unless revenues are at or above the revenue aggregates in this resolution (not including the revenue increases envisioned in subsection (b)).

(2) BUDGET AUTHORITY.—The budget authority adjustments made pursuant to subsection (c) shall not exceed the amounts specified in subsection (b)(2) for a fiscal year.

**SEC. 207A. INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE FOR FISCAL YEARS 1998–2002.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, if legislation is enacted which generates revenue increases or direct spending reductions to finance an intercity passenger rail fund and to the extent that such increases or reductions are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted if such adjustments do not cause an increase in the deficit in this resolution.

(b) ESTABLISHING A RESERVE.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS TO CAPTURE SAVINGS.—After the enactment of legislation described in subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit revisions to the appropriate allocations and aggregates by the amount that provisions in such legislation generates revenue increases or direct spending reductions.

(2) DETERMINATION OF MAXIMUM DISCRETIONARY ALLOWANCE.—Upon the submission of such revisions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall also submit the amount of revenue increases or direct spending reductions such legislation generates and the maximum amount available each year for adjustments pursuant to subsection (c).

H. Con. Res. 84—24

(c) ADJUSTMENTS FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—

(1) REVISIONS TO ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—After either—

(A) the reporting of an appropriations measure, or after a conference committee submits a conference report thereon, that appropriates funds for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation and funds from the intercity passenger rail fund; or

(B) the reporting of an appropriations measure, or after a conference committee submits a conference report thereon, that appropriates funds from the intercity passenger rail fund (funds having previously been appropriated for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for that same fiscal year),

the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit increased budget authority allocations, aggregates, and discretionary limits, for the amount appropriated for authorized expenditures from the intercity passenger rail fund and the outlays in all years flowing from such budget authority.

(2) REVISIONS TO SUBALLOCATIONS.—The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate may submit appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(d) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The revisions made pursuant to subsection (b) shall not be made—

(A) with respect to direct spending reductions, unless the committee that generates the direct spending reductions is within its allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Budget Act in this resolution (not including the direct spending reductions envisioned in subsection (b)); and

(B) with respect to revenue increases, unless revenues are at or above the revenue aggregates in this resolution (not including the revenue increases envisioned in subsection (b)).

(2) BUDGET AUTHORITY.—The budget authority adjustments made pursuant to subsection (c) shall not exceed the amounts specified in subsection (b)(2) for a fiscal year.

**SEC. 208. MASS TRANSIT RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE FOR FISCAL YEARS 1998–2002.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, if legislation generates revenue increases or direct spending reductions to finance mass transit and to the extent that such increases or reductions are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted if such adjustments do not cause an increase in the deficit in this resolution.

(b) ADJUSTMENT FOR BUDGET AUTHORITY.—After the reporting of legislation (the offering of an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that reduces non-mass transit direct spending or increases revenues for a fiscal year or years, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit appropriately revised allocations and aggregates by an amount that equals the amount such legislation reduces direct spending or increases revenues for a fiscal year or years.

(c) ESTABLISHING A RESERVE.—



(1) REVISIONS.—After the enactment of legislation described in subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit revisions to the appropriate allocations and aggregates by the amount that provisions in such legislation generates revenue increases or direct nonhighway spending reductions.

(2) REVENUE INCREASES OR DIRECT SPENDING REDUCTIONS.—After the submission of such revisions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall also submit the amount of revenue increases or non-mass transit direct spending reductions such legislation generates and the maximum amount available each year for adjustments pursuant to subsection (d).

(d) ADJUSTMENTS FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—

(1) REVISIONS TO ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—After the reporting of an appropriations measure, or after a conference committee submits a conference report thereon, that makes available funds for mass transit, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall submit increased outlay allocations, aggregates, and discretionary limits for the amount of outlays flowing from the additional obligational authority provided in such bill.

(2) REVISIONS TO SUBALLOCATIONS.—The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate may submit appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The revisions made pursuant to subsection (c) shall not be made—

(A) with respect to non-mass transit direct spending reductions, unless the committee that generates the direct spending reductions is within its allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Budget Act in this resolution (not including the non-mass transit direct spending reductions envisioned in subsection (c)); and

(B) with respect to revenue increases, unless revenues are at or above the revenue aggregates in this resolution (not including the revenue increases envisioned in subsection (c)).

(2) OUTLAYS.—The outlay adjustments made pursuant to subsection (d) shall not exceed the amounts specified in subsection (c)(2) for a fiscal year.

**SEC. 209. HIGHWAY RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE FOR FISCAL YEARS 1998–2002.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, if legislation generates revenue increases or direct spending reductions to finance highways and to the extent that such increases or reductions are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted if such adjustments do not cause an increase in the deficit in this resolution.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS FOR BUDGET AUTHORITY.—After the reporting of legislation (the offering of an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that reduces nonhighway direct spending or increases revenues for a fiscal year or years, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit appropriately revised allocations and aggregates by an amount that

equals the amount such legislation reduces direct spending or increases revenues for a fiscal year or years.

(c) ESTABLISHING A RESERVE.—

(1) REVISIONS.—After the enactment of legislation described in subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit revisions to the appropriate allocations and aggregates by the amount that provisions in such legislation generates revenue increases or non-highway direct spending reductions.

(2) REVENUE INCREASES OR DIRECT SPENDING REDUCTIONS.—Upon the submission of such revisions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall also submit the amount of revenue increases or direct nonhighway spending reductions such legislation generates and the maximum amount available each year for adjustments pursuant to subsection (d).

(d) ADJUSTMENTS FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—

(1) REVISIONS TO ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—After the reporting of an appropriations measure, or after a conference committee submits a conference report thereon, that makes available funds for highways, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall submit increased outlay allocations, aggregates, and discretionary limits for the amount of outlays flowing from the additional obligational authority provided in such measure.

(2) REVISIONS TO SUBALLOCATIONS.—The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate may submit appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The revisions made pursuant to subsection (c) shall not be made—

(A) with respect to nonhighway direct spending reductions, unless the committee that generates the direct spending reductions is within its allocations under section 302(a) and 602(a) of the Budget Act in this resolution (not including the nonhighway direct spending reductions envisioned in subsection (c)); and

(B) with respect to revenue increases, unless revenues are at or above the revenue aggregates in this resolution (not including the revenue increases envisioned in subsection (c)).

(2) OUTLAYS.—The outlay adjustments made pursuant to subsection (d) shall not exceed the amounts specified in subsection (c)(2) for a fiscal year.

**SEC. 210. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND IN THE HOUSE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.**

(a) PURPOSE.—In the House, 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 of the House 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 (for purposes of such offset) 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) After the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House reports a bill (or after the submission of a conference report thereon) meeting the conditions set forth in subsection (b)(2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House 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 after the reporting of a general, supplemental, or continuing resolution making appropriations by the Committee on Appropriations of the House (or after the submission 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 of the House shall increase the allocation and aggregate levels of outlays to that committee for the appropriate fiscal years.

(d) OFFSETTING ADJUSTMENTS.—Upon the enactment of legislation providing offsets pursuant to subsection (c), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make offsetting adjustments in the appropriate allocations and aggregates.

(e) 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).

H. Con. Res. 84—28

- (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. 211. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.**

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Subsections (b) through (d) of this section shall not apply to the sale of any asset resulting from the enactment of any reconciliation bill referred to in section 104 or 105 of this resolution.

(b) **BUDGETARY TREATMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For the purpose of this 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).

(c) **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.

(d) **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.

(e) **INTENT.**—The asset sale rule may be revisited when the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 is extended.

**SEC. 212. DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGETARY LEVELS; REVERSALS.**

(a) **DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this title, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(b) **REVERSALS AND ADJUSTMENTS.**—(1) In the House of Representatives, if any legislation referred to in this title is not enacted into law, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, as soon as practicable, reverse adjustments made under this title for such legislation and have such adjustments published in the Congressional Record.

(2) In the Senate, the adjustments and revisions to allocations, aggregates, and limits made by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to this title for legislation shall only apply while such legislation is under consideration in the Senate and shall only permanently take effect upon the enactment of such legislation.

(c) **EFFECT OF REVISIONS.**—Any revisions made by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget under this title, and in the Senate,

under section 104(d), shall be considered for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates, and in the Senate, the discretionary spending limits, contained in this resolution, and the chairman shall have such revisions published in the Congressional Record.

**SEC. 213. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

The Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change those rules (so far as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

## **TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS, HOUSE, AND SENATE PROVISIONS**

### **Subtitle A—Sense of the Congress**

**SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON REPAYMENT OF THE FEDERAL DEBT.**

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

(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.

(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.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING PRESIDENT'S SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the 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; and

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

**SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON TAX CUTS.**

It is the sense of the Congress that this resolution assumes that—

(1) a substantial majority of the tax cut benefits provided in the tax reconciliation bill will go to middle class working families earning less than approximately \$100,000 per year; and

(2) the tax cuts in the tax reconciliation bill will not cause revenue losses to increase significantly in years after 2007.

**SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS THAT THE 10-YEAR REVENUE LOSS FROM THE TAX RELIEF PACKAGE SHALL NOT EXCEED \$250,000,000,000.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) a May 15, 1997 letter from the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Majority Leader of the Senate to the President of the United States, representing the agreement on the tax package in the Bipartisan Budget Agreements, states that, “It was agreed that the net tax cut shall be \$85 billion through 2002 and not more than \$250 billion through 2007.”;

(2) a May 15, 1997 letter from the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Majority Leader of the Senate to the Chief of Staff to the President, contained in the same Bipartisan Budget Agreement and referring to the tax package, states that “The proposal shall not cause costs to explode in the outyears.”; and

(3) the text of the Bipartisan Budget Agreement issued on May 15, 1997 states that “If bills, resolutions or conference reports are deemed to be inconsistent, remedial efforts shall be made by all parties to assure consistency. Such efforts shall include bipartisan Leadership consultation and concurrence on amendments and scheduling as necessary.”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) 10-YEAR COST.—The 10-year cost of the tax reconciliation bill resulting from this resolution shall not exceed \$250,000,000,000 and any revenue loss shall be certified by the Joint Committee on Taxation in consultation and cooperation with the Office of Tax Analysis of the Department of Treasury.

(2) 5-YEAR COST.—The 5-year cost of the tax reconciliation bill resulting from this resolution shall be \$85,000,000,000 and any revenue loss shall be certified by the Joint Committee on Taxation in consultation and cooperation with the Office of Tax Analysis of the Department of Treasury.

## **Subtitle B—Sense of the House**

**SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON COMMISSION ON LONG-TERM BUDGETARY PROBLEMS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House 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.

H. Con. Res. 84—31

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House 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. 307. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON CORPORATE WELFARE.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House 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 THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House 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. 308. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON BASELINES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House 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; and

(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 HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House 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. 309. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON FAMILY VIOLENCE OPTION CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(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 THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House 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.



## Subtitle B—Sense of the Senate

### SEC. 311. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LONG TERM ENTITLEMENT REFORMS, INCLUDING ACCURACY IN DETERMINING CHANGES IN THE COST OF LIVING.

#### (a) FINDINGS.—

(1) ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.—The Senate finds that with respect to long term entitlement reforms—

(A) entitlement spending continues to grow dramatically as a percent of total Federal spending, rising from fifty-six percent of the budget in 1987 to an estimated seventy-three percent of the budget in 2007;

(B) this growth in mandatory spending poses a long-term threat to the United States economy because it crowds out spending for investments in education, infrastructure, defense, law enforcement and other programs that enhance economic growth;

(C) in 1994, the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement and Tax Reform concluded that if no changes are made to current entitlement laws, all Federal revenues will be spent on entitlement programs and interest on the debt by the year 2012;

(D) the Congressional Budget Office has also recently issued a report that found that pressure on the budget from demographics and rising health care costs will increase dramatically after 2002; and

(E) making significant entitlement changes will significantly benefit the economy, and will forestall the need for more drastic tax and spending decisions in future years.

(2) CPI.—The Senate finds that with respect to accuracy in determining changes in the cost of living—

(A) the Final Report of the Senate Finance Committee's Advisory Commission to study the CPI has concluded that the Consumer Price Index overstates the cost of living in the United States by 1.1 percentage points;

(B) the overstatement of the cost of living by the Consumer Price Index has been recognized by economists since at least 1961, when a report noting the existence of the overstatement was issued by a National Bureau of Economic Research Committee, chaired by Professor George J. Stigler;

(C) Congress and the President, through the indexing of Federal tax brackets, Social Security benefits, and other Federal program benefits, have undertaken to protect taxpayers and beneficiaries of such programs from the erosion of purchasing power due to inflation; and

(D) the overstatement of the cost of living increases the deficit and undermines the equitable administration of Federal benefits and tax policies.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions in this resolution assume that—

(1) Congress and the President should continue working to enact structural entitlement reforms in the 1997 budget agreement and in subsequent legislation;

(2) Congress and the President must find the most accurate measure of the change in the cost of living in the United

States, and should work in a bipartisan manner to implement any changes that are necessary to achieve an accurate measure; and

(3) Congress and the President must work to ensure that the 1997 budget agreement not only keeps the unified budget in balance after 2002, but that additional measures should be taken to begin to achieve substantial surpluses which will improve the economy and allow our nation to be ready for the retirement of the baby boom generation in the year 2012.

**SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TACTICAL FIGHTER AIRCRAFT PROGRAMS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Department of Defense has proposed to modernize the United States tactical fighter aircraft force through three tactical fighter procurement programs, including the F/A-18 E/F aircraft program of the Navy, the F-22 aircraft program of the Air Force, and the Joint Strike Fighter aircraft program for the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps;

(2) the General Accounting Office, the Congressional Budget Office, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, and several Members of Congress have publicly stated that, given the current Department of Defense budget for procurement, the Department of Defense's original plan to buy over 4,400 F/A-18 E/F aircraft, F-22 aircraft, and Joint Strike Fighter aircraft at a total program cost in excess of \$350,000,000,000 was not affordable;

(3) the F/A-18 E/F, F-22, and the Joint Strike Fighter tactical fighter programs will be competing for a limited amount of procurement funding with numerous other aircraft acquisition programs, including the Comanche helicopter program, the V-22 Osprey aircraft program, and the C-17 aircraft program, as well as for the necessary replacement of other aging aircraft such as the KC-135, the C-5A, the F-117, and the EA-6B aircraft; and

(4) the 1997 Department of Defense Quadrennial Defense Review has recommended reducing the F/A-18 E/F program buy from 1,000 aircraft to 548, and reducing the F-22 program buy from 438 to 339.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that, within 30 days, the Department of Defense should transmit to Congress detailed information pertaining to the implementation of this revised acquisition strategy so that the Congress can adequately evaluate the extent to which the revised acquisition strategy is tenable and affordable given the projected spending levels contained in this budget resolution.

**SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CHILDREN'S HEALTH COVERAGE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) of the estimated 10 million uninsured children in the United States, over 1.3 million have at least one parent who is self-employed and all other uninsured children are dependents of persons who are employed by another, or unemployed;

(2) these 1.3 million uninsured kids comprise approximately 22 percent of all children with self-employed parents, and they are a significant 13 percent of all uninsured children;

(3) the remaining uninsured children are in families where neither parent is self-employed and comprise 13 percent of all children in families where neither parent is self-employed;

(4) children in families with a self-employed parent are therefore more likely to be uninsured than children in families where neither parent is self-employed; and

(5) the current disparity in the tax law reduces the affordability of health insurance for the self-employed and their families, hindering the ability of children to receive essential primary and preventive care services.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that from resources available in this budget resolution, a portion should be set aside for an immediate 100 percent deductibility of health insurance costs for the self-employed. Full-deductibility of health expenses for the self-employed would make health insurance more attractive and affordable, resulting in more dependents being covered. The government should not encourage parents to forgo private insurance for a government-run program.

**SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON A MEDICAID PER CAPITA CAP.**

It is the sense of the Senate that in order to meet deficit reduction targets in this resolution with respect to Medicaid—

(1) the per capita cap will not be used as a method for meeting spending targets; and

(2) the per capita cap could represent a significant structural change that might jeopardize the quality of care for children, the disabled, and senior citizens.

**SEC. 315. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT ADDED SAVINGS GO TO DEFICIT REDUCTION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) balancing the budget will bring numerous economic benefits for the United States economy and American workers and families, including improved economic growth and lower interest rates;

(2) the fiscal year 1998 budget resolution crafted pursuant to an agreement reached between the Congress and the Administration purports to achieve balance in the year 2002;

(3) the deficit estimates contained in this resolution may not conform to the actual deficits in subsequent years, which make it imperative that any additional savings are realized be devoted to deficit reduction;

(4) the Senate's "pay-as-you-go" point of order prohibits crediting savings from updated economic or technical data as an offset for legislation that increases the deficit, and ensures these savings are devoted to deficit reduction; and

(5) Congress and the Administration must ensure that the deficit levels contained in this budget are met and, if actual deficits prove to be lower than projected, the additional savings are used to balance the budget on or before the year 2002.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

H. Con. Res. 84—36

(1) legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution must ensure that the goal of a balanced budget is achieved on or before fiscal year 2002; and

(2) if the actual deficit is lower than the projected deficit in any upcoming fiscal year, the added savings should be devoted to further deficit reduction.

**SEC. 316. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FAIRNESS IN MEDICARE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Trustees of the Medicare Trust Funds recently announced that Medicare's Hospital Insurance (HI) Trust Fund is headed for bankruptcy in 2001, and in 1997, HI will run a deficit of \$26,000,000,000 and add \$56,000,000,000 annually to the Federal deficit by 2001;

(2) the Trustees also project that Supplementary Medical Insurance (SMI), will grow twice as fast as the economy and the taxpayers' subsidy to keep the SMI from bankruptcy will grow from \$58,000,000,000 to \$89,000,000,000 annually from 1997 through 2001;

(3) the Congressional Budget Office reports that when the baby-boom generation begins to receive Social Security benefits and is eligible for Medicare in 2008, the Federal budget will face intense pressure, resulting in mounting deficits and erosion of future economic growth;

(4) long-term solutions to address the financial and demographic problems of Medicare are urgently needed to preserve and protect the Medicare Trust Funds;

(5) these solutions to address the financial and demographic problems of Medicare are urgently needed to preserve and protect the Medicare Trust Funds;

(6) reform of the Medicare Program should ensure equity and fairness for all Medicare beneficiaries, and offer beneficiaries more choice of private health plans, to promote efficiency and enhance the quality of health care;

(7) all Americans pay the same payroll tax of 2.9 percent to the Medicare Trust Funds, and they deserve the same choices and services regardless of where they retire;

(8) however, under the currently adjusted-average-per-capita cost (AAPCC), some counties receive 2.5 times more in Medicare reimbursements than others;

(9) this inequity in Medicare reimbursement jeopardizes the quality of Medicare services of rural beneficiaries and penalizes the most efficient and effective Medicare service providers;

(10) in some states, the result has been the absence of health care choices beyond traditional, fee-for-service medicine for Medicare beneficiaries, which in other counties and states plan providers may be significantly over-compensated, adding to Medicare's fiscal instability; and

(11) ending the practice of basing payments to risk contract plans on local fee-for-service medical costs will help correct these inequities, mitigate unnecessary cost in the program, and begin the serious, long-term restructuring of Medicare.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that the Finance Committee should strongly consider the following elements for Medicare reform—

H. Con. Res. 84—37

(1) any Medicare reform package should include measures to address the inequity in Medicare reimbursement to risk contract plans;

(2) Medicare should use a national update framework rather than local fee-for-service spending increases to determine the annual changes in risk plan payment rates;

(3) an adequate minimum payment rate should be provided for health plans participating in Medicare risk contract programs;

(4) the geographic variation in Medicare payment rates must be reduced over time to raise the lower payment areas closer to the average while taking into account actual differences in input costs that exist from region to regional;

(5) Medicare managers in consultation with plan providers and patient advocates should pursue competitive bidding programs in communities where data indicate risk contract payments are substantially excessive and when plan choices would not diminish by such a bidding process; and

(6) Medicare should phase in the use of risk adjusters which take account of health status so as to address overpayment to some plans.

**SEC. 317. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ASSISTANCE TO LITHUANIA AND LATVIA.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Lithuania and Latvia reestablished democracy and free market economies when they regained their freedom from the Soviet Union;

(2) Lithuania and Latvia, which have made significant progress since regaining their freedom, are still struggling to recover from the devastation of 50 years of communist domination;

(3) the United States, which never recognized the illegal incorporation of Lithuania and Latvia into the Soviet Union, has provided assistance to strengthen democratic institutions and free market reforms in Lithuania and Latvia since 1991;

(4) the people of the United States enjoy close and friendly relations with the people of Lithuania and Latvia;

(5) the success of democracy and free market reform in Lithuania and Latvia is important to the security and economic progress of the United States; and

(6) the United States as well as Lithuania and Latvia would benefit from the continuation of assistance which helps Lithuania and Latvia to implement commercial and trade law reform, sustain private sector development, and establish well-trained judiciaries.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

(1) adequate assistance should be provided to Lithuania and Latvia in fiscal year 1998 to continue the progress they have made; and

(2) assistance to Lithuania and Latvia should be continued beyond fiscal year 1998 as they continue to build democratic and free market institutions.

**SEC. 318. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION.**

It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assure that a national commission should be established to study and make specific recommendations regarding the extent to which increases in student financial aid, and the extent to which Federal, State, and local laws and regulations, contribute to increases in college and university tuition.

**SEC. 319. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LOCKBOX.**

It is the Sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that to ensure all savings from Medicare reform are used to keep the Medicare Program solvent, the Treasury Secretary should credit the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (Part A) with government securities equal to any savings from Medicare Supplemental Medical Insurance (Part B) reforms enacted pursuant to the reconciliation instructions contained in this budget resolution.

**SEC. 320. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE EARNED INCOME CREDIT.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) an April 1997 study by the Internal Revenue Service of Earned Income Credit (EIC) filers for tax year 1994 revealed that over \$4,000,000,000 of the \$17,000,000,000 spent on the EIC for that year was erroneously claimed and paid by the IRS, resulting in a fraud and error rate of 25.8 percent;

(2) the IRS study further concluded that EIC reforms enacted by the One Hundred Fourth Congress will only lower the fraud error rate to 20.7 percent, meaning over \$23,000,000,000 will be wasted over the next five years; and

(3) the President's recent proposals to combat EIC fraud and error contained within this budget resolution are estimated to save \$124,000,000 in scoreable savings over the next five years and additional savings from deterrent effects.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that the President should propose and Congress should enact additional programmatic changes sufficient to ensure that the primary purpose of the EIC to encourage work over welfare is achieved without wasting billions of taxpayer dollars on fraud and error.

**SEC. 321. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING LONG-TERM ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that this resolution assumes that—

(1) entitlement spending has risen dramatically over the last thirty-five years;

(2) in 1963, mandatory spending (i.e., entitlement spending and interest on the debt) made up 29.6 percent of the budget, this figure rose to 61.4 percent by 1993 and is expected to reach 70 percent shortly after the year 2000;

(3) this mandatory spending is crowding out spending for the traditional “discretionary” functions of Government like clean air and water, a strong national defense, parks and recreation, education, our transportation system, law enforcement, research and development and other infrastructure spending; and

(4) taking significant steps sooner rather than later to reform entitlement spending will not only boost economic

growth in this country, it will also prevent the need for drastic tax and spending decisions in the next century.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that the levels in this budget resolution assume that Congress and the President should work to enact structural reforms in entitlement spending in 1997 and beyond which sufficiently restrain the growth of mandatory spending in order to keep the budget in balance over the long term, extend the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds, avoid crowding out funding for basic Government functions and that every effort should be made to hold mandatory spending to no more than 70 percent of the budget.

**SEC. 322. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON DISASTER ASSISTANCE FUNDING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) emergency spending adds to the deficit and total spending;

(2) the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 exempts emergency spending from the discretionary spending caps and pay-go requirements;

(3) the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 expires in 1998 and needs to be extended;

(4) since the enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act, Congress and the President have approved an average of \$5,800,000,000 per year in emergency spending; and

(5) a natural disaster in any particular State is unpredictable, by the United States is likely to experience a natural disaster almost every year.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that the Congress should consider in the extension of the Budget Enforcement Act and in appropriations Acts—

(1) provisions that budget for emergencies or that require emergency spending to be offset;

(2) provisions that provide flexibility to meet emergency funding requirements associated with natural disasters;

(3) Congress and the President should consider appropriating at least \$5,000,000,000 every year to provide for natural disaster relief; and

(4) Congress and the President should not designate any emergency spending for natural disaster relief until such amounts provided in regular appropriations are exhausted.

**SEC. 323. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ENFORCEMENT OF BIPARTISAN BUDGET AGREEMENT.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the bipartisan budget agreement is contingent upon—

(A) favorable economic conditions for the next 5 years;

(B) accurate estimates of the fiscal impacts of assumptions in this resolution; and

(C) enactment of legislation to reduce the deficit; and

(2) if any of the conditions in paragraph (1) are not met, our ability to achieve a balanced budget by 2002 will be jeopardized.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals and limits in this resolution assume that—

H. Con. Res. 84—40

(1) reconciliation legislation should include legislation to enforce the targets set forth in the bipartisan budget agreement and to ensure the balanced budget goal is met; and

(2) such legislation shall—

(A) establish procedures to ensure the agreement is enforced in every year;

(B) require that the President's annual budget and annual Congressional concurrent resolutions on the budget comply the agreement in every year;

(C) consider provisions which provide that if the deficit is below or the surplus is above the deficits projected in the agreement in any year, such savings are locked in for deficit and debt reduction; and

(D) consider provisions which budget for and control emergency spending in order to prevent the use of emergencies to evade the budget agreement.

**SEC. 324. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) heart disease was the leading cause of death for both men and women in every year from 1970 to 1993;

(2) mortality rates for individuals suffering from prostate cancer, skin cancer, and kidney cancer continue to rise;

(3) the mortality rate for African American women suffering from diabetes is 134 percent higher than the mortality rate of Caucasian women suffering from diabetes;

(4) asthma rates for children increased 58 percent from 1982 to 1992;

(5) nearly half of all American women between the ages of 65 and 75 reported having arthritis;

(6) AIDS is the leading cause of death for Americans between the ages of 24 and 44;

(7) the Institute of Medicine has described United States clinical research to be “in a state of crisis” and the National Academy of Sciences concluded in 1994 that “the present cohort of clinical investigators is not adequate”;

(8) biomedical research has been shown to be effective in saving lives and reducing health care expenditures;

(9) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has contributed significantly to the first overall reduction in cancer death rates since record keeping was instituted;

(10) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has resulted in the identification of genetic mutations for osteoporosis; Lou Gehrig's Disease, cystic fibrosis, and Huntington's Disease; breast, skin and prostate cancer; and a variety of other illnesses;

(11) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has been key to the development of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) and Positron Emission Tomography (PET) scanning technologies;

(12) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has developed effective treatments for Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia (ALL). Today, 80 percent of children diagnosed with Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia are alive and free of the disease after 5 years; and



H. Con. Res. 84—41

(13) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health contributed to the development of a new, cost-saving cure for peptic ulcers.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that this Resolution assumes that—

(1) appropriations for the National Institutes of Health should be increased by 100 percent over the next 5 fiscal years; and

(2) appropriations for the National Institutes of Health should be increased by \$2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 over the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1997.

**SEC. 325. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CERTAIN ELDERLY LEGAL ALIENS.**

It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

(1) the Committee on Finance will include in its recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate changes in laws within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance that allow certain elderly, legal immigrants who will cease to receive benefits under the supplemental security income program as a result of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–193; 110 Stat. 2105) to continue to receive benefits during a redetermination or reapplication period to determine if such aliens would qualify for such benefits on the basis of being disabled; and

(2) the Committee on Finance in developing these recommendations should offset the additional cost of this proposal out of other programs within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance.

**SEC. 326. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING RETROACTIVE TAXES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in general, the practice of increasing a tax retroactively is fundamentally unfair to taxpayers; and

(2) retroactive taxation is disruptive to families and small business in their ability to plan and budget.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this budget resolution assume that—

(1) except for closing tax loopholes, no revenues should be generated from any retroactively increased tax; and

(2) the Congress and the President should work together to ensure that any revenue generating proposal contained within reconciliation legislation pursuant to this concurrent resolution proposal, except those proposals closing tax loopholes, should take effect prospectively.

**SEC. 327. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOCIAL SECURITY AND BALANCING THE BUDGET.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) this budget resolution is projected to balance the unified budget of the United States in fiscal year 2002;

(2) section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 requires that the deficit be computed without counting the annual surpluses of the Social Security Trust Funds; and

(3) if the deficit were calculated according to the requirements of section 13301, this budget resolution would be

H. Con. Res. 84—42

projected to result in a deficit of \$108,700,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying this budget resolution assume that after balancing the unified Federal budget, the Congress should continue efforts to reduce the on-budget deficit, so that the Federal budget will be balanced without counting Social Security surpluses.

**SEC. 328. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR VETERANS PROGRAMS AND BENEFITS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) veterans and their families represent approximately 27 percent of the United States population;

(2) more than 20 million of our 26 million living veterans served during wartime, sacrificing their freedom so that we may have ours; and

(3) veterans have earned the benefits promised to them.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the assumptions underlying this Budget Resolution assume that the 602(b) allocation to the Department of Veterans Affairs will be sufficient in fiscal year 1998 to fully fund all discretionary veterans programs, including medical care; and

(2) funds collected from legislation to improve the Department of Veterans Affairs' ability to collect and retain reimbursement from third-party payers ought to be used to supplement, not supplant, an adequate appropriation for medical care.

**SEC. 329. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FAMILY VIOLENCE OPTION CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.**

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

(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  $\frac{1}{4}$  of battered women surveyed had lost a job partly because of being abused and that over  $\frac{1}{2}$  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  $\frac{1}{2}$  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 Committee on the Budget of the Senate in considering the 1997 Resolution on the budget of the United States unanimously adopted a sense of the Congress amendment concerning domestic violence and Federal assistance. Subsequently, Congress adopted the family violence option amendment as part of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.

(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 that 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 SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

(1) States should not be subject to any numerical limits in granting domestic violence good cause waivers under section 402(a)(7)(A)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)(7)(A)(iii)) 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 individual who is granted a domestic violence good cause waiver by a State shall not be included in the States' 20 percent hardship exemption under section 408(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 608(a)(7)).

**SEC. 330. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ASSISTANCE TO AMTRAK.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Amtrak is in a financial crisis, with growing and substantial debt obligations approaching \$2,000,000,000;

(2) Amtrak has not been authorized since 1994;

(3) the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation favorably reported legislation to reform Amtrak during the last two Congresses, but no legislation was enacted;

(4) the Finance Committee favorably reported legislation in the last Congress that created a dedicated trust fund for Amtrak, but no legislation was enacted;

(5) in 1997 Amtrak testified before the Congress that it cannot survive beyond 1998 without comprehensive legislative reforms and a dedicated source of capital funding; and

(6) Congress is obligated to invest Federal tax dollars responsibly and to reduce waste and inefficiency in Federal programs, including Amtrak.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

H. Con. Res. 84—44

(1) legislative reform is urgently needed to address Amtrak's financial and operational problems;

(2) Congress should allocate additional Federal dollars to Amtrak in conjunction with reforms requested by Amtrak to address its precarious financial situation; and

(3) the distribution of money from any new fund to finance an intercity rail passenger fund should be implemented in conjunction with legislation to reauthorize and reform the National Rail Passenger Corporation.

**SEC. 331. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN'S HEALTH.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Today's children and the next generation of children are the prime beneficiaries of a balanced Federal budget. Without a balanced budget, today's children will bear the increasing burden of the Federal debt. Continued deficit spending would doom future generations to slower economic growth, higher taxes, and lower living standards.

(2) The health of children is essential to the future economic and social well-being of the Nation.

(3) The Medicaid Program provides health coverage for over 17,000,000 children, or 1 out of every 4 children.

(4) While children represent  $\frac{1}{2}$  of all individuals eligible for Medicaid, children account for less than 25 percent of expenditures under the Medicaid Program.

(5) Disproportionate share hospital (DSH) funding under the Medicaid Program has allowed States to provide health care services to thousands of uninsured pregnant women and children. DSH funding under the Medicaid Program is critical for these populations.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that the health care needs of low-income pregnant women and children should be a top priority. Careful study must be made of the impact of Medicaid disproportionate share hospital (DSH) reform proposals on children's health and on vital sources of care, including children's hospitals. Any restrictions on DSH funding under the Medicaid Program should not harm State Medicaid coverage of children and pregnant women.

**SEC. 332. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON DEPOSITING ALL FEDERAL GASOLINE TAXES INTO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Since 1956, Federal gasoline excise tax revenues have generally been deposited in the Highway Trust Fund and reserved for transportation uses.

(2) In 1993, Congress and the President enacted the first permanent increase in the Federal gasoline excise tax which was dedicated to general revenues, not the Highway Trust Fund.

(3) Over the next five years, approximately \$7,000,000,000 per year in Federal gasoline excise tax revenues will be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury, rather than the Highway Trust Fund.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions in this resolution assume that Congress should in

the extension of the Budget Enforcement Act, ISTEA reauthorization, appropriations Acts, and in any revenue bills, consider dedicating all revenues from Federal gasoline excise taxes, including amounts dedicated to general revenues in 1993, to the Highway Trust Fund so that such taxes may be used for the purpose to which they have historically been dedicated, promoting transportation infrastructure and building roads.

**SEC. 333. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.**

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

(1) Scientific research on the development of the brain has confirmed that the early childhood years, particularly from birth to the age of 3, are critical to children's development.

(2) Studies repeatedly have shown that good quality child care helps children develop well, enter school ready to succeed, improve their skills, cognitive abilities and socioemotional development, improve classroom learning behavior, and stay safe while their parents work. Further, quality early childhood programs can positively affect children's long-term success in school achievement, higher earnings as adults, decrease reliance on public assistance and decrease involvement with the criminal justice system.

(3) The first of the National Education Goals, endorsed by the Nation's governors, passed by Congress and signed into law by President Bush, stated that by the year 2000, every child should enter school ready to learn and that access to a high quality early childhood education program was integral to meeting this goal.

(4) According to data compiled by the RAND Corporation, while 90 percent of human brain growth occurs by the age of 3, public spending on children in that age range equals only 8 percent of spending on all children. A vast majority of public spending on children occurs after the brain has gone through its most dramatic changes, often to correct problems that should have been addressed during early childhood development.

(5) According to the Department of Education, of \$29,400,000,000 in current estimated education expenditures, only \$1,500,000,000, or 5 percent, is spent on children from birth to age 5. The vast majority is spent on children over age 5.

(6) A new commitment to quality child care and early childhood education is a necessary response to the fact that children from birth to the age of 3 are spending more time in care away from their homes. Almost 60 percent of women in the workforce have children under the age of 3 requiring care.

(7) Many States and communities are currently experimenting with innovative programs directed at early childhood care and education in a variety of care settings, including the home. States and local communities are best able to deliver efficient, cost-effective services, but while such programs are long on demand, they are short on resources. Additional Federal resources should not create new bureaucracy, but build on successful locally driven efforts.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budget totals and levels in this resolution assume that funds

ought to be directed toward increasing the supply of quality child care, early childhood education, and teacher and parent training for children from birth through age 3.

**SEC. 334. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) there is no direct linkage between the fuel taxes deposited in the Highway Trust Fund and the transportation spending from the Highway Trust Fund;

(2) the Federal budget process has severed this linkage by dividing revenues and spending into separate budget categories with—

(A) fuel taxes deposited in the Highway Trust Fund as revenues; and

(B) most spending from the Highway Trust Fund in the discretionary category;

(3) each budget category referred to in paragraph (2) has its own rules and procedures; and

(4) under budget rules in effect prior to the date of adoption of this resolution, an increase in fuel taxes permits increased spending to be included in the budget, but not for increased Highway Trust Fund spending.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) in this session of Congress, Congress should, within a unified budget, consider changing the Federal budget process to establish a linkage between the fuel taxes deposited in the Highway Trust Fund, including any fuel tax increases that may be enacted into law after the date of adoption of this resolution, and the spending from the Highway Trust Fund; and

(2) changes to the budgetary treatment of the Highway Trust Fund should not result in total program levels for highways or mass transit that is inconsistent with those assumed under the resolution.

**SEC. 335. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING TAX INCENTIVES FOR THE COST OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION.**

It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that any revenue reconciliation bill should include tax incentives for the cost of post-secondary education, including expenses of workforce education and training at vocational schools and community colleges.

**SEC. 336. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ADDITIONAL TAX CUTS.**

It is the sense of the Senate that nothing in this resolution shall be construed as prohibiting Congress in future years from providing additional tax relief if the cost of such tax relief is offset by reductions in spending or increases in revenue from alternative sources.

**SEC. 337. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TRUTH IN BUDGETING AND SPECTRUM AUCTIONS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the electromagnetic spectrum is the property of the American people and is managed on their behalf by the Federal Government;

(2) the spectrum is a highly valuable and limited natural resource;

(3) the auctioning of spectrum has raised billions of dollars for the Treasury;

(4) the estimates made regarding the value of spectrum in the past have proven unreliable, having previously understated and now overstating its worth; and

(5) because estimates of spectrum value depend on a number of technological, economic, market forces, and other variables that cannot be predicted or completely controlled, it is not possible to reliably estimate the value of a given segment of spectrum.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that as auctions occur as assumed by this resolution, the Congress shall take such steps as necessary to reconcile the difference between actual revenues raised and estimates made and shall reduce spending and make other appropriate adjustments accordingly if such auctions raise less revenue than projected.

**SEC. 338. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON HIGHWAY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) 10 demonstration projects totaling \$362,000,000 were listed for special line-item funding in the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982;

(2) 152 demonstration projects totaling \$1,400,000,000 were named in the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987;

(3) 64 percent of the funding for the 152 projects had not been obligated after 5 years and State transportation officials determined the projects added little, if any, to meeting their transportation infrastructure priorities;

(4) 538 location specific projects totaling \$6,230,000,000 were included in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991;

(5) more than \$3,300,000,000 of the funds authorized for the 538 location-specific projects remained unobligated as of January 31, 1997;

(6) the General Accounting Office determined that 31 States plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico would have received more funding if the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act location-specific project funds were redistributed as Federal-aid highway program apportionments;

(7) this type of project funding diverts Highway Trust Fund money away from State transportation priorities established under the formula allocation process and under the Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act of 1991;

(8) on June 20, 1995, by a vote of 75 yeas to 21 nays, the Senate voted to prohibit the use of Federal Highway Trust Fund money for future demonstration projects;

(9) the Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act of 1991 expires at the end of fiscal year 1997; and

(10) hundreds of funding requests for specific transportation projects in Congressional Districts have been submitted in the House of Representatives.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) notwithstanding different views on existing Highway Trust Fund distribution formulas, funding for demonstration projects or other similarly titled projects diverts Highway Trust

Fund money away from State priorities and deprives States of the ability to adequately address their transportation needs;

(2) States are best able to determine the priorities for allocating Federal-Aid-To-Highway monies within their jurisdiction;

(3) Congress should not divert limited Highway Trust Fund resources away from State transportation priorities by authorizing new highway projects; and

(4) Congress should not authorize any new demonstration projects or other similarly-titled projects.

**SEC. 339. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE USE OF BUDGET SAVINGS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Poverty rates among the elderly are at the lowest level since our Nation began to keep poverty statistics, due in large part to the Social Security system and the Medicare Program.

(2) Twenty-two percent of every dollar spent by the Federal Government goes to the Social Security system.

(3) Eleven percent of every dollar spent by the Federal Government goes to the Medicare Program.

(4) Currently, spending on the elderly accounts for  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the Federal budget and more than  $\frac{1}{2}$  of all domestic spending other than interest on the national debt.

(5) Future generations of Americans must be guaranteed the same value from the Social Security system as past covered recipients.

(6) According to the 1997 report of the Managing Trustee for the Social Security Trust Funds, the accumulated balance in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund is estimated to fall to zero by 2029, and the estimated payroll tax at that time will be sufficient to cover only 75 percent of the benefits owed to retirees at that time.

(7) The accumulated balance in the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund is estimated to fall to zero by 2001.

(8) While the Federal budget deficit has shrunk for the fourth straight year to \$67,000,000,000 in 1997, measures need to be taken to ensure that trend continues.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that budget savings in the mandatory spending area should be used—

(1) to protect and enhance the retirement security of the American people by ensuring the long-term future of the Social Security system;

(2) to protect and enhance the health care security of senior citizens by ensuring the long-term future of the Medicare Program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); and

(3) to restore and maintain Federal budget discipline to ensure that the level of private investment necessary for long-term economic growth and prosperity is available.

**SEC. 340. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE VALUE OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM FOR FUTURE RETIREES.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Social Security system has allowed a generation of Americans to retire with dignity. Today, 13 percent of the



population is 65 or older and by 2030, 20 percent of the population will be 65 or older. More than  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the elderly do not receive private pensions and more than  $\frac{1}{3}$  have no income from assets.

(2) For 60 percent of all senior citizens, Social Security benefits provide almost 80 percent of their retirement income. For 80 percent of all senior citizens, Social Security benefits provide over 50 percent of their retirement income.

(3) Poverty rates among the elderly are at the lowest level since the United States began to keep poverty statistics, due in large part to the Social Security system.

(4) Seventy-eight percent of Americans pay more in payroll taxes than they do in income taxes.

(5) According to the 1997 report of the Managing Trustee for the Social Security Trust Funds, the accumulated balance in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund is estimated to fall to zero by 2029, and the estimated payroll tax at that time will be sufficient to cover only 75 percent of the benefits owed to retirees at that time.

(6) The average American retiring in the year 2015 will pay \$250,000 in payroll taxes over the course of his or her working career.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that no change in the Social Security system should be made that would reduce the value of the Social Security system for future generations of retirees.

**SEC. 341. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ECONOMIC GROWTH DIVIDEND PROTECTION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that with respect to the revenue levels established under this resolution—

(1) according to the President's own economists, the tax burden on Americans is the highest ever at 31.7 percent;

(2) according to the National Taxpayers Union, the average American family now pays almost 40 percent of their income in State, local, and Federal taxes;

(3) between 1978 and 1985, while the top marginal rate on capital gains was cut almost in half—from 35 to 20 percent—total annual Federal receipts from the tax almost tripled from \$9,100,000,000 annually to \$26,500,000,000 annually;

(4) conversely, when Congress raised the rate in 1986, revenues actually fell well below what was anticipated;

(5) economists across-the-board predict that cutting the capital gains rate will result in a revenue windfall for the Treasury; and

(6) while a USA Today poll from this March found 70 percent of the American people believe that they need a tax cut, under this resolution Federal spending will grow 17 percent over five years while the net tax cuts are less than 1 percent of the total tax burden.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that with respect to the revenue levels established under this resolution, to the extent that actual revenues exceed the revenues projected under this resolution due to higher than anticipated economic growth, that revenue windfall should be reserved exclusively for additional tax cuts and/or deficit reduction.

**SEC. 342. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING FEDERAL, STATE, AND  
LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Our Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers provide essential services that preserve and protect our freedoms and security, and with the support of Federal assistance, State and local law enforcement officers have succeeded in reducing the national scourge of violent crime, as illustrated by a murder rate in 1996 that is projected to be the lowest since 1971 and a violent crime total in 1996 that is the lowest since 1990.

(2) Through a comprehensive effort to attack violence against women mounted by State and local law enforcement, and dedicated volunteers and professionals who provide victim services, shelter, counseling, and advocacy to battered women and their children, important strides have been made against the national scourge of violence against women, illustrated by the decline in the murder rate for wives, ex-wives, and girlfriends at the hands of their “intimates” fell to a 19-year low in 1995.

(3) Federal, State, and local law enforcement efforts need continued financial commitment from the Federal Government for funding and financial assistance to continue their efforts to combat violent crime and violence against women.

(4) Federal, State and local law enforcement also face other challenges which require continued financial commitment from the Federal Government, including regaining control over the Southwest Border, where drug trafficking and illegal immigration continue to threaten public safety and menace residents on the border and throughout the Nation.

(5) The Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund established in section 310001 the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14211) fully funds the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, including the Violence Against Women Act, without adding to the Federal budget deficit.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions and the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that—

(1) the Federal Government’s commitment to fund Federal law enforcement programs and programs to assist State and local efforts to combat violent crime, including violence against women, will be maintained; and

(2) funding for the Violent Crime Reduction program will continue as authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.

H. Con. Res. 84—51

**SEC. 343. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN PREVENTION OF DRUG USE BY CHILDREN.**

It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that, from resources available in this budget resolution, a portion should be set aside for a national grassroots volunteer effort to encourage parental education and involvement in youth drug prevention and to create a drug-intolerant culture for our children.

Attest:

*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

Attest:

*Secretary of the Senate.*