

TABLE 2.—HISTORICAL ILLUSTRATION OF FOOD ASSISTANCE BLOCK GRANT—Continued  
[In millions of dollars]

| Year       | Actual food as-<br>sistance | With initial reduction <sup>1</sup> |            |         | Without initial reduction |            |         |
|------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|---------|---------------------------|------------|---------|
|            |                             | Adjusted block<br>grant             | Difference |         | Adjusted block<br>grant   | Difference |         |
|            |                             |                                     | Total      | Percent |                           | Total      | Percent |
| 1992 ..... | 33,519                      | 23,232                              | — 10,287   | — 30.7  | 26,612                    | — 6,907    | — 20.6  |
| 1993 ..... | 35,397                      | 23,369                              | — 12,028   | — 34.0  | 26,769                    | — 8,628    | — 24.4  |
| 1994 ..... | 36,928                      | 24,374                              | — 12,554   | — 34.0  | 27,920                    | — 9,008    | — 24.4  |

<sup>1</sup> The initial 12.7 percent reduction in the first year is equivalent to the estimated percentage reduction in food assistance funding in the first year of the Personal Responsibility Act as shown in Table 1.

Notes.—Actual food assistance includes total federal cost of all USDA food assistance programs, excluding Food Program Administration. The cost of food programs operated by the Administration on Aging in the Department of Health and Human Services are not included.

These figures assume that Congress would have appropriated the full amount authorized in each year. The block grant authorization is adjusted by the change in total U.S. population and the Consumer Price Index for Food at Home in the preceding year (ending on July 1 for population and in May for the CPI).

TABLE 3.—EFFECT OF THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT ON USDA FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS BY STATE IN FISCAL YEAR 1996  
[In millions of dollars]

| State                           | Level of food assistance |          | Difference |         |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------|------------|---------|
|                                 | Current                  | Proposed | Total      | Percent |
| Alabama .....                   | \$818                    | \$713    | — \$105    | — 13    |
| Alaska .....                    | 97                       | 84       | — 13       | — 13    |
| Arizona .....                   | 663                      | 554      | — 109      | — 16    |
| Arkansas .....                  | 422                      | 403      | — 19       | — 4     |
| California .....                | 4,170                    | 4,820    | 650        | 16      |
| Colorado .....                  | 412                      | 417      | 5          | 1       |
| Connecticut .....               | 297                      | 248      | — 49       | — 17    |
| Delaware .....                  | 92                       | 58       | — 34       | — 37    |
| District of Co-<br>lumbia ..... | 137                      | 85       | — 52       | — 38    |
| Florida .....                   | 2,194                    | 1,804    | — 389      | — 18    |
| Georgia .....                   | 1,209                    | 934      | — 275      | — 23    |
| Hawaii .....                    | 215                      | 198      | — 17       | — 8     |
| Idaho .....                     | 127                      | 176      | 49         | 38      |
| Illinois .....                  | 1,741                    | 1,483    | — 258      | — 15    |
| Indiana .....                   | 713                      | 691      | — 22       | — 3     |
| Iowa .....                      | 297                      | 266      | — 31       | — 11    |
| Kansas .....                    | 307                      | 270      | — 37       | — 12    |
| Kentucky .....                  | 740                      | 582      | — 157      | — 21    |
| Louisiana .....                 | 1,141                    | 765      | — 375      | — 33    |
| Maine .....                     | 188                      | 167      | — 21       | — 11    |
| Maryland .....                  | 576                      | 404      | — 172      | — 30    |
| Massachusetts ..                | 608                      | 577      | — 32       | — 5     |
| Michigan .....                  | 1,390                    | 1,109    | — 281      | — 20    |

TABLE 3.—EFFECT OF THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT ON USDA FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS BY STATE IN FISCAL YEAR 1996—Continued  
[In millions of dollars]

| State             | Level of food assistance |          | Difference |         |
|-------------------|--------------------------|----------|------------|---------|
|                   | Current                  | Proposed | Total      | Percent |
| Minnesota .....   | 508                      | 490      | — 18       | — 4     |
| Mississippi ..... | 730                      | 603      | — 127      | — 17    |
| Missouri .....    | 810                      | 754      | — 56       | — 7     |
| Montana .....     | 111                      | 140      | 29         | 26      |
| Nebraska .....    | 187                      | 175      | — 12       | — 6     |
| New Hampshire .   | 89                       | 94       | 5          | 5       |
| New Jersey .....  | 836                      | 704      | — 132      | — 16    |
| New Mexico .....  | 361                      | 321      | — 40       | — 11    |
| Nevada .....      | 145                      | 150      | 5          | 3       |
| New York .....    | 3,101                    | 2,661    | — 440      | — 14    |
| North Carolina .. | 930                      | 849      | — 81       | — 9     |
| North Dakota .... | 86                       | 76       | — 9        | — 11    |
| Ohio .....        | 1,768                    | 1,287    | — 481      | — 27    |
| Oklahoma .....    | 528                      | 475      | — 53       | — 10    |
| Oregon .....      | 410                      | 346      | — 64       | — 16    |
| Pennsylvania .... | 1,617                    | 1,465    | — 152      | — 9     |
| Rhode Island .... | 128                      | 101      | — 27       | — 21    |
| South Carolina .. | 602                      | 546      | — 56       | — 9     |
| South Dakota .... | 99                       | 95       | — 4        | — 4     |
| Tennessee .....   | 983                      | 743      | — 241      | — 24    |
| Texas .....       | 3,819                    | 2,665    | — 1,154    | — 30    |
| Utah .....        | 234                      | 277      | — 43       | 18      |
| Vermont .....     | 76                       | 66       | — 10       | — 13    |
| Virginia .....    | 783                      | 597      | — 185      | — 24    |

TABLE 3.—EFFECT OF THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT ON USDA FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS BY STATE IN FISCAL YEAR 1996—Continued  
[In millions of dollars]

| State              | Level of food assistance |          | Difference       |         |
|--------------------|--------------------------|----------|------------------|---------|
|                    | Current                  | Proposed | Total            | Percent |
| Washington .....   | 660                      | 444      | — 216            | — 33    |
| West Virginia .... | 405                      | 309      | — 96             | — 24    |
| Wisconsin .....    | 467                      | 442      | — 25             | — 5     |
| Wyoming .....      | 57                       | 57       | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | 1       |
| Total .....        | 40,764                   | 35,600   | — 5,164          | — 13    |

<sup>1</sup> Equals less than \$1 million.

Notes.—Individual cells may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Total includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, other territories and outlying areas, and Indian Tribal Organizations.

This table assumes that Congress appropriates the full amount authorized for fiscal year 1996.

HOMICIDES BY GUNSHOT IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to continue my weekly practice of reporting to the Senate on the death

toll by gunshot in New York City. Last week, 6 people lost their lives to bullet wounds in New York City, bringing this year's total to 27.

#### THE APPOINTMENT OF MARGARET FLEMING TO THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today I rise to inform the Senate that I have chosen Margaret Fleming from Butte, MT, to represent our State at the White House Conference on Aging in May. While Margaret is proud to be a senior citizen, anybody who knows her also knows that she adds meaning to the saying that you will never grow old if you are young at heart. Her energy, her hard work and sense of public service are an inspiration to me and so many other Montanans.

From May 2d through the 5th, several of our Nation's top senior citizens will meet in Washington, DC, to discuss issues that are important to the aging community. This year's theme, "America Now and Into the 21st Century: Generations Aging Together With Independence, Opportunity, and Dignity," focuses not only on the current aging population, but future generations as well. The issues to be discussed impact all Americans. They include comprehensive health care, including long-term care, economic security, housing, and quality of life.

Throughout her career, Margaret Fleming has earned the greatest respect and admiration. But her activities in retired life are just as commendable. She has been president of the Montana chapter of the National Association of Retired Federal Employees, and before was president of Butte's local chapter. Currently, Margaret is president of the Legacy Legislature, a congress of seniors that meets annually in Helena. And as if that isn't enough, she is president of the Lady of the Rockies, a group responsible for youth group tours and the construction of a chapter near the Lady on the Hill in Butte. Last year, the Montana Soroptimist Club honored her with the Women of Distinction Award. Of course, Margaret's toughest job of all is baby-sitting her grandchildren on the weekends.

In a recent letter to me, Margaret remarked:

The needs of our Nation are so great. I'm sure you know that I believe a health care plan like your Health Montana is so important. However, the problems with poverty, educational opportunities and a myriad of other issues are equally important. I only hope the participants unite, and think of America's future, as well as our immediate needs.

The honor of representing Montana could not go to a more dedicated, deserving, and accomplished person. I congratulate Margaret Fleming and wish her well at the White House conference on Aging.

#### BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the budget through January 13, 1995. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues, which are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 218), show that current level spending is below the budget resolution by \$2.3 billion in budget authority and \$0.4 billion in outlays. Current level is \$0.8 billion over the revenue floor in 1995 and below by \$8.2 billion over the 5 years 1995-99. The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is \$238.7 billion, \$2.3 billion below the maximum deficit amount for 1995 of \$241.0 billion.

Since my last report, dated January 4, 1995, there has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

The report follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, January 17, 1995.

Hon. PETE DOMENICI,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report for fiscal year 1995 shows the effects of Congressional action on the 1995 budget and is current through January 13, 1995. The estimates of budget authority, outlays and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 1995 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 218). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, and meets the requirements of Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the 1986 First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Since my last report, dated January 4, 1995, there has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,  
Director.

#### THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, FISCAL YEAR 1995, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JANUARY 13, 1994

[In billions of dollars]

|                              | Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) <sup>1</sup> | Current level <sup>2</sup> | Current level over/under resolution |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>ON-BUDGET</b>             |   |                            |                                     |
| Budget authority .....       | 1,238.7   | 1,236.5                    | -2.3                                |
| Outlays .....                | 1,217.6   | 1,217.2                    | -0.4                                |
| Revenues:                    |   |                            |                                     |
| 1995 .....                   | 977.7   | 978.5                      | 0.8                                 |
| 1995-99 <sup>3</sup> .....   | 5,415.2   | 5,407.0                    | -8.2                                |
| Maximum deficit amount ..... | 241.0   | 238.7                      | -2.3                                |
| Debt subject to limit .....  | 4,965.1   | 4,718.8                    | -246.3                              |
| <b>OFF-BUDGET</b>            |   |                            |                                     |
| Social Security outlays:     |   |                            |                                     |
| 1995 .....                   | 287.6   | 287.5                      | -0.1                                |

#### THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, FISCAL YEAR 1995, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JANUARY 13, 1994—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

|                           | Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) <sup>1</sup> | Current level <sup>2</sup> | Current level over/under resolution |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1995-99 .....             | 1,562.6   | 1,562.6                    | 4.0                                 |
| Social Security revenues: |   |                            |                                     |
| 1995 .....                | 360.5   | 360.3                      | -0.2                                |
| 1995-99 .....             | 1,998.4   | 1,998.2                    | -0.2                                |

<sup>1</sup> Reflects revised allocation under section 9(g) of H. Con. Res. 64 for the Deficit-Neutral reserve fund.

<sup>2</sup> Current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

<sup>3</sup> Includes effects, beginning in fiscal year 1996, of the International Anti-trust Enforcement Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-438).

<sup>4</sup> Less than \$50 million.

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.

#### THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JANUARY 13, 1994

[In millions of dollars]

|  | Budget authority | Outlays   | Revenues |
|--|------------------|-----------|----------|
| <b>ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS</b>  |                  |           |          |
| Revenues .....   |                  |           | 978,466  |
| Permanents and other spending  |                  |           |          |
| legislation .....  | 750,307          | 706,236   |          |
| Appropriation legislation .....  | 738,096          | 757,783   |          |
| Offsetting receipts .....  | (250,027)        | (250,027) |          |
| Total previously enacted .....   | 1,238,376        | 1,213,992 | 978,466  |
| <b>ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES</b>  |                  |           |          |
| Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted ..... | (1,887)          | 3,189     |          |
| Total current level <sup>1</sup> .....   | 1,236,489        | 1,217,181 | 978,466  |
| Total budget resolution .....  | 1,238,744        | 1,217,605 | 977,700  |
| Amount remaining:  |                  |           |          |
| Under budget resolution .....  | 2,255            | 424       |          |
| Over budget resolution .....   |                  |           | 766      |

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include \$1,212 million in budget authority and \$6,360 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress, and \$1,027 million in budget authority and \$1,041 million in outlays for emergencies that would be available only upon an official budget request from the President designating the entire amount requested as an emergency requirement.

Notes.—Numbers in parentheses are negative. Detail may not add due to rounding.

#### WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS SAID "YES"

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the incredibly enormous Federal debt is like the weather—everybody talks about it but up to now hardly anybody has undertaken the responsibility of doing anything about it. The Congress now had better get cracking—time's a-wasting and the debt is mushrooming.

In the past, a lot of politicians talked a good game—when they were back home—about bringing Federal deficits and the Federal debt under control. But many of these same politicians regularly voted in support of bloated spending bills that rolled through the Senate. The American people took note of that on November 8.

As of Friday, January 13, at the close of business, the Federal debt stood—down to the penny—at exactly