economic, political and strategic interests cannot be isolated or insulated from world affairs; their successful engagement in world affairs are America's guarantor of prosperity and peace.

An understanding of the cost-effectiveness of U.S. foreign aid and a strong commitment to maintain it as an efficient instrument of foreign policy. Reduced in real-dollar terms in recent budgets to less than 1 percent of Federal spending—and the lowest, as a percentage of GNP, among major industrialized nations—U.S. foreign aid serves to safeguard America's political and economic interests abroad and spurs the development of new markets, generates American jobs (with 3 out of 4 aid dollars spent at home), and helps ease foreign crises that could escalate into instability and military conflict.

Continued U.S. leadership in efforts to resolve regional conflicts in areas of vital economic, political and strategic interest; to bar the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and to combat international terrorism that threatens America, Israel, moderate Arab states, and the values and institutions of modern civilization. America's role in the pursuit of Arab-Israeli reconciliation, and in the development of regional economic and security arrangements to promote Middle East peace, has been, and continues to be, indispensable.

Continued U.S. leadership, active participation, and appropriate investment in multilateral and bilateral institutions, including international lending agencies, trade and health organizations, and the United Nations. These institutions are valuable tools through which the United States, with vital security and economic interests across the globe, seeks global consensus on issues of national importance.

The protection of international human rights as an essential component of U.S. foreign policy, reflecting America's deepest values while advancing its interests in a safer world. Indeed, at the founding conference of the United Nations 50 years ago, it was American Jewish Committee representatives Joseph Proskauer and Jacob Blaustein who argued persuasively that governments which respect human rights in their own countries are less likely to upset regional and global stability.

This message, one of a series on public policy issues, was adopted by the Board of Governors of the American Jewish Committee at its 89th Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C., on May 3, 1995.

The American Jewish Committee, Robert S. Rifkind, President; David A. Harris, Executive Director.●

SENATOR THURMOND RECEIVES HONORARY DEGREE

● Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 20, 1995, Senator STROM THURMOND received the honorary degree of doctor of medical jurisprudence honoris causa during the 16th commencement ceremony of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences [USUHS].

Our Nation's only military medical school recognized the President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate and the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee for his ''uncompromising commitment to excellence in military service and in particular, to military medicine.'' Through his vision and efforts, 2,148 USUHS physicians have been commissioned into the uniformed services; and, of those fine, uniformed doctors, over 81 percent remain on active duty in the service of their Nation beyond their initial service obligation.

Senator THURMOND'S leadership and foresight played a major role in the conception of USUHS. Through his consistent support and recognition of the importance of pre-war and wartime knowledge of military medical requirements, the Congress established USUHS and the scholarship program [HPSP] as complementary sources of accession for military physicians. In 1972, Public Law 92–426 established the HPSP program to be a flexible source for the quantity of doctors required by the Armed Forces. USUHS was established to provide a corps of military medical officers—presently 14 percent of the total physician force—who would provide continuity and leadership to the medical services.

It was Senator THURMOND's sound and correct judgment that without continuity and leadership, the lessons learned in military medicine from past wars are forgotten and must be relearned at the expense of the fighting forces. Senator THURMOND has continuously understood that it is essential for military medical readiness to maintain enough physicians in the military services to ensure that the lessons learned in military medicine during both combat and peacetime will be safeguarded. Because of his tenacity, the USUHS military medical personnel, faculty, active duty alumni and programs continue to serve as the institutional memory for military medicine.

During four major assaults attempting to close USUHS, Senator THURMOND's fortitude and mettle have provided the steadfastness of purpose to thwart those who do not understand that there is a vast difference between a civilian doctor in the military and a military physician. Senator THURMOND's military physicians have demonstrated immediate deployability and played key roles in numerous military and humanitarian operations at home and abroad, including: Operation Just Cause (Panama); Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm; Operation Provide Comfort (Kurdish relief); Somalia, Bosnia, Croatia, and Hurricanes Hugo and Andrew relief operations; the 1993 Midwestern flood relief; the operations to restore democracy in Haiti, and in operational planning support provided in response to the 1995 bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma.

Without a doubt, through the passage of time, the immediate deployability of USUHS physicians to military and humanitarian operations, the extraordinary retention rates of the USUHS graduates, the testimony of military medical combat experts during congressional hearings in March and April of 1994, the exceptional support from both military and civilian medical leadership and associations, the documentation from economic analyses that verifies USUHS is a wise investment for the Federal Government, and the renewed recognition of the need for military medical readiness in support of those whom we send into harm's way, have all combined to illuminate the foresight and leadership of Senator STROM THURMOND. He has truly proven himself to be a visionary for the special needs of military medicine.

I sincerely thank Senator THURMOND for his magnificent service to the Senate and to the Nation and join in the standing ovation of the 2,000 attendees at the USUHS commencement ceremony in recognition of his outstanding leadership.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD the citation conferring the honorary degree upon Senator THURMOND.

SENATOR JAMES STROM THURMOND, DOCTOR OF MEDICAL JURISPRUDENCE HONORIS CAUSA

Senator Thurmond, over 70 years ago you unselfishly answered your nation's call for service. Since that time, your commitment to patriotism and concern for those who serve their nation has won you the undying respect of all Americans. Tens of thousands of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines have benefitted from your uncompromising commitment to excellence in military service and in particular, military medicine. To provide the care to those who serve when called is sometimes more perilous in the legislature than on the battlefield. You are a luminary of health care delivery and support of those who serve. Your vision has been tested and proven from the battlefields of Vietnam, Grenada, Lebanon, Panama, Haiti, Somalia, and the Persian Gulf to the clinics and health centers that serve the American people. Your spirit and humanity, together with your legislative acumen, have left a legacy for this nation which is unmatched and truly enviable. Through your efforts, this University is now a part of that legacy. Doctors, nurses, and scientists are now serving their nation because of your vision and commitment to purpose. Your nation's health care University takes great pride in awarding you the degree of Doctor of Medical Jurisprudence Honoris Causa.●

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The text of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, as agreed to by the Senate on Thursday, May 25, 1995, is as follows:

Resolved, That the resolution from the House of Representatives (H. Con. Res. 67) entitled ''Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002'', do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

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

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

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

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 1996: $1,043,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,083,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,135,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,189,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,248,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,315,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,386,675,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996: $275,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $450,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $2,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $2,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,675,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996: $103,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $109,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $114,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $120,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $126,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $133,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $140,400,000,000.

(B) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund)—

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

Fiscal year 1996: $938,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $973,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,019,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,067,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,120,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,180,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,244,600,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996: −$595,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: −$701,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: −$793,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $11,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$6,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996: $1,269,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,296,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,344,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,387,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,446,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,473,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,519,775,000,000.

(B) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund), the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,171,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,194,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,237,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,272,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,324,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,342,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,377,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996: $1,275,675,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,293,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,321,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,368,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,423,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,452,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,500,175,000,000.

(B) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund), the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,179,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,193,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,214,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,255,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,302,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,322,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,359,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996: $232,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $209,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $185,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $178,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $174,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $136,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $113,500,000,000.

(B) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund), the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $240,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $219,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $195,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $187,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $182,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $141,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $114,900,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996: $5,201,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,481,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $5,734,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,980,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,219,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,421,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,599,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996: $37,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $40,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $42,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $45,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $45,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $45,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $46,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1996: $193,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $187,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $185,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $183,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $184,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $186,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $187,600,000,000.

SEC. 102. DEBT INCREASE.

The amounts of the increase in the public debt subject to limitation are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $298,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $279,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $253,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $245,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $239,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $202,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $177,700,000,000.

SEC. 103. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 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 1996: $374,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $392,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $411,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $430,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $452,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $475,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $498,600,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 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 1996: $299,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $310,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $324,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $338,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $353,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $368,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $383,800,000,000.

SEC. 104. 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 1996 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $257,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $253,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $259,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $266,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $259,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $276,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $275,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $275,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $15,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $14,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,300,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(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 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, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $2,900,000,000
(B) Outlays, $2,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $1,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $4,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $4,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $19,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $18,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $10,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $10,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $2,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$7,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $1,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$7,000,000,000
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $36,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $38,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $39,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $40,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $41,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $41,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $40,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $5,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $4,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $4,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $48,975,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,575,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $48,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $48,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,250,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $19,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $48,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $49,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,850,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $48,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,350,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,575,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,600,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $121,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,030,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $127,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $127,420,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $133,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $138,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $142,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $146,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $150,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $150,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $171,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $169,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $180,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $193,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $191,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $207,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $204,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $221,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $238,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $236,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $258,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $256,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund:
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $61,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $66,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $73,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $81,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $90,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $100,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $112,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $111,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $226,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $233,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $235,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $253,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $246,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $256,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $272,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $277,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $291,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $291,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(15) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $8,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $9,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,500,000,000.
(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, $11,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $37,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $37,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $21,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $37,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $37,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $37,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $38,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $38,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,600,000,000.
(17) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $20,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $20,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $21,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $22,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $22,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $21,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $21,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $12,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
(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, $12,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $297,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $297,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $308,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $308,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $316,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $316,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $327,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $327,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $338,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $338,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $345,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $345,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $353,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $353,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $308,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $308,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $319,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $319,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $326,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $326,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $337,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $346,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $346,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $351,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $351,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $356,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $356,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(21) The corresponding levels of gross interest on the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 1996: $369,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $380,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $388,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $400,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $411,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $421,668,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $430,760,000,000.
(22) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$7,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,070,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$7,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$7,580,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$4,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(23) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$42,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$42,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(24) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$30,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$30,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$31,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$31,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 105. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SENATE COMMITTEES.—Not later than July 14, 1995, 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 reduce outlays $2,490,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $27,973,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $45,804,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $21,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $338,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $649,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit $373,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $5,742,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $6,690,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit $2,464,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $21,937,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $33,685,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(5) 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 to reduce outlays $1,771,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $4,775,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $5,001,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.—The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $106,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $1,290,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $2,236,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $21,657,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $278,760,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $519,002,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.—The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $0 in fiscal year 1996, $0 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $0 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(9) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $118,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $3,023,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $6,871,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(10) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $119,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $923,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $1,483,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(11) 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 to reduce outlays $266,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $2,990,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $4,395,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(12) COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION.—The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $2,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $37,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $72,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(13) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending to reduce outlays $301,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $5,760,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $10,002,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

SEC. 201. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) DEFINITION.—As used in this section and for the purposes of allocations made pursuant to section 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the discretionary category, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(1) with respect to fiscal year 1996—

(A) for the defense category $258,379,000,000 in new budget authority and $262,035,000,000 in outlays; and

(B) for the nondefense category $219,441,000,000 in new budget authority and $264,908,000,000 in outlays;

(2) with respect to fiscal year 1997—

(A) for the defense category $254,028,000,000 in new budget authority and $257,695,000,000 in outlays; and

(B) for the nondefense category $212,164,000,000 in new budget authority and $249,248,000,000 in outlays;

(3) with respect to fiscal year 1998—

(A) for the defense category $260,321,000,000 in new budget authority and $255,226,000,000 in outlays; and

(B) for the nondefense category $219,177,000,000 in new budget authority and $244,735,000,000 in outlays;

(4) with respect to fiscal year 1999—

(A) for the defense category $266,906,000,000 in new budget authority and $260,331,000,000 in outlays; and

(B) for the nondefense category $210,509,000,000 in new budget authority and $242,212,000,000 in outlays;

(5) with respect to fiscal year 2000—

(A) for the defense category $276,644,000,000 in new budget authority and $268,468,000,000 in outlays; and

(B) for the nondefense category $215,463,000,000 in new budget authority and $243,078,000,000 in outlays;

(6) with respect to fiscal year 2001—

(A) for the defense category $276,644,000,000 in new budget authority and $268,468,000,000 in outlays; and

(B) for the nondefense category $219,384,000,000 in new budget authority and $248,786,000,000 in outlays; and

(7) with respect to fiscal year 2002—

(A) for the defense category $276,644,000,000 in new budget authority and $270,000,000,000 in outlays; and

(B) for the nondefense category $218,784,000,000 in new budget authority and $248,160,000,000 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) any concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such a resolution) that provides discretionary spending in excess of the sum of the defense and nondefense discretionary spending limits for such fiscal year; or

(B) any appropriations bill or resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such appropriations bill or resolution) for fiscal year 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 that would exceed any of the discretionary spending limits in this section or suballocations of those limits made pursuant to section 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) EXCEPTION.—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.

(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, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER.

(a) PURPOSE.—The Senate declares that it is essential to—

(1) ensure continued compliance with the balanced budget plan set forth in this resolution; and

(2) continue the pay-as-you-go enforcement system.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct-spending or receipts legislation (as defined in paragraph (3)) that would increase the deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods (as defined in paragraph (2)) as measured pursuant to paragraph (4).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''applicable time period'' means any one of the three following periods—

(A) the first fiscal year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget;

(B) the period of the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(C) the period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) DIRECT-SPENDING OR RECEIPTS LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''direct-spending or receipts legislation'' shall—

(A) except as otherwise provided in this subsection, include all direct-spending legislation as that term is interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985;

(B) include—

(i) any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report to which this subsection otherwise applies; and

(ii) the estimated amount of savings in direct-spending programs applicable to that fiscal year resulting from the prior year's sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, if any (except for any amounts sequestered as a result of a net deficit increase in the fiscal year immediately preceding the prior fiscal year); and

(C) exclude—

(i) any concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(ii) full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

(4) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall—

(A) use the baseline used for the most recent concurrent resolution on the budget, and for years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution; and

(B) abide by the requirements of subsections (a) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that references to ''outyears'' in that section shall be deemed to apply to any year (other than the budget year) covered by any one of the time periods defined in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(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 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, and receipts for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 23 of House Concurrent Resolution 218 (103d Congress) is repealed.

(g) SUNSET.—Subsections (a) through (e) of this section shall expire September 30, 2002.

SEC. 203. TAX RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—After passage of a conference report on legislation complying with the reconciliation requirements of section 105, revenue and spending aggregates shall be reduced and allocations shall be revised for legislation that reduces revenues within a committee's jurisdiction if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase the deficit in this resolution for—

(1) fiscal year 1996;

(2) the period of fiscal years 1996 through 2000; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(c) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committee shall report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to sections 302(b) and 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

SEC. 204. BUDGET SURPLUS ALLOWANCE.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—For the purposes of points of order under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 and this concurrent resolution on the budget, the revenue aggregates shall be reduced and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and levels shall be revised to reflect the additional deficit reduction achieved as calculated under subsection (c) for legislation that reduces revenues by providing family tax relief and incentives to stimulate savings, investment, job creation, and economic growth.

(b) REVISED AGGREGATES.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall submit to the Senate appropriately revised budgetary aggregates and levels by an amount that does not exceed the additional deficit reduction calculated under subsection (d).

(c) CBO REVISED DEFICIT ESTIMATE.—After the enactment of legislation that complies with the reconciliation directives of section 105, the Congressional Budget Office shall provide the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate a revised estimate of the deficit for fiscal years 1996 through 2005.

(d) ADDITIONAL DEFICIT REDUCTION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''additional deficit reduction'' means the amount by which the total deficit levels assumed in this resolution for a fiscal year exceed the revised deficit estimate provided pursuant to subsection (c) for such fiscal year for fiscal years 1996 through 2005.

(e) CBO CERTIFICATION AND CONTINGENCIES.—This section shall not apply unless—

(1) legislation has been enacted complying with the reconciliation directives of section 105;

(2) the Director of the Congressional Budget Office has provided the estimate required by subsection (c); and

(3) the revisions made pursuant to this subsection do not cause a budget deficit for fiscal year 2002, 2003, 2004, or 2005.

SEC. 205. SCORING OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

Notwithstanding section 606(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and beginning with fiscal year 1996, the determinations under sections 302, 303, and 311 of such Act shall take into account any new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, receipts, or deficit effects as a consequence of the provisions of section 251(b)(2)(D) and 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 206. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the prohibition on scoring asset sales has discouraged the sale of assets that can be better managed by the private sector and generate receipts to reduce the Federal budget deficit;

(2) the President's fiscal year 1996 budget included $8,000,000,000 in receipts from asset sales and proposed a change in the asset sale scoring rule to allow the proceeds from these sales to be scored;

(3) assets should not be sold if such sale would increase the budget deficit over the long run; and

(4) the asset sale scoring prohibition should be repealed and consideration should be given to replacing it with a methodology that takes into account the long-term budgetary impact of asset sales.

(b) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—For purposes of any concurrent resolution on the budget and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the amounts realized from sales of assets shall be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—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.

SEC. 207. CREDIT REFORM AND GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS.

For the purposes of allocations and points of order under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and this resolution, the cost of a direct loan shall be the net present value, at the time when the direct loan is disbursed, of the following cash flows for the estimated life of the loan:

(1) Loan disbursements.

(2) Repayments of principal.

(3) Payments of interest and other payments by or to the Government over the life of the loan after adjusting for estimated defaults, prepayments, fees, penalties, and other recoveries.

(4) In the case of legislation increasing direct loan commitments for a program in which loan commitments will equal or exceed $5,000,000,000 for the coming fiscal year (or for any prior fiscal year), direct expenses, including—

(A) activities related to credit extension, loan origination, loan servicing, training, program promotion, management of contractors, and payments to contractors, other government entities, and program participants;

(B) collection of delinquent loans; and

(C) writeoff and closeout of loans.

SEC. 208. EXTENSION OF BUDGET ACT 60-VOTE ENFORCEMENT THROUGH 2002.

Notwithstanding section 275(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as amended by sections 13112(b) and 13208(b)(3) of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990), the second sentence of section 904(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (except insofar as it relates to section 313 of that Act) and the final sentence of section 904(d) of that Act (except insofar as it relates to section 313 of that Act) shall continue to have effect as rules of the Senate through (but no later than) September 30, 2002.

SEC. 209. REPEAL OF IRS ALLOWANCE.

(a) Section 25 of House Concurrent Resolution 218 (103d Congress, 2d Session) is repealed.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the revenue levels contained in the budget resolution should assume passage of the ''Taxpayers Bill of Rights 2'' and that the Senate should pass the Taxpayers Bill of Rights 2 this Congress.

(c) It is the sense of the Senate that funding for tax compliance efforts should be a top priority and that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution include the administration's full request for the Internal Revenue Service.

SEC. 210. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The Senate adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate, 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 the Senate to change those rules (so far as they relate to the Senate) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate.

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE CONGRESS AND THE SENATE

SEC. 301. RESTRUCTURING GOVERNMENT AND PROGRAM TERMINATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that to balance the Federal budget in a rational and reasonable manner requires an assessment of national priorities and the appropriate role of the Federal Government in meeting the challenges facing the United States in the 21st century.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that to balance the budget the Congress should—

(1) restructure Federal programs to meet identified national priorities in the most effective and efficient manner so that program dollars get to the intended purpose or recipient;

(2) terminate programs that have largely met their goals, that have outlived their original purpose, or that have been superseded by other programs;

(3) seek to end significant duplication among Federal programs, which results in excessive administrative costs and ill serve the American people; and

(4) eliminate lower priority programs.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING RETURNING PROGRAMS TO THE STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) section 8 of article I of the Constitution grants the Federal Government limited powers and the 10th amendment to the Constitution expressly provides that the powers not delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the States and the people;

(2) in fiscal year 1993, the Federal Government provided funds to States and localities through 593 categorical programs totaling $206,000,000,000;

(3) in attempting to solve every problem of society, the Federal Government is overburdening the States and its citizens with cumbersome and intrusive laws, programs, regulations, and mandates; and

(4) in administering many Federal programs, the States are often better equipped to determine and respond to the particular needs of the people than the Federal Government.

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

(1) Federal programs should be reviewed to determine whether they are an appropriate function of the Federal Government and whether they are more appropriately a responsibility of the States consistent with the 10th amendment to the Constitution;

(2) Federal resources should be provided in a manner which rewards work, promotes families, and provides a helping hand during times of crisis;

(3) the Federal Government should seek a new partnership with States that recognizes that ''one size fits all'' solutions of the past are flawed;

(4) this new partnership should include block grants that provide maximum flexibility to States and localities in terms of the design and structure of programs to ensure the maximum benefit at the least cost to the American taxpayer;

(5) Federal funds must not be used to supplant existing expenditures by individuals, localities, and States;

(6) block grants should not be reduced to revenue sharing;

(7) adequate safeguards should be in place to protect the Federal investment, such as auditing or maintenance of effort provisions; and

(8) the inclusion of Federal goals and principles in block grant programs may be appropriate, as well as essential data collection requirements for evaluation purposes.

SEC. 303. COMMERCIALIZATION OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) there are a number of functions being performed by the Federal Government that should not be performed by the Federal Government because they could be more conveniently and efficiently provided by the private sector;

(2) our Founding Fathers wrote a Constitution that created a Federal Government of limited powers and limited responsibility;

(3) the current Federal Government owns one-third of the land of this great Nation, oil fields, hospitals, railroads, Tokyo office buildings, electric companies, 4,900,000 housing units which are owned outright by Housing and Urban Development or are eligible for Housing and Urban Development subsidy payments, and loan portfolios that are larger than most of the financial institutions in the country; and

(4)(A) the Federal Government's encroachment into the private sector is significant, often duplicative, inconsistent with free market principles, and costly for taxpayers;

(B) when the Federal Government monopolizes a service that could be provided by the private sector it usually costs taxpayers 30 percent more; and

(C) one-fourth of the work done by Federal employees competes with the private sector.

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

(1) Congress should better define privatization and how it can contribute to ''right sizing'' the Federal Government and at the same time achieve better service, more innovation, and significant deficit reduction;

(2) privatization can take at least four forms: asset sales, contracting out, creating corporate enterprises under strict and clearly defined deadlines designed to achieve full privatization, and eliminating legislative barriers, generically called ''private sector lockouts'';

(3) provisions of law that prohibit or ''lockout'' the private sector from competing for providing certain services should be examined and eliminated;

(4) the private sector from Main Street, Wall Street and Academia should be encouraged by the President and the Congress to bring forward their privatization best practices and proposals for privatization;

(5) the Head of each Federal agency and department and the Office of Management and Budget should designate senior level staff persons to develop and evaluate private sector privatization initiatives that should be included in the President's budget;

(6)(A) the Office of Management and Budget should set appropriate privatization goals for each agency; and

(B) no expansions of programs under a department's jurisdiction should be approved by the Office of Management and Budget unless the agency has achieved those privatization goals;

(7) section 257(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act which prohibits crediting savings from asset sales should be repealed or modified; and

(8) Congress should evaluate privatization processes taking place in other countries to determine what lessons could be learned so that United States could develop a comprehensive privatization policy by the end of the next fiscal year.

SEC. 304. NONPARTISAN ADVISORY COMMISSION ON THE CPI.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) Congress intended to insulate certain government beneficiaries and taxpayers from the effects of inflation by indexing payments and tax brackets to the Consumer Price Index (CPI);

(2) approximately 30 percent of total Federal outlays and 45 percent of Federal revenues are indexed to reflect changes in the CPI; and

(3) the overwhelming consensus among experts is that the method used to construct the CPI and the current calculation of the CPI both overstate the estimate of the true cost of living.

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

(1) a temporary advisory commission should be established to make objective and nonpartisan recommendations concerning the appropriateness and accuracy of the methodology and calculations that determine the CPI;

(2) the Commission should be appointed on a nonpartisan basis, and should be composed of experts in the fields of economics, statistics, or other related professions; and

(3) the Commission should report its recommendations to the Bureau of Labor Statistics and to Congress at the earliest possible date.

SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON A UNIFORM ACCOUNTING SYSTEM IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND NONPARTISAN COMMISSION ON ACCOUNTING AND BUDGETING.

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

(1) Much effort has been devoted to strengthening Federal internal accounting controls in the past. Although progress has been made in recent years, there still exists no uniform Federal accounting system for Federal Government entities and institutions.

(2) As a result, Federal financial management continues to be seriously deficient, and Federal financial management and fiscal practices have failed to identify costs, failed to reflect the total liabilities of congressional actions, and failed to accurately report the financial condition of the Federal Government.

(3) Current Federal accounting practices do not adequately report financial problems of the Federal Government or the full cost of programs and activities. The continued use of these practices undermines the Government's ability to provide credible and reliable financial data, contributes to waste and inefficiency, and will not assist in achieving a balanced budget.

(4) Waste and inefficiency in Federal Government undermine the confidence of the American people in the Government and reduces the Federal Government's ability to address adequately vital public needs.

(5) To rebuild the accountability and credibility of the Federal Government and restore public confidence in the Federal Government, a uniform Federal accounting system, that fully meets the accounting standards and reporting objectives for the Federal Government, must be immediately established so that all assets and liabilities, revenues and expenditures or expenses, and the full cost of programs and activities of the Federal Government can be consistently and accurately recorded, monitored, and uniformly reported throughout all government entities for budgeting and control and management evaluation purposes.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution include the following assumptions:

(1) UNIFORM FEDERAL ACCOUNTING SYSTEM.—(A) A uniform Federal accounting system should be established to consistently compile financial data across the Federal Government, and to make full disclosure of Federal financial data, including the full cost of Federal programs and activities, to the citizens, the Congress, the President, and agency management.

(B) Beginning with fiscal year 1997, the President should require the heads of agencies to—

(i) implement and maintain a uniform Federal accounting system; and

(ii) provide financial statements;

in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a consistent basis and established in accordance with proposed Federal accounting standards and interpretations recommended by the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board and other applicable law.

(2) NONPARTISAN ADVISORY COMMISSION ON ACCOUNTING AND BUDGETING.—(A) A temporary advisory commission should be established to make objective and nonpartisan recommendations for the appropriate treatment of capital expenditures under a uniform Federal accounting system that is consistent with generally accepted accounting principles.

(B) The Commission should be appointed on a nonpartisan basis, and should be composed of public and private experts in the fields of finance, economics, accounting, and other related professions.

(C) The Commission should report to the President and the Congress by August 1, 1995, on its recommendations, and should include in its report a detailed plan for implementing such recommendations.

SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS THAT 90 PERCENT OF THE BENEFITS OF ANY TAX CUTS MUST GO TO THE MIDDLE CLASS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the incomes of middle-class families have stagnated since the early 1980's, with family incomes growing more slowly between 1979 and 1989 than in any other business cycle since World War II; and

(2) according to the Department of the Treasury, in 1996, approximately 90 percent of American families will have incomes less than $100,000.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that if the 1996 Concurrent Budget Resolution includes any cut in taxes, approximately 90 percent of the benefits of these tax cuts must go to working families with incomes less than $100,000.

SEC. 307. BIPARTISAN COMMISSION ON THE SOLVENCY OF MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Health Insurance for the Aged Act, which created the medicare program, was enacted on July 30, 1965, and, therefore, the medicare program will celebrate its 30-year anniversary on July 30, 1995;

(2) on April 3, 1995, the Trustees of medicare submitted their 1995 Annual Report on the Status of the Medicare Program to the Congress;

(3) the Trustees of medicare have concluded that ''the medicare program is clearly unsustainable in its present form'';

(4) the Trustees of medicare have concluded that ''the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, which pays inpatient hospital expenses, will be able to pay benefits for only about 7 years and is severely out of financial balance in the long range'';

(5) the Public Trustees of medicare have concluded that ''the Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund shows a rate of growth of costs which is clearly unsustainable'';

(6) the Trustees of medicare have recommended ''legislation to reestablish the Quadrennial Advisory Council that will help lead to effective solutions to the problems of the program'';

(7) the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement and Tax Reform concluded that, absent long-term changes in medicare, projected medicare outlays will increase from about 4 percent of the payroll tax base today to over 15 percent of the payroll tax base by the year 2030;

(8) the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement and Tax Reform recommended, by a vote of 30 to 1, that spending and revenues available for medicare must be brought into long-term balance;

(9) the Public Trustees of medicare have concluded that ''We had hoped for several years that comprehensive health reform would include meaningful medicare reforms. However, with the results of the last Congress, it is now clear that medicare reform needs to be addressed urgently as a distinct legislative initiative''; and

(10) the Public Trustees of medicare ''strongly recommend that the crisis presented by the financial condition of the medicare trust funds be urgently addressed on a comprehensive basis, including a review of the programs's financing methods, benefit provisions, and delivery mechanisms.''.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) a special bipartisan commission should be established immediately to make recommendations concerning the most appropriate response to the short-term solvency and long-term sustainability issues facing medicare;

(2) the commission should report to Congress its recommendations on the appropriate response to the short-term solvency of medicare by July 10, 1995, in order that the committees of jurisdiction may consider those recommendations in fashioning an appropriate congressional response; and

(3) the commission should report its recommendations to respond to the Public Trustees' call to make medicare's financial condition sustainable over the long term to Congress by February 1, 1996.

SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURE SAVINGS.

It is the sense of the Senate that, in response to the reconciliation instructions in section 105 of this resolution, the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry should provide that no more than 20 percent of the savings be achieved in commodity programs.

SEC. 309. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING PROTECTION OF CHILDREN'S HEALTH.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

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

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

(3) Medicaid covers one in four children and one in three births. Nearly 60 percent of children covered by medicaid are from working families.

(4) While children represent one-half of all people eligible for medicaid, they account for less than 25 percent of medicaid expenditures.

(5) Medicaid provides a broad range of services essential for the health of a significant portion of the Nation's children with disabilities.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the health care needs of low-income pregnant women and children should be a top priority;

(2) careful study must be made of the impact of medicaid reform proposals on children's health and on vital sources of care including children's hospitals and community and migrant health centers; and

(3) medicaid reform legislation which would allow greater State flexibility in the delivery of care and in the control of the rate of growth in costs of the program should also encourage States to place a priority on coverage for pregnant women and children.

SEC. 310. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT LOBBYING EXPENSES SHOULD REMAIN NONDEDUCTIBLE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that ordinary Americans generally are not allowed to deduct the costs of communicating with their elected representatives.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that lobbying expenses should not be tax deductible.

SEC. 311. EXPATRIATE TAXES.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Congress should revise the Internal Revenue Code to ensure that very wealthy individuals are not able to reduce or avoid their United States income, estate, or gift tax liability by relinquishing their United States citizenship; and

(2) the increased revenues resulting from the revision should be used to reduce the deficit.

SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING LOSSES OF TRUST FUNDS DUE TO FRAUD AND ABUSE IN THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the General Accounting Office estimates that as much as $100,000,000,000 are wasted each year in the health care system due to fraud and abuse;

(2) outlays for the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act during fiscal year 1994 were $161,100,000,000, and the General Accounting Office estimates that up to 10 percent of those outlays were wasted because of fraud and abuse;

(3) medicare beneficiaries incur higher out-of-pocket costs and copayments due to inflated billings resulting from fraudulent and abusive practices perpetrated against the medicare program; and

(4) funds lost because of fraud and abuse are contributing to the financial crises of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, as identified by the Boards of Trustees of such trust funds in their 1995 annual reports.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that as the Committee on Finance of the Senate and, if established, the Bipartisan Commission on the Solvency of Medicare recommended under section 307, address the long-term solvency of the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), high priority should be given to proposals which identify, eliminate, and recover funds expended from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund due to fraud and abuse in such program. In addition, the Senate assumes that funds recovered from enhanced anti-fraud and abuse efforts be used to fund health care anti-fraud and abuse enforcement efforts, reimbursements to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for losses due to fraud and abuse, and deficit reduction.

SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING FULL FUNDING FOR DECADE OF THE BRAIN RESEARCH.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) long-term health care costs associated with diseases and disorders of the brain have a substantial impact on Federal expenditures for medicaid and medicare, and on the earning potential of the Nation;

(2) to highlight the impact of brain diseases and disorders on the economy and well being of the Nation the Congress has declared the 1990's the Decade of the Brain;

(3) meaningful research has been initiated as part of the Decade of the Brain;

(4) if fully funded this research could provide important new medical breakthroughs; and

(5) these breakthroughs could result in a significant reduction in costs to the Federal Government.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that in furtherance of the goals of the Decade of the Brain the appropriate committees should seek to ensure that full funding is provided for research on brain diseases and disorders in each of the fiscal years to which this resolution applies.

SEC. 314. CONSIDERATION OF THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS, FISCAL YEAR 1996.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(1) Whereas over 26,000,000 veterans are eligible for veterans health care;

(2) Whereas the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs operates the largest Federal medical care delivery system in the United States, providing for the medical care needs of our Nation's veterans;

(3) Whereas the veterans' service organizations have provided a plan, known as the Independent Budget for Veterans Affairs, to reform the veterans' health care delivery system to adapt it to the modern health care environment and improve its ability to meet the health care needs of veterans in a cost-effective manner;

(4) Whereas current budget proposals assume a change in the definition of service-connected veterans;

(5) Whereas proposals contained within the Independent Budget may provide improved service to veterans;

(6) Whereas current budget proposals may not have fully considered the measures proposed by the veterans' service organizations in the Independent Budget.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the reforms and proposals contained within the Independent Budget for Veterans Affairs, Fiscal Year 1996 should be given careful consideration in an effort to ensure the Nation's commitment to its veterans.

SEC. 315. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE COSTS OF THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993.

It is the sense of the Senate that within the assumptions under budget function 800 funds will be spent for reimbursement to the States for the costs of implementing the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

SEC. 316. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying function 800 include the following: That payments to presidential campaigns from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, as authorized by the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974, should not be used to pay for or augment damage awards or settlements arising from a civil or criminal action, or the threat thereof, related to sexual harassment.

SEC. 317. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FUNDS TO DEFEND AGAINST SEXUAL HARASSMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that no Member of Congress or the Executive Branch may use campaign funds or privately donated funds to defend against sexual harassment lawsuits.

SEC. 318. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY TO SCHOOLS AFFECTED BY FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds as follows:

(1) In order to fulfill its responsibility to communities that were adversely affected by Federal activities, the Congress established the Impact Aid program in 1950.

(2) The Impact Aid program is intended to ease the burden on local school districts for educating children who live on Federal property. Since Federal property is exempt from local property taxes, such districts are denied the primary source of revenue used to finance elementary and secondary education. Most Impact Aid payments are made for students whose parents are in the uniformed services, or for students who reside on Indian lands or in federally subsidized low-rent housing projects. Over 1,600 local educational agencies enrolling over 17,000,000 children are provided assistance under the Impact Aid program.

(3) The Impact Aid program is one of the few Federal education programs where funds are sent directly to the school district. Such funds go directly into the general fund and may be used as the local educational agency decides.

(4) The Impact Aid program covers less than half of what it costs to educate each federally connected student in some school districts, requiring local school districts or States to provide the remainder.

(5) Added to the burden described in paragraph (4) is the fact that some States do not rely upon an income tax for State funding of education. In these cases, the loss of property tax revenue makes State and local education funding even more difficult to obtain.

(6) Given the serious budget constraints facing State and local governments it is critical that the Federal Government continue to fulfill its responsibility to the federally impacted school districts in our Nation's States.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that in the assumptions for the overall accounts it is assumed that the Federal Government has a financial responsibility to schools in our Nation's communities which are adversely affected by Federal activities and that funding for such responsibilities should not be reduced or eliminated.

SEC. 319. SENSE OF THE SENATE TO ELIMINATE THE EARNINGS PENALTY.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution include that the increased revenues resulting from the revision of the expatriate tax loophole should be used to eliminate the earnings penalty imposed on low and middle income senior citizens receiving social security.

SEC. 320. STUDENT LOAN CUTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in the 20th century, educational increases in the workforce accounted for 30 percent of the growth in our Nation's wealth, and advances in knowledge accounted for 55 percent of such growth;

(2) the Federal Government provides 75 percent of all college financial aid;

(3) the Federal student loan program was created to make college accessible and affordable for the middle class;

(4) increased fees and interest costs discourage college participation by making higher education more expensive, and more of a risk, for students and their families;

(5) full-time students already work an average of 25 hours per week, taking time away from their studies; and

(6) student indebtedness is already increasing rapidly, and any reduction of the in-school interest subsidy will increase the indebtedness burden on students and families.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume the Labor and Human Resources Committee, in seeking to achieve mandatory savings, should do their best to not increase the cost of borrowing for students participating in the Robert T. Stafford Federal Student Loan Program.

SEC. 321. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NUTRITIONAL HEALTH OF CHILDREN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Federal nutrition programs, such as the school lunch program, the school breakfast program, the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (referred to in this section as ''WIC''), the child and adult care food program, and others, are important to the health and well-being of children;

(2) participation in Federal nutrition programs is voluntary on the part of States, and the programs are administered and operated by every State;

(3) a major factor that led to the creation of the school lunch program was that a number of the recruits for the United States armed forces in World War II failed physical examinations due to problems related to inadequate nutrition;

(4)(A) WIC has proven to be extremely valuable in promoting the health of newborn babies and children; and

(B) each dollar invested in the prenatal component of WIC has been shown to save up to $3.50 in medicaid costs related to medical problems that arise in the first 90 days after the birth of an infant;

(5) the requirement that infant formula be purchased under a competitive bidding system under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786) saved $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 and enabled States to allow 1,600,000 women, infants, and children to participate in WIC at no additional cost to taxpayers; and

(6) a balanced Federal budget will provide economic benefits to children alive today and to future generations of Americans.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution include the assumptions that—

(1) schools should continue to serve lunches that meet minimum nutritional requirements based on tested nutritional research;

(2) the content of WIC food packages for infants, children, and pregnant and postpartum women should continue to be based on scientific evidence;

(3) the competitive bidding system for infant formula under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786) should be maintained;

(4) foods of minimum nutritional value should not be sold in competition with school lunches in the school cafeterias during lunch hours;

(5) some reductions in nutrition program spending can be made without compromising the nutritional well-being of program recipients;

(6) in complying with the reconciliation instructions in section 6 of this resolution, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate should take this section into account; and

(7) Congress should continue to move toward fully funding the WIC program.

SEC. 322. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MAINTAINING FEDERAL FUNDING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers provide essential services that preserve and protect our freedoms and security;

(2) law enforcement officers deserve our appreciation and support;

(3) law enforcement officers and agencies are under increasing attacks, both to their physical safety and to their reputations;

(4) on April 7, 1995, the Senate passed S.J. Res. 32 in which the Senate recognizes the debt of gratitude the Nation owes to the men and women who daily serve the American people as law enforcement officers and the integrity, honesty, dedication, and sacrifice of our Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers;

(5) the Nation's sense of domestic tranquility has been shaken by explosions at the World Trade Center in New York and the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City and by the fear of violent crime in our cities, towns, and rural areas across the Nation;

(6) Federal, State, and local law enforcement efforts need increased financial commitment from the Federal Government and not the reduction of such commitment to law enforcement if law enforcement officers are to carry out their efforts to combat violent crime; and

(7) on April 5, 1995, and May 18, 1995, the House of Representatives has nonetheless voted to reduce $5,000,000,000 from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund in order to provide for tax cuts in both H. R. 1215 and H. Con. Res. 67.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that the Federal Government's commitment to fund Federal law enforcement programs and programs to assist State and local efforts should be maintained and funding for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund should not be reduced by $5,000,000,000 as the bill and resolution passed by the House of Representatives would require.

SEC. 323. NEED TO ENACT LONG TERM HEALTH CARE REFORM.

It is the sense of the Senate that the One Hundred Fourth Congress should enact fundamental long-term health care reform that emphasizes cost-effective, consumer oriented, and consumer-directed home and community-based care that builds upon existing family supports and achieves deficit reduction by helping elderly and disabled individuals remain in their own homes and communities.

SEC. 324. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MANDATORY MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS UNDER FUNCTION 270: ENERGY.

It is the sense of the Senate that within the mandatory major assumptions under budget function 270, none of the power marketing administrations within the 48 contiguous States will be sold, and any savings that were assumed would be realized from the sale of those power marketing administrations will be realized through cost reductions in other programs within the Department of Energy.

SEC. 325. DEFENSE OVERHEAD.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the major discretionary assumptions in this concurrent budget resolution include 15 percent

reduction in overhead for programs of nondefense agencies that remain funded in the budget and whose funding is not interconnected with receipts dedicated to a program;

(2) the Committee Report (104–82) on this concurrent budget resolution states that ''this assumption would not reduce funding for the programmatic activities of agencies.''.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations should make a reduction of at least three percent in overhead for fiscal year 1996 programs of defense agencies, and should do so in a manner so as not to reduce funding for the programmatic activities of these agencies.

SEC. 326. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the essential air service program of the Department of Transportation under subchapter II of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code—

(A) provides essential airline access to isolated rural communities across the United States;

(B) is necessary for the economic growth and development of rural communities;

(C) connects small rural communities to the national air transportation system of the United States;

(D) is a critical component of the national transportation system of the United States; and

(E) provides air service to 108 communities in 30 States; and

(2) the National Commission to Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry established under section 204 of the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity, Noise Improvement, and Intermodal Transportation Act of 1992 recommended maintaining the essential air service program with a sufficient level of funding to continue to provide air service to small communities.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the essential air service program of the Department of Transportation under subchapter II of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, should receive, to the maximum extent possible, a sufficient level of funding to continue to provide air service to small rural communities that qualify for assistance under the program.

SEC. 327. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE PRIORITY THAT SHOULD BE GIVEN TO RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION ACTIVITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) section 1202 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 2956), which passed the Senate 93 to 3 and was signed into law by President Bush in 1992, amended section 6 of the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Technology Competitiveness Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 12005) to direct the Secretary of Energy to conduct a 5-year program to commercialize renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies;

(2) poll after poll shows that the American people overwhelmingly believe that renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies should be the highest priority of Federal research, development, and demonstration activities;

(3) renewable technologies (such as wind, photovoltaic, solar thermal, geothermal, and biomass technology) have made significant progress toward increased reliability and decreased cost;

(4) energy efficient technologies in the building, industrial, transportation, and utility sectors have saved more than 3 trillion dollars for industries, consumers, and the Federal Government over the past 20 years while creating jobs, improving the competitiveness of the economy, making housing more affordable, and reducing the emissions of environmentally damaging pollutants;

(5) the renewable energy and energy efficiency technology programs feature private sector cost shares that are among the highest of Federal energy research and development programs;

(6) according to the Energy Information Administration, the United States currently imports more than 50 percent of its oil, representing $46,000,000,000, or approximately 40 percent, of the $116,000,000,000 total United States merchandise deficit in 1993; and

(7) renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies represent potential inroads for American companies into export markets for energy products and services estimated at least $225,000,000,000 over the next 25 years.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution include the assumption that renewable energy and energy efficiency technology research, development, and demonstration activities should be given priority among the Federal energy research programs.

SEC. 328. FOREIGN SALES CORPORATIONS INCOME EXCLUSION.

The assumption underlying the functional totals include that it is the sense of the Senate that cuts in student loan benefits should be minimized, and that the current exclusion of income of Foreign Sales Corporations should be eliminated.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BOND pertaining to the introduction of S. 872 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

MR. ASHCROFT. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. Ashcroft pertaining to the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 36 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOND). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LES ASPIN: A PUBLIC SERVANT AND A FRIEND

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, last Sunday the Nation lost one of its foremost leaders on military and defense policies, and I lost a good friend, with the passing of Les Aspin.

I came to know and appreciate Les Aspin when we served together in the House of Representatives, and he and Junket, his huge, hairy sheep dog, shared an office down the hall from me in the Cannon House Office Building.

I came to know and appreciate Les as a good and decent man who was never too busy to stop and exchange a joke with you.

I also came to admire and respect him as a dedicated, selfless public servant. At the time of his death, he had spent more than 3 decades in public service as a Member of the House of Representatives, as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, as a chief adviser on military policy to the Clinton-Gore campaign, as Secretary of Defense, and as the head of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.

No person could have been better prepared for these important and demanding positions. Les Aspin brought to them the best of education, including an undergraduate degree from Yale, a master's degree from Oxford University, and a Ph.D. in economics from MIT.

And he had the best of training, as he had worked on the staffs of Senator William Proxmire, Dr. Walter Heller when he chaired the Council of Economic Advisers, and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

Not only was Les well educated and well versed in public policy, he was a person who cared deeply for his country and its citizens.

Les Aspin may well be most remembered for his brief, but stormy tenure as the Secretary of Defense. To those who were surprised by his controversial tenure in this position, I can only say that I am surprised that they were surprised.

Les Aspin has always been controversial—he was never afraid to take a position—at times, a lonely, unpopular decision. He was elected to Congress as a critic of the Vietnam war, but backed President Reagan's military buildup and the decision to go to war against Iraq.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Les Aspin was a one-man think tank, as he always seemed on the cutting edge of defense issues. An AP reporter dubbed him a ''strategic intellectual.'' He was as comfortable in dealing with foreign policy and defense issues as he was in reviewing Pentagon procurement practices. And he had that incredible and marvelous ability to present the most complicated and difficult public policy issues in simple and easily understood ways.

Congressman Aspin was a logical choice to reshape the Pentagon and U.S. military in the post-cold-war era. When President-elect Clinton nominated him for the position of Secretary of Defense, the Washington Post noted that it seemed that Mr. Aspin had ''spent most of his professional life preparing for the defense secretary's job.'' The Washington Times remarked that he had ''devoted nearly every waking hour as a student, professional, and politician to thinking about weapons and soldiers.''

Everyone knew that the adjustments to the post-Soviet world would be difficult and controversial—and they were. Secretary Aspin did not shrink from these challenges. He welcomed them. His time as head of the Pentagon was a time of shifting international commitments, and new challenges posed by the disintegration of the Soviet Union. This included the painful