

Calendar No. 64

106TH CONGRESS
1ST Session

S. CON. RES. 20

[Report No. 106-27]

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Setting forth the congressional budget for the
United States Government for fiscal years 2000
through 2009.

MARCH 19, 1999

Placed on the calendar

Calendar No. 64

106TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION**S. CON. RES. 20****[Report No. 106–27]**

Setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government
for fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 19, 1999

Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, reported the following
original concurrent resolution; which was read twice and placed on the
calendar

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Setting forth the congressional budget for the United States
Government for fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

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

3 **SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET**

4 **FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.**

5 (a) DECLARATION.—

6 (1) IN GENERAL.—Congress determines and de-
7 clares that this resolution is the concurrent resolu-

1 tion on the budget for fiscal year 2000 including the
 2 appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001
 3 through 2009 as authorized by section 301 of the
 4 Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

5 (2) FISCAL YEAR 1999 BUDGET RESOLUTION.—
 6 S. Res. 312, approved October 21, 1998, (105th
 7 Congress) shall be considered to be the concurrent
 8 resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

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

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

Sec. 201. Reserve fund for fiscal year 2000 surplus.
 Sec. 202. Reserve fund for agriculture.
 Sec. 203. Tax reduction reserve fund in the Senate.
 Sec. 204. Clarification on the application of section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67.
 Sec. 205. Emergency designation point of order.
 Sec. 206. Authority to provide committee allocations.
 Sec. 207. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for use of OCS receipts.
 Sec. 208. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for managed care plans that agree to
 provide additional services to the elderly.
 Sec. 209. Reserve fund for Medicare and prescription drugs.
 Sec. 210. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE CONGRESS AND THE SENATE

Sec. 301. Sense of the Senate on marriage penalty.
 Sec. 302. Sense of the Senate on improving security for United States diplo-
 matic missions.
 Sec. 303. Sense of the Senate on access to medicare home health services.
 Sec. 304. Sense of the Senate regarding the deductibility of health insurance
 premiums of the self-employed.
 Sec. 305. Sense of the Senate that tax reductions should go to working fami-
 lies.
 Sec. 306. Sense of the Senate on the National Guard.

- Sec. 307. Sense of the Senate on effects of social security reform on women.
 Sec. 308. Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the national institutes of health.
 Sec. 309. Sense of Congress on funding for Kyoto protocol implementation prior to Senate ratification.
 Sec. 310. Sense of the Senate on Federal research and development investment.
 Sec. 311. Sense of the Senate on counter-narcotics funding.
 Sec. 312. Sense of the Senate regarding tribal colleges.
 Sec. 313. Sense of the Senate on the social security surplus.
 Sec. 314. Sense of the Senate on the sale of Governor's Island.
 Sec. 315. Sense of the Senate on Pell Grant funding.

1 **TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

2 **SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

3 The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the
 4 fiscal years 2000 through 2009:

5 (1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the en-
 6 forcement of this resolution—

7 (A) The recommended levels of Federal reve-
 8 nues are as follows:

- 9 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,401,979,000,000.
 10 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,435,214,000,000.
 11 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,455,158,000,000.
 12 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,531,015,000,000.
 13 Fiscal year 2004: \$1,584,969,000,000.
 14 Fiscal year 2005: \$1,648,259,000,000.
 15 Fiscal year 2006: \$1,681,438,000,000.
 16 Fiscal year 2007: \$1,735,646,000,000.
 17 Fiscal year 2008: \$1,805,517,000,000.
 18 Fiscal year 2009: \$1,868,515,000,000.

1 (B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels
 2 of Federal revenues should be changed are as fol-
 3 lows:

4 Fiscal year 2000: \$0.

5 Fiscal year 2001: \$− 7,433,000,000.

6 Fiscal year 2002: \$− 53,118,000,000.

7 Fiscal year 2003: \$− 32,303,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2004: \$− 49,180,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2005: \$− 62,637,000,000.

10 Fiscal year 2006: \$− 109,275,000,000.

11 Fiscal year 2007: \$− 135,754,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2008: \$− 150,692,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2009: \$− 177,195,000,000.

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

17 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,426,931,000,000.

18 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,456,294,000,000.

19 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,487,477,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,560,513,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2004: \$1,612,278,000,000.

22 Fiscal year 2005: \$1,665,843,000,000.

23 Fiscal year 2006: \$1,697,402,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2007: \$1,752,567,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2008: \$1,813,739,000,000.

1 Fiscal year 2009: \$1,873,969,000,000.

2 (3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforce-
3 ment of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total
4 budget outlays are as follows:

5 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,408,292,000,000.

6 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,435,214,000,000.

7 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,455,158,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,531,015,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2004: \$1,582,070,000,000.

10 Fiscal year 2005: \$1,638,428,000,000.

11 Fiscal year 2006: \$1,666,608,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2007: \$1,715,883,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2008: \$1,780,697,000,000.

14 Fiscal year 2009: \$1,840,699,000,000.

15 (4) DEFICITS OR SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the
16 enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits
17 or surpluses are as follows:

18 Fiscal year 2000: \$−6,313,000,000.

19 Fiscal year 2001: \$0.

20 Fiscal year 2002: \$0.

21 Fiscal year 2003: \$0.

22 Fiscal year 2004: \$2,899,000,000.

23 Fiscal year 2005: \$9,831,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2006: \$14,830,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2007: \$19,763,000,000.

1 Fiscal year 2008: \$24,820,000,000.

2 Fiscal year 2009: \$27,816,000,000.

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

5 Fiscal year 2000: \$5,635,900,000,000.

6 Fiscal year 2001: \$5,716,100,000,000.

7 Fiscal year 2002: \$5,801,000,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2003: \$5,885,000,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2004: \$5,962,200,000,000.

10 Fiscal year 2005: \$6,029,400,000,000.

11 Fiscal year 2006: \$6,088,100,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2007: \$6,138,900,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2008: \$6,175,100,000,000.

14 Fiscal year 2009: \$6,203,500,000,000.

15 (6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate
16 levels of the debt held by the public are as follows:

17 Fiscal year 2000: \$3,510,000,000,000.

18 Fiscal year 2001: \$3,377,700,000,000.

19 Fiscal year 2002: \$3,236,900,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2003: \$3,088,200,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2004: \$2,926,000,000,000.

22 Fiscal year 2005: \$2,742,900,000,000.

23 Fiscal year 2006: \$2,544,200,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2007: \$2,329,100,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2008: \$2,099,500,000,000.

1 Fiscal year 2009: \$1,861,100,000,000.

2 **SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.**

3 (a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of
 4 Senate enforcement under sections 302, and 311 of the
 5 Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of reve-
 6 nues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance
 7 Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust
 8 Fund are as follows:

9 Fiscal year 2000: \$468,020,000,000.

10 Fiscal year 2001: \$487,744,000,000.

11 Fiscal year 2002: \$506,293,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2003: \$527,326,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2004: \$549,876,000,000.

14 Fiscal year 2005: \$576,840,000,000.

15 Fiscal year 2006: \$601,834,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2007: \$628,277,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2008: \$654,422,000,000.

18 Fiscal year 2009: \$681,313,000,000.

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

25 Fiscal year 2000: \$327,256,000,000.

1 Fiscal year 2001: \$339,789,000,000.

2 Fiscal year 2002: \$350,127,000,000.

3 Fiscal year 2003: \$362,197,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2004: \$375,253,000,000.

5 Fiscal year 2005: \$389,485,000,000.

6 Fiscal year 2006: \$404,596,000,000.

7 Fiscal year 2007: \$420,616,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2008: \$438,132,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2009: \$459,496,000,000.

10 **SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

11 Congress determines and declares that the appro-
 12 priate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new
 13 direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee
 14 commitments for fiscal years 2000 through 2009 for each
 15 major functional category are:

16 (1) National Defense (050):

17 Fiscal year 2000:

18 (A) New budget authority,

19 \$288,812,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$274,567,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2001:

22 (A) New budget authority,

23 \$303,616,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$285,949,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2002:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$308,175,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$291,714,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2003:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$318,277,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$303,642,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2004:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$327,166,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$313,460,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2005:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$328,370,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$316,675,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2006:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$329,600,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$315,111,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2007:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$330,870,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$313,687,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2008:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$332,176,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$317,103,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2009:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$333,452,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$318,041,000,000.

8 (2) International Affairs (150):

9 Fiscal year 2000:

10 (A) New budget authority,
11 \$12,511,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, \$14,850,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2001:

14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$12,716,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$15,362,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2002:

18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$11,985,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$14,781,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2003:

22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$13,590,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$14,380,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2004:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$14,494,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$14,133,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2005:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$14,651,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$13,807,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2006:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$14,834,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$13,513,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2007:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$14,929,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$13,352,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2008:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$14,998,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$13,181,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2009:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$14,962,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$13,054,000,000.

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

25 Fiscal year 2000:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$17,955,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$18,214,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2001:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$17,946,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$17,907,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2002:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$17,912,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$17,880,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2003:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$17,912,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$17,784,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2004:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$17,912,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$17,772,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2005:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$17,912,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$17,768,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2006:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$17,912,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$17,768,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2007:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$17,912,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$17,768,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2008:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$17,912,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$17,768,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2009:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$17,912,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$17,768,000,000.

16 (4) Energy (270):

17 Fiscal year 2000:

18 (A) New budget authority, \$49,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, −\$650,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2001:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 −\$1,435,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, −\$3,136,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2002:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$ − 163,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, − \$1,138,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2003:

5 (A) New budget authority, − \$84,000,000.

6 (B) Outlays, − \$1,243,000,000.

7 Fiscal year 2004:

8 (A) New budget authority,
9 − \$319,000,000.

10 (B) Outlays, − \$1,381,000,000.

11 Fiscal year 2005:

12 (A) New budget authority,
13 − \$447,000,000.

14 (B) Outlays, − \$1,452,000,000.

15 Fiscal year 2006:

16 (A) New budget authority,
17 − \$452,000,000.

18 (B) Outlays, − \$1,453,000,000.

19 Fiscal year 2007:

20 (A) New budget authority,
21 − \$506,000,000.

22 (B) Outlays, − \$1,431,000,000.

23 Fiscal year 2008:

24 (A) New budget authority,
25 − \$208,000,000.

1 (B) Outlays, −\$1,137,000,000.

2 Fiscal year 2009:

3 (A) New budget authority, −\$76,000,000.

4 (B) Outlays, −\$1,067,000,000.

5 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

6 Fiscal year 2000:

7 (A) New budget authority,
8 \$21,520,000,000.

9 (B) Outlays, \$22,244,000,000.

10 Fiscal year 2001:

11 (A) New budget authority,
12 \$21,183,000,000.

13 (B) Outlays, \$21,729,000,000.

14 Fiscal year 2002:

15 (A) New budget authority,
16 \$20,747,000,000.

17 (B) Outlays, \$21,023,000,000.

18 Fiscal year 2003:

19 (A) New budget authority,
20 \$22,479,000,000.

21 (B) Outlays, \$22,579,000,000.

22 Fiscal year 2004:

23 (A) New budget authority,
24 \$22,492,000,000.

25 (B) Outlays, \$22,503,000,000.

1 Fiscal year 2005:

2 (A) New budget authority,

3 \$22,536,000,000.

4 (B) Outlays, \$22,429,000,000.

5 Fiscal year 2006:

6 (A) New budget authority,

7 \$22,566,000,000.

8 (B) Outlays, \$22,466,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2007:

10 (A) New budget authority,

11 \$22,667,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, \$22,425,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2008:

14 (A) New budget authority,

15 \$22,658,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$22,361,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2009:

18 (A) New budget authority,

19 \$23,041,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$22,738,000,000.

21 (6) Agriculture (350):

22 Fiscal year 2000:

23 (A) New budget authority,

24 \$14,831,000,000.

25 (B) Outlays, \$13,660,000,000.

1 Fiscal year 2001:

2 (A) New budget authority,

3 \$13,519,000,000.

4 (B) Outlays, \$11,279,000,000.

5 Fiscal year 2002:

6 (A) New budget authority,

7 \$11,288,000,000.

8 (B) Outlays, \$9,536,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2003:

10 (A) New budget authority,

11 \$11,955,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, \$10,252,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2004:

14 (A) New budget authority,

15 \$12,072,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$10,526,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2005:

18 (A) New budget authority,

19 \$10,553,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$9,882,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2006:

22 (A) New budget authority,

23 \$10,609,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$9,083,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2007:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$10,711,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$9,145,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2008:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$10,763,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$9,162,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2009:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$10,853,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$9,223,000,000.

12 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

13 Fiscal year 2000:

14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$9,864,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$4,470,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2001:

18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$10,620,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$5,754,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2002:

22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$14,450,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$10,188,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2003:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$14,529,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$10,875,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2004:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$13,859,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$10,439,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2005:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$12,660,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$9,437,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2006:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$12,635,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$9,130,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2007:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$12,666,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$8,879,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2008:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$12,642,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$8,450,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2009:

1 (A) New budget authority,
 2 \$13,415,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$8,824,000,000.

4 (8) Transportation (400):

5 Fiscal year 2000:

6 (A) New budget authority,
 7 \$51,325,000,000.

8 (B) Outlays, \$45,333,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2001:

10 (A) New budget authority,
 11 \$51,128,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, \$47,711,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2002:

14 (A) New budget authority,
 15 \$51,546,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$47,765,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2003:

18 (A) New budget authority,
 19 \$52,477,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$46,720,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2004:

22 (A) New budget authority,
 23 \$52,580,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$46,207,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2005:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$52,609,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$46,022,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2006:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$52,640,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$45,990,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2007:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$52,673,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$45,990,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2008:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$52,707,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$46,007,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2009:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$52,742,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$46,033,000,000.

20 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):

21 Fiscal year 2000:

22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$5,343,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$10,273,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2001:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$2,704,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$7,517,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2002:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$1,889,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$4,667,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2003:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$2,042,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$2,964,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2004:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$2,037,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$2,120,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2005:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$2,030,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$1,234,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2006:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$2,027,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$931,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2007:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$2,021,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$795,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2008:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$2,019,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$724,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2009:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$2,013,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$688,000,000.

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

14 Fiscal year 2000:

15 (A) New budget authority,
16 \$67,373,000,000.

17 (B) Outlays, \$63,994,000,000.

18 Fiscal year 2001:

19 (A) New budget authority,
20 \$66,549,000,000.

21 (B) Outlays, \$65,355,000,000.

22 Fiscal year 2002:

23 (A) New budget authority,
24 \$67,295,000,000.

25 (B) Outlays, \$66,037,000,000.

1 Fiscal year 2003:

2 (A) New budget authority,
3 \$73,334,000,000.

4 (B) Outlays, \$68,531,000,000.

5 Fiscal year 2004:

6 (A) New budget authority,
7 \$76,648,000,000.

8 (B) Outlays, \$72,454,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2005:

10 (A) New budget authority,
11 \$77,464,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, \$75,891,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2006:

14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$78,229,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$77,189,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2007:

18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$79,133,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$78,119,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2008:

22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$80,144,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$79,109,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2009:

1 (A) New budget authority,
 2 \$80,051,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$79,059,000,000.

4 (11) Health (550):

5 Fiscal year 2000:

6 (A) New budget authority,
 7 \$156,181,000,000.

8 (B) Outlays, \$152,986,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2001:

10 (A) New budget authority,
 11 \$164,089,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, \$162,357,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2002:

14 (A) New budget authority,
 15 \$173,330,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$173,767,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2003:

18 (A) New budget authority,
 19 \$184,679,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$185,330,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2004:

22 (A) New budget authority,
 23 \$197,893,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$198,499,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2005:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$212,821,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$212,637,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2006:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$228,379,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$228,323,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2007:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$246,348,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$245,472,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2008:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$265,160,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$264,420,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2009:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$285,541,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$284,941,000,000.

20 (12) Medicare (570):

21 Fiscal year 2000:

22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$208,652,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$208,698,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2001:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$222,104,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$222,252,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2002:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$230,593,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$230,222,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2003:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$250,743,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$250,871,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2004:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$268,558,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$268,738,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2005:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$295,574,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$295,188,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2006:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$306,772,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$306,929,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2007:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$337,566,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$337,761,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2008:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$365,642,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$365,225,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2009:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$394,078,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$394,249,000,000.

12 (13) Income Security (600):

13 Fiscal year 2000:

14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$244,390,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$248,088,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2001:

18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$250,873,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$257,033,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2002:

22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$263,620,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$266,577,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2003:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$276,386,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$276,176,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2004:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$285,576,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$285,388,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2005:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$297,942,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$298,128,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2006:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$304,155,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$304,593,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2007:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$310,047,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$310,948,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2008:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$323,315,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$324,766,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2009:

1 (A) New budget authority,
 2 \$333,562,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$335,104,000,000.

4 (14) Social Security (650):

5 Fiscal year 2000:

6 (A) New budget authority,
 7 \$14,239,000,000.

8 (B) Outlays, \$14,348,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2001:

10 (A) New budget authority,
 11 \$13,768,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, \$13,750,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2002:

14 (A) New budget authority,
 15 \$15,573,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$15,555,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2003:

18 (A) New budget authority,
 19 \$16,299,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$16,281,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2004:

22 (A) New budget authority,
 23 \$17,087,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$17,069,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2005:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$17,961,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$17,943,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2006:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$18,895,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$18,877,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2007:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$19,907,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$19,889,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2008:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$21,033,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$21,015,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2009:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$22,233,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$22,215,000,000.

20 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

21 Fiscal year 2000:

22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$44,724,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$45,064,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2001:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$44,255,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$44,980,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2002:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$44,728,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$45,117,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2003:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$45,536,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$46,024,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2004:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$45,862,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$46,327,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2005:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$48,341,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$48,844,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2006:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$46,827,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$47,373,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2007:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$47,377,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$45,803,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2008:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$47,959,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$48,505,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2009:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$48,578,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$49,150,000,000.

12 (16) Administration of Justice (750):

13 Fiscal year 2000:

14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$23,434,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$25,349,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2001:

18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$24,656,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$25,117,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2002:

22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$24,657,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$24,932,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2003:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$24,561,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$24,425,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2004:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$24,467,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$24,356,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2005:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$24,355,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$24,242,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2006:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$24,242,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$24,121,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2007:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$24,114,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$23,996,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2008:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$23,989,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$23,885,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2009:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$23,833,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$23,720,000,000.

4 (17) General Government (800):

5 Fiscal year 2000:

6 (A) New budget authority,
7 \$12,339,000,000.

8 (B) Outlays, \$13,476,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2001:

10 (A) New budget authority,
11 \$11,916,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, \$12,605,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2002:

14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$12,080,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$12,282,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2003:

18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$12,083,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$12,150,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2004:

22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$12,099,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$12,186,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2005:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$12,112,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$11,906,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2006:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$12,134,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$11,839,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2007:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$12,150,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$11,873,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2008:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$12,169,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$12,064,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2009:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$12,178,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$11,931,000,000.

20 (18) Net Interest (900):

21 Fiscal year 2000:

22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$275,682,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$275,682,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2001:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$271,443,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$271,443,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2002:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$267,855,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$267,855,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2003:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$265,573,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$265,573,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2004:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$263,835,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$263,835,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2005:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$261,411,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$261,411,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2006:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$259,195,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$259,195,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2007:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$257,618,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$257,618,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2008:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$255,177,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$255,177,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2009:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$253,001,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$253,001,000,000.

12 (19) Allowances (920):

13 Fiscal year 2000:

14 (A) New budget authority,
15 − \$8,033,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, − \$8,094,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2001:

18 (A) New budget authority,
19 − \$8,480,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, − \$12,874,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2002:

22 (A) New budget authority,
23 − \$6,437,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, − \$19,976,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2003:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 — \$4,394,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, — \$4,835,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2004:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 — \$4,481,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, — \$5,002,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2005:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 — \$4,515,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, — \$5,067,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2006:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 — \$4,619,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, — \$5,192,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2007:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 — \$5,210,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, — \$5,780,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2008:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 — \$5,279,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, — \$5,851,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2009:

1 (A) New budget authority,
 2 — \$5,316,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, — \$5,889,000,000.

4 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

5 Fiscal year 2000:

6 (A) New budget authority,
 7 — \$34,260,000,000.

8 (B) Outlays, — \$34,260,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2001:

10 (A) New budget authority,
 11 — \$36,876,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, — \$36,876,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2002:

14 (A) New budget authority,
 15 — \$43,626,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, — \$43,626,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2003:

18 (A) New budget authority,
 19 — \$37,464,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, — \$37,464,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2004:

22 (A) New budget authority,
 23 — \$37,559,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, — \$37,559,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2005:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 — \$38,497,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, — \$38,497,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2006:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 — \$39,178,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, — \$39,178,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2007:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 — \$40,426,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, — \$40,426,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2008:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 — \$41,237,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, — \$41,237,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2009:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 — \$42,084,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, — \$42,084,000,000.

20 **SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN**
21 **THE SENATE.**

22 Not later than June 18, 1999, the Senate Committee
23 on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill
24 proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction
25 necessary—

1 (1) to reduce revenues by not more than \$0 in
 2 fiscal year 2000, \$142,034,000,000 for the period of
 3 fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and
 4 \$777,587,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000
 5 through 2009; and

6 (2) to decrease the statutory limit on the public
 7 debt to not more than \$5,865,000,000,000 for fiscal
 8 year 2000.

9 **SEC. 105. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN**
 10 **THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**

11 Not later than June 11, 1999, the Committee on
 12 Ways and Means shall report to the House of Representa-
 13 tives a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws within
 14 its jurisdiction necessary—

15 (1) to reduce revenues by not more than \$0 in
 16 fiscal year 2000, \$142,034,000,000 for the period of
 17 fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and
 18 \$777,587,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000
 19 through 2009; and

20 (2) to decrease the statutory limit on the public
 21 debt to not more than \$5,865,000,000,000 for fiscal
 22 year 2000.

1 **TITLE II—BUDGETARY**
 2 **RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING**

3 **SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR A FISCAL YEAR 2000 SUR-**
 4 **PLUS.**

5 (a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED
 6 BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—Pursuant
 7 to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of
 8 1974, the Congressional Budget Office shall update its
 9 economic and budget forecast for fiscal year 2000 by July
 10 15, 1999.

11 (b) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the report provided
 12 pursuant to subsection (a) estimates an on-budget surplus
 13 for fiscal year 2000, the Chairman of the Committee on
 14 the Budget shall make the adjustments as provided in sub-
 15 section (c).

16 (c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Com-
 17 mittee on the Budget shall take the amount of the on-
 18 budget surplus for fiscal year 2000 estimated in the report
 19 submitted pursuant to subsection (a) and—

20 (1) reduce the on-budget revenue aggregate by
 21 that amount for fiscal year 2000;

22 (2) provide for or increase the on-budget sur-
 23 plus levels used for determining compliance with the
 24 pay-as-you-go requirements of section 202 of H.

1 Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) by that amount for
2 fiscal year 2000; and

3 (3) adjust the instruction in sections 104(1)
4 and 105(1) of this resolution to—

5 (A) reduce revenues by that amount for
6 fiscal year 2000; and

7 (B) increase the reduction in revenues for
8 the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004
9 and for the period of fiscal years 2000 through
10 2009 by that amount.

11 (d) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised aggre-
12 gates and other levels under subsection (c) shall be consid-
13 ered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of
14 1974 as aggregates and other levels contained in this reso-
15 lution.

16 **SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.**

17 (a) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is reported by the
18 Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry
19 that provides risk management and income assistance for
20 agriculture producers, the Chairman of the Senate Com-
21 mittee on the Budget may increase the allocation of budg-
22 et authority and outlays to that Committee by an amount
23 that does not exceed—

24 (1) \$500,000,000 in budget authority and in
25 outlays for fiscal year 2000; and

1 (2) \$6,000,000,000 in budget authority and
 2 \$5,165,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal
 3 years 2000 through 2004; and

4 (3) \$6,000,000,000 in budget authority and in
 5 outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through
 6 2009.

7 (b) LIMITATION.—The Chairman shall not make the
 8 adjustments authorized in this section if legislation de-
 9 scribed in subsection (a) would cause an on-budget deficit
 10 when taken with all other legislation enacted for—

11 (1) fiscal year 2000;

12 (2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through
 13 2004; or

14 (3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through
 15 2009.

16 (c) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised alloca-
 17 tions under subsection (a) shall be considered for the pur-
 18 poses of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as alloca-
 19 tions contained in this resolution.

20 **SEC. 203. TAX REDUCTION RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.**

21 (a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, the Chairman of
 22 the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce
 23 the spending and revenue aggregates and may revise com-
 24 mittee allocations for legislation that reduces revenues if
 25 such legislation will not increase the deficit for—

1 (1) fiscal year 2000;

2 (2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through
3 2004; or

4 (3) the period of fiscal years 2000 through
5 2009.

6 (b) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised alloca-
7 tions and aggregates under subsection (a) shall be consid-
8 ered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of
9 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this reso-
10 lution.

11 **SEC. 204. CLARIFICATION ON THE APPLICATION OF SEC-**
12 **TION 202 OF H. CON. RES. 67.**

13 Section 202(b) of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress)
14 is amended—

15 (1) in paragraph (1), by striking “the deficit”
16 and inserting “the on-budget deficit or cause an on-
17 budget deficit”; and

18 (2) in paragraph (6), by—

19 (A) striking “increases the deficit” and in-
20 serting “increases the on-budget deficit or
21 causes an on-budget deficit”; and

22 (B) striking “increase the deficit” and in-
23 serting “increase the on-budget deficit or cause
24 an on-budget deficit”.

1 **SEC. 205. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION POINT OF ORDER.**

2 (a) POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is consid-
3 ering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference
4 report, a point of order may be made by a Senator against
5 an emergency designation in that measure and if the Pre-
6 siding Officer sustains that point of order, that provision
7 making such a designation shall be stricken from the
8 measure and may not be offered as an amendment from
9 the floor.

10 (b) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY REQUIRE-
11 MENT.—A provision shall be considered an emergency des-
12 ignation if it designates any item an emergency require-
13 ment pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the
14 Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of
15 1985.

16 (c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be
17 waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative
18 vote of three-fifths of the members, duly chosen and
19 sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members
20 of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required
21 in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the
22 Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

23 (d) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of
24 order under this section may be raised by a Senator as
25 provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget
26 Act of 1974.

1 (e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is
 2 sustained under this section against a conference report
 3 the report shall be disposed of as provided in section
 4 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, except
 5 that there shall be no limit on debate.

6 **SEC. 206. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE COMMITTEE ALLOCA-**
 7 **TIONS.**

8 In the event there is no joint explanatory statement
 9 accompanying a conference report on the concurrent reso-
 10 lution on the budget for fiscal year 2000, and in conform-
 11 ance with section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act
 12 of 1974, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget
 13 of the House of Representatives and of the Senate shall
 14 submit for printing in the Congressional Record alloca-
 15 tions consistent with the concurrent resolution on the
 16 budget for fiscal year 2000, as passed by the House of
 17 Representatives and of the Senate.

18 **SEC. 207. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR USE OF**
 19 **OCS RECEIPTS.**

20 (a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, spending aggre-
 21 gates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits
 22 may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legisla-
 23 tion that would use proceeds from Outer Continental Shelf
 24 leasing and production to fund historic preservation, recre-
 25 ation and land, water, fish, and wildlife conservation ef-

1 forts and to support coastal needs and activities, provided
 2 that, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the
 3 budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the
 4 enactment of that legislation will not increase (by virtue
 5 of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit re-
 6 duction) the deficit in this resolution for—

7 (1) fiscal year 2000;

8 (2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through
 9 2004; or

10 (3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through
 11 2009.

12 (b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

13 (1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—Upon
 14 the consideration of legislation pursuant to sub-
 15 section (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the
 16 Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate ap-
 17 propriately revised allocations under section 302(a)
 18 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised
 19 functional levels and aggregates to carry out this
 20 section. These revised allocations, functional levels,
 21 and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes
 22 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as alloca-
 23 tions, functional levels, and aggregates contained in
 24 this resolution.

1 (2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the
 2 Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the
 3 Senate submits an adjustment under this section for
 4 legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in
 5 subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment
 6 to that legislation that would necessitate such sub-
 7 mission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate
 8 appropriately revised allocations under section
 9 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and
 10 revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out
 11 this section. These revised allocations, functional lev-
 12 els, and aggregates shall be considered for the pur-
 13 poses of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as
 14 allocations, functional levels, and aggregates con-
 15 tained in this resolution.

16 (c) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The ap-
 17 propriate committees shall report appropriately revised al-
 18 locations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional
 19 Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

20 **SEC. 208. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MAN-**
 21 **AGED CARE PLANS THAT AGREE TO PROVIDE**
 22 **ADDITIONAL SERVICES TO THE ELDERLY.**

23 (a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, spending aggre-
 24 gates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits
 25 may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legisla-

1 tion to provide: additional funds for medicare managed
 2 care plans agreeing to serve elderly patients for at least
 3 2 years and whose reimbursement was reduced because
 4 of the risk adjustment regulations, provided that to the
 5 extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does
 6 not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of
 7 that legislation will not increase (by virtue of either con-
 8 temporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the
 9 deficit in this resolution for—

10 (1) fiscal year 2000;

11 (2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through
 12 2004; or

13 (3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through
 14 2009.

15 (b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

16 (1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—Upon
 17 the consideration of legislation pursuant to sub-
 18 section (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the
 19 Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate ap-
 20 propriately revised allocations under section 302(a)
 21 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised
 22 functional level and spending aggregates to carry out
 23 this section. These revised allocations, functional lev-
 24 els, and spending aggregates shall be considered for
 25 the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of

1 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates
2 contained in this resolution.

3 (2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the
4 Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the
5 Senate submits an adjustment under this section for
6 legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in
7 subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment
8 to that legislation that would necessitate such sub-
9 mission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate
10 appropriately revised allocations under section
11 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and
12 revised functional levels and spending aggregates to
13 carry out this section. These revised allocations,
14 functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered
15 for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of
16 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates
17 contained in this resolution.

18 (d) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The ap-
19 propriate committees shall report appropriately revised al-
20 locations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional
21 Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

22 **SEC. 209. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE AND PRESCRIP-**
23 **TION DRUGS.**

24 (a) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is reported by the
25 Senate Committee on Finance that significantly extends

1 the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust
 2 Fund without the use of transfers of new subsidies from
 3 the general fund, the Chairman of the Committee on the
 4 Budget may change committee allocations and spending
 5 aggregates if such legislation will not cause an on-budget
 6 deficit for—

7 (1) fiscal year 2000;

8 (2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through
 9 2004; or

10 (3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through
 11 2009.

12 (b) PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT.—The adjust-
 13 ments made pursuant to subsection (a) may be made to
 14 address the cost of the prescription drug benefit.

15 (c) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—The revision of al-
 16 locations and aggregates made under this section shall be
 17 considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget
 18 Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in
 19 this resolution.

20 **SEC. 210. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

21 Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

22 (1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of
 23 the Senate and the House of Representatives, re-
 24 spectively, and as such they shall be considered as
 25 part of the rules of each House, or of that House

1 to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall
 2 supersede other rules only to the extent that they
 3 are inconsistent therewith; and

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

9 **TITLE III—SENSE OF THE**
 10 **CONGRESS AND THE SENATE**

11 **SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MARRIAGE PENALTY.**

12 (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

13 (1) differences in income tax liabilities caused
 14 by marital status are embodied in a number of tax
 15 code provisions including separate rate schedules
 16 and standard deductions for married couples and
 17 single individuals;

18 (2) according to the Congressional Budget Of-
 19 fice (CBO), 42 percent of married couples incurred
 20 “marriage penalties” under the tax code in 1996,
 21 averaging nearly \$1,400;

22 (3) measured as a percent of income, marriage
 23 penalties are largest for low-income families, as cou-
 24 ples with incomes below \$20,000 who incurred a

1 marriage penalty in 1996 were forced to pay nearly
2 8 percent more of their income in taxes than if they
3 had been able to file individual returns;

4 (4) empirical evidence indicates that the mar-
5 riage penalty may affect work patterns, particularly
6 for a couple's second earner, because higher rates
7 reduce after-tax wages and may cause second earn-
8 ers to work fewer hours or not at all, which, in turn,
9 reduces economic efficiency; and

10 (5) the tax code should not improperly influence
11 the choice of couples with regard to marital status
12 by having the combined Federal income tax liability
13 of a couple be higher if they are married than if they
14 are single.

15 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
16 Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation en-
17 acted pursuant to this resolution assume that significantly
18 reducing or eliminating the marriage penalty should be a
19 component of any tax cut package reported by the Finance
20 Committee and passed by Congress during the fiscal year
21 2000 budget reconciliation process.

22 **SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON IMPROVING SECURITY**
23 **FOR UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS.**

24 It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this
25 resolution assume that there is an urgent and ongoing re-

1 quirement to improve security for United States diplo-
 2 matic missions and personnel abroad, which should be met
 3 without compromising existing budgets for International
 4 Affairs (Function 150).

5 **SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ACCESS TO MEDICARE**
 6 **HOME HEALTH SERVICES.**

7 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

8 (1) medicare home health services provide a vi-
 9 tally important option enabling homebound individ-
 10 uals to stay in their own homes and communities
 11 rather than go into institutionalized care; and

12 (2) implementation of the Interim Payment
 13 System and other changes to the medicare home
 14 health benefit have exacerbated inequalities in pay-
 15 ments for home health services between regions, lim-
 16 iting access to these services in many areas and pe-
 17 nalizing efficient, low-cost providers.

18 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
 19 Senate the levels in this resolution assume that the Senate
 20 should act to ensure fair and equitable access to high qual-
 21 ity home health services.

22 **SEC. 304. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE DEDUCT-**
 23 **IBILITY OF HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS**
 24 **OF THE SELF-EMPLOYED.**

25 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

1 (1) under current law, the self-employed do not
2 enjoy parity with their corporate competitors with
3 respect to the tax deductibility of their health insur-
4 ance premiums;

5 (2) this April, the self-employed will only be
6 able to deduct only 45 percent of their health insur-
7 ance premiums for the tax year 1998;

8 (3) the following April, the self-employed will be
9 able to take a 60-percent deduction for their health
10 insurance premiums for the tax year 1999;

11 (4) it will not be until 2004 that the self-em-
12 ployed will be able to take a full 100-percent deduc-
13 tion for their health insurance premiums for the tax
14 year 2003;

15 (5) the self-employed's health insurance pre-
16 miums are generally over 30 percent higher than the
17 health insurance premiums of group health plans;

18 (6) the increased cost coupled with the less fa-
19 vorable tax treatment makes health insurance less
20 affordable for the self-employed;

21 (7) these disadvantages are reflected in the
22 higher rate of uninsured among the self-employed
23 which stands at 24.1 percent compared with 18.2
24 percent for all wage and salaried workers, for self-
25 employed living at or below the poverty level the rate

1 of uninsured is 53.1 percent, for self-employed living
 2 at 100 through 199 percent of poverty the rate of
 3 uninsured is 47 percent, and for self-employed living
 4 at 200 percent of poverty and above the rate of un-
 5 insured is 17.8 percent;

6 (8) for some self-employed, such as farmers
 7 who face significant occupational safety hazards, this
 8 lack of health insurance affordability has even great-
 9 er ramifications; and

10 (9) this lack of full deductibility is also ad-
 11 versely affecting the growing number of women who
 12 own small businesses.

13 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
 14 Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that tax
 15 relief legislation should include parity between the self-em-
 16 ployed and corporations with respect to the tax treatment
 17 of health insurance premiums.

18 **SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT TAX REDUCTIONS**
 19 **SHOULD GO TO WORKING FAMILIES.**

20 It is the sense of the Senate that this concurrent reso-
 21 lution on the budget assumes any reductions in taxes
 22 should be structured to benefit working families by pro-
 23 viding family tax relief and incentives to stimulate savings,
 24 investment, job creation, and economic growth.

1 **SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE NATIONAL**
2 **GUARD.**

3 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

4 (1) the Army National Guard relies heavily
5 upon thousands of full-time employees, Military
6 Technicians and Active Guard/Reserves, to ensure
7 unit readiness throughout the Army National Guard;

8 (2) these employees perform vital day-to-day
9 functions, ranging from equipment maintenance to
10 leadership and staff roles, that allow the drill week-
11 ends and annual active duty training of the tradi-
12 tional Guardsmen to be dedicated to preparation for
13 the National Guard's warfighting and peacetime
14 missions;

15 (3) when the ability to provide sufficient Active
16 Guard/Reserves and Technicians end strength is re-
17 duced, unit readiness, as well as quality of life for
18 soldiers and families is degraded;

19 (4) the Army National Guard, with agreement
20 from the Department of Defense, requires a min-
21 imum essential requirement of 23,500 Active Guard/
22 Reserves and 25,500 Technicians; and

23 (5) the fiscal year 2000 budget request for the
24 Army National Guard provides resources sufficient
25 for approximately 21,807 Active Guard/Reserves and

1 22,500 Technicians, end strength shortfalls of 3,000
2 and 1,693, respectively.

3 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
4 Senate that the functional totals in the budget resolution
5 assume that the Department of Defense will give priority
6 to providing adequate resources to sufficiently fund the
7 Active Guard/Reserves and Military Technicians at min-
8 imum required levels.

9 **SEC. 307. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EFFECTS OF SOCIAL**
10 **SECURITY REFORM ON WOMEN.**

11 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

12 (1) the Social Security benefit structure is of
13 particular importance to low-earning wives and wid-
14 ows, with 63 percent of women beneficiaries aged 62
15 or older receiving wife's or widow's benefits;

16 (2) three-quarters of unmarried and widowed
17 elderly women rely on Social Security for more than
18 half of their income;

19 (3) without Social Security benefits, the elderly
20 poverty rate among women would have been 52.2
21 percent, and among widows would have been 60.6
22 percent;

23 (4) women tend to live longer and tend to have
24 lower lifetime earnings than men do;

1 (5) women spend an average of 11.5 years out
 2 of their careers to care for their families, and are
 3 more likely to work part-time than full-time; and

4 (6) during these years in the workforce, women
 5 earn an average of 70 cents for every dollar men
 6 earn.

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

9 (1) women face unique obstacles in ensuring re-
 10 tirement security and survivor and disability sta-
 11 bility;

12 (2) Social Security plays an essential role in
 13 guaranteeing inflation-protected financial stability
 14 for women throughout their entire old age; and

15 (3) the Congress and the President should take
 16 these factors into account when considering pro-
 17 posals to reform the Social Security system.

18 **SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING**

19 **FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.**

20 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

21 (1) the National Institutes of Health is the Na-
 22 tion's foremost research center;

23 (2) the Nation's commitment to and investment
 24 in biomedical research has resulted in better health
 25 and an improved quality of life for all Americans;

1 (3) continued biomedical research funding must
 2 be ensured so that medical doctors and scientists
 3 have the security to commit to conducting long-term
 4 research studies;

5 (4) funding for the National Institutes of
 6 Health should continue to increase in order to pre-
 7 vent the cessation of biomedical research studies and
 8 the loss of medical doctors and research scientists to
 9 private research organizations; and

10 (5) the National Institutes of Health conducts
 11 research protocols without proprietary interests,
 12 thereby ensuring that the best health care is re-
 13 searched and made available to the Nation.

14 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
 15 Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation en-
 16 acted pursuant to this resolution assume that there shall
 17 be a continuation of the pattern of budgetary increases
 18 for biomedical research.

19 **SEC. 309. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FUNDING FOR KYOTO**
 20 **PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION PRIOR TO SEN-**
 21 **ATE RATIFICATION.**

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

23 (1) The agreement signed by the Administra-
 24 tion on November 12, 1998, regarding legally bind-
 25 ing commitments on greenhouse gas reductions is in-

1 consistent with the provisions of S. Res. 98, the
2 Byrd-Hagel Resolution, which passed the Senate
3 unanimously.

4 (2) The Administration has agreed to allowing
5 at least 2 additional years for negotiations on the
6 Buenos Aires Action Plan to determine the provi-
7 sions of several vital aspects of the Treaty for the
8 United States, including emissions trading schemes,
9 carbon sinks, a clean development mechanism, and
10 developing Nation participation.

11 (3) The Administration has not submitted the
12 Kyoto Protocol to the Senate for ratification and has
13 indicated it has no intention to do so in the foresee-
14 able future.

15 (4) The Administration has pledged to Con-
16 gress that it would not implement any portion of the
17 Kyoto Protocol prior to its ratification in the Senate.

18 (5) Congress agrees that Federal expenditures
19 are required and appropriate for activities which
20 both improve the environment and reduce carbon di-
21 oxide emissions. Those activities include programs to
22 promote energy efficient technologies, encourage
23 technology development that reduces or sequesters
24 greenhouse gases, encourage the development and
25 use of alternative and renewable fuel technologies,

1 and other programs justifiable independent of the
2 goals of the Kyoto Protocol.

3 (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con-
4 gress that the levels in this resolution assume that funds
5 should not be provided to put into effect the Kyoto Pro-
6 tocol prior to its Senate ratification in compliance with
7 the requirements of the Byrd-Hagel Resolution and con-
8 sistent with previous Administration assurances to Con-
9 gress.

10 **SEC. 310. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FEDERAL RESEARCH**
11 **AND DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT.**

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

13 (1) A dozen internationally, prestigious eco-
14 nomic studies have shown that technological
15 progress has historically been the single most impor-
16 tant factor in economic growth, having more than
17 twice the impact of labor or capital.

18 (2) The link between economic growth and
19 technology is evident: our dominant high technology
20 industries are currently responsible for 80 percent of
21 the value of today's stock market, $\frac{1}{3}$ of our eco-
22 nomic output, and half of our economic growth. Fur-
23 thermore, the link between Federal funding of re-
24 search and development (R&D) and market products
25 is conclusive: 70 percent of all patent applications

1 cite nonprofit or federally-funded research as a core
2 component to the innovation being patented.

3 (3) The revolutionary high technology applica-
4 tions of today were spawned from scientific advances
5 that occurred in the 1960's, when the government
6 intensively funded R&D. In the 3 decades since then,
7 our investment in R&D as a fraction of Gross Do-
8 mestic Product (GDP) has dropped to half its
9 former value. As a fraction of the Federal budget,
10 the investment in civilian R&D has dropped to only
11 $\frac{1}{3}$ its value in 1965.

12 (4) Compared to other foreign nation's invest-
13 ment in science and technology, American competi-
14 tiveness is slipping: an Organization for Economic
15 Co-operation and Development report notes that 14
16 countries now invest more in basic and fundamental
17 research as a fraction of GDP than the United
18 States.

19 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
20 Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the
21 Federal investment in R&D should be preserved and in-
22 creased in order to ensure long-term United States eco-
23 nomic strength. Funding for Federal agencies performing
24 basic scientific, medical, and precompetitive engineering
25 research pursuant to the Balanced Budget Agreement Act

1 of 1997 should be a priority for the Senate Budget and
2 Appropriations Committees this year, within the Budget
3 as established by this Committee, in order to achieve a
4 goal of doubling the Federal investment in R&D over an
5 11 year period.

6 **SEC. 311. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON COUNTER-NARCOTICS**
7 **FUNDING.**

8 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

9 (1) the drug crisis facing the United States is
10 a top national security threat;

11 (2) the spread of illicit drugs through United
12 States borders cannot be halted without an effective
13 drug interdiction strategy;

14 (3) effective drug interdiction efforts have been
15 shown to limit the availability of illicit narcotics,
16 drive up the street price, support demand reduction
17 efforts, and decrease overall drug trafficking and
18 use; and

19 (4) the percentage change in drug use since
20 1992, among graduating high school students who
21 used drugs in the past 12 months, has substantially
22 increased—marijuana use is up 80 percent, cocaine
23 use is up 80 percent, and heroin use is up 100 per-
24 cent.

1 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
2 Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional to-
3 tals included in this resolution assume the following:

4 (1) All counter-narcotics agencies will be given
5 a high priority for fully funding their counter-nar-
6 cotics mission.

7 (2) Front line drug fighting agencies are dedi-
8 cating more resources for intentional efforts to con-
9 tinue restoring a balanced drug control strategy.
10 Congress should carefully examine the reauthoriza-
11 tion of the United States Customs service and en-
12 sure they have adequate resources and authority not
13 only to facilitate the movement of internationally
14 traded goods but to ensure they can aggressively
15 pursue their law enforcement activities.

16 (3) By pursuing a balanced effort which re-
17 quires investment in 3 key areas: demand reduction
18 (such as education and treatment); domestic law en-
19 forcement; and international supply reduction, Con-
20 gress believes we can reduce the number of children
21 who are exposed to and addicted to illegal drugs.

22 **SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TRIBAL COL-**
23 **LEGES.**

24 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

1 (1) more than 26,500 students from 250 tribes
2 nationwide attend tribal colleges. The colleges serve
3 students of all ages, many of whom are moving from
4 welfare to work. The vast majority of tribal college
5 students are first-generation college students;

6 (2) while annual appropriations for tribal col-
7 leges have increased modestly in recent years, core
8 operation funding levels are still about $\frac{1}{2}$ of the
9 \$6,000 per Indian student level authorized by the
10 Tribally Controlled College or University Act;

11 (3) although tribal colleges received a
12 \$1,400,000 increase in funding in fiscal year 1999,
13 because of rising student populations, these institu-
14 tions faced an actual per-student decrease in fund-
15 ing over fiscal year 1998; and

16 (4) per student funding for tribal colleges is
17 only about 63 percent of the amount given to main-
18 stream community colleges (\$2,964 per student at
19 tribal colleges versus \$4,743 per student at main-
20 stream community colleges).

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

23 (1) this resolution recognizes the funding dif-
24 ficulties faced by tribal colleges and assumes that
25 priority consideration will be provided to them

1 through funding for the Tribally Controlled College
 2 and University Act, the 1994 Land Grant Institu-
 3 tions, and title III of the Higher Education Act; and
 4 (2) the levels in this resolution assume that
 5 such priority consideration reflects Congress' intent
 6 to continue work toward current statutory Federal
 7 funding goals for the tribal colleges.

8 **SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE SOCIAL SECURITY**
 9 **SURPLUS.**

10 (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

11 (1) according to the Congressional Budget Of-
 12 fice (CBO) January 1999 “Economic and Budget
 13 Outlook,” the Social Security Trust Fund is pro-
 14 jected to incur annual surpluses of
 15 \$126,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1999,
 16 \$137,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000,
 17 \$144,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2001,
 18 \$153,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002,
 19 \$161,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2003, and
 20 \$171,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2004;

21 (2) the fiscal year 2000 budget resolution craft-
 22 ed by Chairman Domenici assumes that Trust Fund
 23 surpluses will be used to reduce publicly-held debt
 24 and for no other purposes, and calls for the enact-

1 ment of statutory legislation that would enforce this
2 assumption;

3 (3) the President's fiscal year 2000 budget pro-
4 posal not only fails to call for legislation that will en-
5 sure annual Social Security surpluses are used
6 strictly to reduce publicly-held debt, but actually
7 spends a portion of these surpluses on non-Social
8 Security programs;

9 (4) using CBO's re-estimate of his budget pro-
10 posal, the President would spend approximately
11 \$40,000,000,000 of the Social Security surplus in
12 fiscal year 2000 on non-Social Security programs;
13 \$41,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2001;
14 \$24,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002;
15 \$34,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2003; and
16 \$20,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2004; and

17 (5) spending any portion of an annual Social
18 Security surplus on non-Social Security programs is
19 wholly-inconsistent with efforts to preserve and pro-
20 tect Social Security for future generations.

21 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
22 Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation en-
23 acted pursuant to this resolution assume that Congress
24 shall reject any budget that would spend any portion of

1 the Social Security surpluses generated in any fiscal year
 2 for any Federal program other than Social Security.

3 **SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SALE OF GOVERNORS**
 4 **ISLAND.**

5 It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this
 6 resolution assume that the sale of Governors Island should
 7 be completed prior to the end of fiscal year 2000.

8 **SEC. 315. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PELL GRANT FUND-**
 9 **ING.**

10 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

11 (1) public investment in higher education yields
 12 a return of several dollars for each dollar invested;

13 (2) higher education promotes economic oppor-
 14 tunity for individuals, as recipients of bachelor's de-
 15 grees earn an average of 75 percent per year more
 16 than those with high school diplomas and experience
 17 half as much unemployment as high school grad-
 18 uates;

19 (3) higher education promotes social oppor-
 20 tunity, as increased education is correlated with re-
 21 duced criminal activity, lessened reliance on public
 22 assistance, and increased civic participation;

23 (4) a more educated workforce will be essential
 24 for continued economic competitiveness in an age
 25 where the amount of information available to society

1 will double in a matter of days rather than months
2 or years;

3 (5) access to a college education has become a
4 hallmark of American society, and is vital to uphold-
5 ing our belief in equality of opportunity;

6 (6) for a generation, the Federal Pell Grant has
7 served as an established and effective means of pro-
8 viding access to higher education for students with
9 financial need;

10 (7) over the past decade, Pell Grant awards
11 have failed to keep pace with inflation, eroding their
12 value and threatening access to higher education for
13 the nation's neediest students;

14 (8) grant aid as a portion of all students finan-
15 cial aid has fallen significantly over the past 5 years;

16 (9) the nation's neediest students are now bor-
17 rowing approximately as much as its wealthiest stu-
18 dents to finance higher education; and

19 (10) the percentage of freshmen attending pub-
20 lic and private 4-year institutions from families
21 below national median income has fallen since 1981.

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

24 (1) the President's proposed reductions in the
25 Pell Grant program are incompatible with his pro-

1 posed \$125 increase in the Pell Grant maximum
2 award;

3 (2) the President's proposed reductions should
4 be rejected; and

5 (3) within the discretionary allocation provided
6 to the Appropriations Committee, the maximum
7 grant award should be raised, to the maximum ex-
8 tent practicable and funding for the Pell Grant pro-
9 gram should be higher than the level requested by
10 the President.