

Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$270,654,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$271,973,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$110,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$37,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$277,036,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$276,619,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$145,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$37,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$290,634,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$289,068,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$170,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$37,000,000.  
 (14) Social Security (650):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,482,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,557,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,121,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,241,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,868,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,928,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,125,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,126,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,523,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,523,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,907,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,469,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,029,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$27,096,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,422,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,598,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,068,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$26,671,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,868,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,661,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,177,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$26,202,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,286,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,582,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,249,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,609,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,724,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,787,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,277,000,000.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,129,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,765,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,609,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,511,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,728,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,673,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,641,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,066,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$26,492,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,726,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,601,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 (17) General Government (800):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,881,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,023,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,698,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,549,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,388,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15,088,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,301,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,692,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,547,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,485,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 (18) Net Interest (900):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$300,909,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$300,909,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$311,931,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$311,931,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$314,999,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$314,999,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$316,469,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$316,469,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$320,135,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$320,135,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 (19) Allowances (920):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$0.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$0.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$0.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$0.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$0.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
 Fiscal year 1998:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$41,806,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$41,806,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 1999:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$36,689,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$36,689,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2000:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$37,692,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$37,692,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2001:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$40,311,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$40,311,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2002:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$47,696,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$48,696,000,000.  
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.  
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

# SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17—SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOMENICI submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. CON. RES. 17

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

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

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is

the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1998.

#### TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Social Security.

Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

Sec. 104. Reconciliation.

#### TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

Sec. 201. Deficit and discretionary spending limits.

Sec. 202. Adjustments to limits.

Sec. 203. Tax reserve fund in the Senate.

Sec. 204. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

#### TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,164,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,213,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,267,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,327,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,389,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,200,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$113,498,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$119,114,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$125,095,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$130,688,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$136,824,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,360,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,415,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,449,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,480,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,497,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,358,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,405,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,445,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,456,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,477,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$—193,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$—191,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$—178,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$—128,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$—108,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$5,637,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$5,870,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$6,089,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$6,258,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$6,404,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$33,829,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$33,378,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$34,775,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$36,039,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$37,099,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$315,472,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$324,749,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$328,124,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$332,063,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$335,141,000,000.

##### SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$402,805,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$422,322,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$442,569,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$461,552,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$482,825,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$317,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$330,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$343,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$358,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$373,700,000,000.

##### SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$268,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$262,500,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$588,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$270,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$265,400,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$273,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$269,300,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$275,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$268,700,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$1,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$278,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$269,100,000,000.  
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$1,050,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,966,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$12,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,021,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,077,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$12,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,122,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,826,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$12,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,178,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$14,217,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$16,800,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$16,900,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$16,100,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$16,100,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$16,100,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,050,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$2,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,078,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,109,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,141,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$900,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,174,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$30,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$32,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$32,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$34,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$34,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,620,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,365,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

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

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,047,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,436,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,300,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,071,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,509,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, \$9,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,960,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,583,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,965,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,660,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$-1,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$4,739,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,887,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$253,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,238,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,574,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$257,989,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,680,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$259,897,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$155,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$135,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1998:

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

(B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,867,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,385,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,500,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,943,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,406,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,020,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,429,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,098,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,452,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,180,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,475,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$53,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$12,328,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$20,665,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$53,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,092,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$21,899,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$54,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$54,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,926,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$23,263,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$55,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$55,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$14,701,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$24,517,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$55,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$54,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,426,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,676,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$135,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$135,300,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$85,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$142,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$142,500,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$150,400,000,000.

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

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$158,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$157,500,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$167,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$166,700,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$203,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$204,000,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$217,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$217,100,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$226,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$230,100,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$240,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$236,100,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$257,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$256,400,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$229,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$243,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$45,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$37,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$243,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$248,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$75,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$37,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$253,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$259,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$110,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$37,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, \$263,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$145,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$37,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, \$273,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$170,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$37,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,700,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.

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

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,400,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$41,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,029,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$27,096,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$41,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,068,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$26,671,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,000,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,177,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$26,202,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,249,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,609,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,277,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,129,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,500,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,400,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,300,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,500,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,900,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,600,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,600,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,600,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,800,000,000.

(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, \$13,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,500,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$299,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$299,900,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(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 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$309,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$309,600,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$308,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$308,200,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$308,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$308,600,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, —\$1,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$900,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, —\$1,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$1,400,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, —\$1,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$1,500,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, —\$1,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$1,600,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, —\$1,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$1,700,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, —\$42,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$42,100,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, —\$37,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$37,100,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, —\$38,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$38,100,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, —\$39,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$39,100,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, —\$40,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$40,900,000,000.

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

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

#### SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION.

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

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY.—The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit \$41,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 and \$283,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(2) COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit \$544,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 and \$2,892,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(3) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit \$376,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 and \$18,004,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$55,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 and \$1,693,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(5) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit \$2,903,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 and \$110,122,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(6) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit \$914,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 and \$7,235,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(7) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Senate Committee on the Judiciary 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 \$0 in fiscal year 1998 and \$476,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(8) COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES.—The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit \$1,118,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 and \$4,551,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

(9) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall

report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays \$247,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 and \$3,929,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

#### TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

##### SEC. 201. DEFICIT AND DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) UNIFIED DEFICIT LIMITS.—In this section, the term "deficit limit" means—

(A) with respect to fiscal year 1997, —\$118,800,000,000.

(B) with respect to fiscal year 1998, —\$111,100,000,000.

(C) with respect to fiscal year 1999, —\$98,800,000,000.

(D) with respect to fiscal year 2000, —\$78,300,000,000.

(E) with respect to fiscal year 2001, —\$25,100,000,000; and

(F) with respect to fiscal year 2002, \$0.

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

(A) with respect to fiscal year 1998, for the discretionary category: \$503,901,000,000 in new budget authority and \$541,376,000,000 in outlays;

(B) with respect to fiscal year 1999, for the discretionary category: \$505,998,000,000 in new budget authority and \$537,631,000,000 in outlays;

(C) with respect to fiscal year 2000, for the discretionary category: \$504,791,000,000 in new budget authority and \$536,888,000,000 in outlays;

(D) with respect to fiscal year 2001, for the discretionary category: \$506,049,000,000 in new budget authority and \$531,311,000,000 in outlays; and

(E) with respect to fiscal year 2002, for the discretionary category: \$510,397,000,000 in new budget authority and \$530,536,000,000 in outlays.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

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

(A) a revision of this resolution or any concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such a resolution) that provides—

(i) discretionary spending in excess of the discretionary spending limit for such fiscal year; or

(ii) a deficit in excess of the deficit limit for such fiscal year; or

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

(2) EXCEPTION.—

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

(B) ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY LIMITS IN FY 1998.—Until the enactment of reconciliation legislation pursuant to subsection (a) of section 104 of this resolution—

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

(ii) subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to fiscal year 1995.

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

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

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

##### SEC. 202. ADJUSTMENTS TO LIMITS.

(a) DEFICIT CALCULATIONS.—As part of the information included in the annual report of CBO to the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, CBO shall include—

(1) the amount, if any, the deficit for the prior year was above the deficit limit in section 201 for such year;

(2) the amount, if any, the deficit for the prior year was below the deficit limit in section 201 for such year; and

(3) the amount (if any) the projected deficit for the budget year is below the deficit limit in section 201 for such year.

(b) ADJUSTMENT CALCULATIONS.—

(1) DIVIDEND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate (in this section referred to as the "Chairman") shall make an adjustment in accordance with subparagraph (B) by an amount equal to the smaller of the estimate calculated pursuant to paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a).

(B) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman shall—

(i) increase the budget authority and outlay discretionary spending limits in this resolution for the budget year by an amount equal to 50 percent of the amount determined pursuant to subparagraph (A); and

(ii) after the adoption of the concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year, credit the prior surplus determined for the pay-as-you-go point of order by an amount equal to 50 percent of the amount determined pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(2) DEFICIT EXCESS.—If the deficit for the prior year was above the deficit limit in section 201, the Chairman shall reduce the deficit limit in this resolution for the budget year by the amount determined pursuant to subsection (a)(1).

##### SEC. 203. TAX RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates may be reduced and allocations may be revised for legislation that reduces revenues by providing family tax relief, fuel tax relief, and incentives to stimulate savings, investment, job creation, and economic growth if such legislation will not increase the deficit for—

(1) fiscal year 1998;

(2) the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2007.

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), 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 section. 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 resolution.

(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. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

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

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, as my friends on the other side of the aisle like to point out, the Congressional Budget Act includes a timetable for Congress to adopt a budget resolution that includes having the Senate Budget Committee report a budget resolution by April 1—it used to be May but it was moved back to April 1—and the conference with the House is supposed to be completed by April 15. What, of course, is not being said is the simple fact that since 1987, when we moved the completion date from May 15 to April 15—only once in those 11 years has the Congress ever met the April 15 deadline. Only three times has the Senate Budget Committee itself met the April 1 deadline.

Obviously, we have not been in charge of that committee most of those years that the Democrat majority on the other side was in charge. Nonetheless, this year the Senate Budget Committee received the President's budget on February 6. Incidentally, the President's budget was delayed a few days this year also. Nevertheless, the committee has engaged in many hearings and meetings on the President's budget. And only 17 days ago, on March 3, did the Congress receive the Congressional Budget Office's preliminary analysis of the President's budget. The final analysis is yet to be completed. And we all know that the Congressional Budget Office analysis of the President's budget set us back in our efforts to get this job done quickly. The President's plan did not achieve balance according to this preliminary report in the year 2002 without relying on some awkward triggering mechanisms.

Yesterday, I, along with my fellow House Budget Committee Chairman and two ranking members, met with the President to discuss the budget be-

fore he left for Helsinki. We agreed that over the upcoming recess and early when we return we would work to identify and clarify our differences and attempt to seek some settlement of issues so that we might return together a bipartisan budget blueprint that will get us to balance in 2002 and keep us on a path to balance well into the next century.

Our hope is that these meetings which will take place in the next 2 weeks at the staff level to be followed by an intensive week of work on our return will yield a bipartisan budget blueprint with the President working with the Congress. I am not saying to the Senate that I am certain that will work, but I truly believe there is a probability that this could work. There has been a lot of behind-the-scenes work, and I think the issues are pretty well defined. Everybody wants to be rather specific in the solutions and that will take a little bit of time.

As I expressed with the President yesterday, it is my fervent hope and I am committed to finding that common ground that will achieve the goal not for anybody's political gain but for the country's economic future.

For today, however, it is obvious that the statutory deadline in the Senate will come while we are out on Easter recess and while staff is working on this budget process during the recess. So today, in order to ensure that the work of the Senate will go on, regardless of the outcome of these discussions, I am introducing two fully drafted budget resolutions that will be referred to the Budget Committee but will be automatically discharged from the committee on April 1 and placed back on the Senate Calendar. All of this occurs by statute which dictates that procedure. This is not unprecedented and certainly not unreasonable. My former Democratic chairmen, Senators Chiles and Sasser, routinely followed this process to provide that insurance the Senate needs that we would, indeed, be able to work our will even if the committee failed to report a resolution.

So I want to make it clear that I do not intend that the Budget Committee not report a budget resolution. That is clearly not my intention. I would not want to be vested with that result because we have always been able to report a budget resolution out of the Budget Committee for better or for worse. It has always met its responsibilities, and I am certain we are going to do that again this year. But in the event we could not, either of these resolutions which I introduced today could be called off the calendar by the leader and the full Senate would then work its will on either of those as they are called up and made part of the Senate's ordinary business.

The first resolution I am submitting today is simply the President's budget submitted back in February and reestimated by the Congressional Budget Office which we now know did not reach

balance in the year 2002 but resulted in a deficit of nearly \$70 billion in that year. Obviously, I do not support this resolution. I am doubtful whether it would have much support of the Senate. And if it were called up by the Budget Committee in the Chamber, I would work to modify it significantly so that it did achieve balance and make these fundamental changes required to truly address the fiscal concerns that lie beyond 2002.

The second resolution I am introducing, I must say that I do not support it either and I do not think there would be a lot of Senators who would like the medicine provided in that budget resolution but, reluctantly, would be forced to vote for this if progress is not made in the next few weeks to modify the President's proposal, and that might be the case.

This is my own resolution. It is not necessarily a Republican resolution. It is simply my effort to point out to all what would be required to reach balance in 2002 without any changes to the President's limited entitlement savings. This second resolution, based on the Congressional Budget Office benchmark used to analyze the President's budget, assumes the President's relatively low stated savings over the next 5 years in Medicare of \$100 billion and Medicaid of \$9 billion.

This resolution assumes essentially the same defense spending pattern as the President had. The budget makes no assumptions about any changes to the Consumer Price Index and no changes to the Congressional Budget Office assumptions. This alternative budget resolution assumes no net tax reductions over the next 5 years.

This resolution includes what might be thought of as a reverse trigger. It is based on the Congressional Budget Office economic forecast which is more conservative than the administration's, but the resolution would allow for an adjustment to domestic spending and permit tax cuts, if the administration's more optimistic economic assumptions turn out to be right, more right than the Congressional Budget Office, and the targets toward a balanced budget are being met on a specified timetable. Then there would be a trigger in instead of a trigger out as the President proposed to make up for an unbalanced budget.

Finally, to achieve balance in 2002 with these assumptions, that portion of the Federal Government that represents annually appropriated accounts for most domestic agencies will be reduced by \$183 billion over the next 5 years—nearly three times the level that the President assumes in his budget. I estimate that these domestic spending programs would see nearly a 20 percent reduction in the level of spending over the next 5 years. And, of course, that is estimating that they all take the same cut. To the extent that you cause some to increase others would have to be reduced even more. There would be absolutely no room for

any new initiatives and many existing programs would obviously have to be terminated.

The message from this second resolution, if the goal is still to reach balance by 2002 using the conservative Congressional Budget Office forecasts and unless the President is willing to do more than his budget now envisions in mandatory programs or entitlement programs, not only would we not be able to fund any new initiatives, there would be significant reductions in programs such as education, environment, crime fighting, transportation, housing and others and neither would tax cuts in the President's budget or the congressional budget be possible.

Again, this is not a preferred option on my part. I certainly am not recommending this to anyone. I think we can do much better, and I think we will. I think we can achieve balance and provide some relief, tax relief, to hard-working American families. I believe we do not need to devastate Government programs in the manner that I have just described.

But it will require courage in dealing with entitlement spending, and I am asking that the President join with us in a bipartisan way to exhibit that courage. I am dedicated to making sure neither of these resolutions I have introduced today will ever need to be considered when we return from this recess, for they will not be considered if we produce a balanced budget in the committee and report it to the Senate, for that will be the subject matter before the Senate at that time.

I believe that is entirely possible. If we cannot work something out with the President, which I am still hoping and indicating today there is a probability that we could, then we will work it out in the committee. One way or another it will come out of there, in my opinion perhaps bipartisan. Work is underway and I remain hopeful that a solid budget will be prepared that will enjoy the support of the President and the vast majority here in the Congress. I think we all understand the significance of these events this year, and I must say that I believe the President understands the significance.

I mean, it seems to me that if, in fact, we do not reach some accord with the President, he can look forward to a very frustrating couple of years, achieving little or nothing, not moving toward a balanced budget with any dispatch and any earnestness. And I am not sure that is good for him.

For Republicans, I am quite positive that we do not want 2 or 4 years of just constant turmoil, working by ourselves, among ourselves as Republicans, but rather should look forward to working this very important set of circumstances out in a bipartisan manner for the benefit of everyone.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee and the Senator from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, has just introduced and ex-

plained to the Senate two alternative budget resolutions.

He has, as a matter of courtesy, introduced the President's budget without change, but with the analysis and economic impacts that it will cost made by the Congressional Budget Office.

The Senator from New Mexico has also introduced a budget, a sparse and bare-bones budget, that he feels will be required as almost the only responsible answer to the refusal of the President of the United States seriously to consider entitlement reform in his budget.

In order to bring the budget of the United States in balance by the year 2002, in order to get the huge fiscal dividend of more than \$75 billion that economists tell us will result from a balanced budget, in order to provide the economic opportunities and the increased income to Americans across the country that a balanced budget will provide, in order to end the practice of spending money today and sending the bills to our children and grandchildren, the Senator from New Mexico has introduced a budget that does no more and no less in the way of entitlement reform than the inadequate proposals of the President of the United States, accepts the conservative projections of our economy made by our own Congressional Budget Office and, therefore, includes no room—and I emphasize no room, Mr. President—for overdue and deserved tax relief for the American people.

Even without any tax relief for the American people, this set of decisions requires reductions in domestic discretionary spending that are extremely drastic, more than twice those that either the President or most of us, as Republicans on the Budget Committee, feel to be appropriate. In addition to leaving no room for any tax relief, this budget has no room for any of the new initiatives proposed by the President himself.

The Senator from New Mexico has introduced this budget in this form to indicate precisely what the real world consequences of a failure to reform entitlement spending will be.

In addition, in order to end or to mute the debate with the President over whether the President's far more rosy projections of our economy are correct as against those of the Congressional Budget Office, the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico says if, in fact, the economy operates in a better fashion than is projected by the Congressional Budget Office, half of those additional revenues will be devoted to tax relief and half to reducing the cuts in domestic discretionary spending. In other words, instead of the policies proposed by the President, which is "spend now and then cut everything to ribbons if my projections don't work out," this proposal says, "take the more conservative projections now and spend and provide tax relief in the future if the President's projections show themselves to be correct in whole or in part."

The chairman of the Budget Committee did not present this proposal as his preferred budget, nor is it mine, nor is it, I am sure, that of the distinguished Presiding Officer at this point. It is simply what we are likely to be forced to do if we cannot agree on significant reform in the entitlement programs which are growing both so rapidly as to crowd out all other spending and all tax relief, but also so rapidly as to threaten their own very existence.

What the Senator from New Mexico would prefer, what this Senator would prefer, would be an engagement, a budget resolution reflecting a strong bipartisan consensus in this body and the strong enthusiastic support and recommendations of the President of the United States himself that will require us to deal with entitlements. It will require us to look into the accuracy, or lack of accuracy, in the Consumer Price Index, because it is only if we have a more equitably distributed budget that we can provide for tax relief and for necessary discretionary spending programs. Only then we can have a conversation with the President and between the two parties on exactly what tax relief should be granted to the American people and where additional discretionary funds may be spent.

As I began these remarks, there was on the floor the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. CHAFEE, and there is now my friend from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD. Each of them was a leader, one a Republican and one a Democrat, in a bipartisan budget proposal which was presented to this body almost a year ago on this floor. It courageously dealt with each one of these issues, dealt with them in a balanced fashion and dealt with them in a way that decisively would have brought the budget into balance by the year 2002.

One of the curious elements of that budget, I may say, Mr. President, and I am sure my friend from North Dakota agrees with me, was that we hear today numerous favorable comments about it from those who did not vote for it. In fact, if we could try it again and put ourselves back into April of last year, it looks like it might have gotten 70 votes rather than 46.

In any event, that time is past, that time is lost and because we lost it, the challenges we face are even more difficult today. But I know that my friend from New Mexico, who has now returned to the floor, means the introduction of these two alternatives to be a trigger toward an agreement with the President and with many members of the Democratic Party on a budget that will realistically reach balance by the year 2002 which will give needed tax relief to the American people, tax relief that they deserve, that will allow us sufficient money for the important discretionary programs of this Government, whether they are the building of an infrastructure or for education or for environmental purposes, and that will not only reform entitlement programs so that these other goals can be



reached, but will reform them so that they are themselves secure and financially sound for the future, and so that what we do reflects the real world and not an artificial set of statistics.

So I came to the floor this evening, Mr. President, to thank the Senator from New Mexico for his thoughtfulness and his tremendous amount of work for the two resolutions that he has submitted, and to simply try to emphasize that with him I hope not that either of these proposals passes and becomes a guideline for the U.S. Senate and for the Congress, but that they help us reach a goal that is not a Republican goal, not a Democratic goal, but a goal for all Americans.

Mr. DOMENICI. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. GORTON. The Senator would.

Mr. DOMENICI. First, let me note the presence of Senator CONRAD on the floor.

Might I just say, I do not think you heard any of my remarks since I returned from a couple of hours at the White House yesterday. And I have not had a chance to speak with the distinguished Senator. But we are busy, as of today, working on trying to reach our differences. There will be a lot of work the next 2 weeks. We are very hopeful 1 week after we return, with that week being spent by some of us getting down to the final stages of negotiations, that we will have something very constructive.

It is hard to say where it will all end up, but I can say the President approached it with a degree of not only earnestness, but a sense that we ought to go ahead and move and we ought to resolve some differences and get going. And I have expressed that here today, indicating that as these two budgets are only there in the event we cannot get a budget out of the Budget Committee, then we have to get something to work off of, and this is a rather normal way to do it: Put a budget resolution in. Then the leader can call it up if we were to fail, and we have something to work on.

I simply think everybody knows there are a lot of possibilities of working a budget together this year because there are many Republicans and Democrats who are looking seriously at ways to put something together that does do some difficult things, that is not just a skirting over the difficulties, and is saying, let us do some things that have real long-term impact and as you, I say to the Senator, have so eloquently said, something we can all be proud of that really does the job.

That is my goal. I will try as best I can in the next few weeks. And, again, subject to the frailties of partisanship and things that can happen that you know nothing about, I said I thought there was a probability we could reach an agreement with the President, bipartisan, that many Senators would like.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18—RELATIVE TO BELARUS

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. D'AMATO) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 18

Whereas the seedlings of an independent and democratic Belarus, for which generations of Belarusian patriots have fought and died, are in danger of being swept away as a result of the policies of Belarusian President Alaksandr Lukashenka and the efforts of Russian nationalist leaders to recreate the Soviet empire;

Whereas March 25th is the date that Belarusians throughout the world salute the sacrifices and bravery of the members of the Council of the Belarusian Democratic Republic, who in 1918 liberated their country from czarist rule;

Whereas the Russian Duma in March 1996 voted to declare void the 1991 agreement dissolving the Soviet Union;

Whereas the referendum adopted in November of 1996 expanded President Lukashenka's already considerable powers in violation of the Constitution of Belarus and basic democratic principles;

Whereas on January 16, 1996, the Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for the Security and Cooperation of Europe urged the Government of Belarus "to enter into dialogue with the opposition and to ensure freedom of media and not restrict access to the media for members of the opposition";

Whereas on March 14, 1997, the United States Department of State issued a statement that calls on President Lukashenka's Government to exercise restraint and to observe the international human rights agreements to which it is a party; and

Whereas the Government of President Lukashenka has monopolized the mass media, undermined the constitutional foundation for the separation of powers, suppressed the freedom of the press, undermined efforts to restore the Belarusian language, and undercut the ground for all-Belarusian unity; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President should urge President Lukashenka and the Government of Belarus to—*

- (1) abide by the provisions of—
  - (A) the Helsinki Final Act; and
  - (B) other agreements of the Organization for the Security and Cooperation of Europe;
- (2) guarantee human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of the press, assembly, and expression; and
- (3) guarantee separation of powers.

### SEC. 2. SUPPORT OF INDEPENDENCE.

It is the policy of the United States to support the people of Belarus in—

- (1) maintaining independent statehood;
- (2) promoting the rule of law, human rights, and fundamental freedoms; and
- (3) assuring that Belarus has the opportunity to survive as an equal and full-fledged member-state among the sovereign nations of the world.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, today I am submitting a concurrent resolution regarding Belarus. I am pleased that Senator D'AMATO is an original cosponsor of this concurrent resolution. Representative PALLONE has submitted a similar measure in the House of Representatives.

I am deeply concerned about events in Belarus and the effort by President

Lukashenka to expand his already considerable powers at the expense of basic democratic principles. I am deeply concerned by his proposal to unify Russia and Belarus. And, as the cochairman of the Helsinki Commission, I am dismayed by President Lukashenka's failure to abide by the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE agreements which guarantee respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The resolution recognizes March 25, 1997, as the anniversary of the proclamation of Belarusian independence. It calls on President Lukashenka and the Government to abide by the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and other agreements of the Organization for the Security and Cooperation of Europe; to guarantee human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of the press, assembly, and expression; and to guarantee separation of powers. The resolution states that it is the policy of the United States to support the people of Belarus in achieving independent statehood, promoting the rule of law, human rights, and fundamental freedoms, and assuring that Belarus has the opportunity to survive as an equal and full-fledged member-state among sovereign nations of the world.

As we approach the anniversary of Belarus' 1918 declaration of independence, we are reminded that Belarus is a nation with a proud history and traditions. It is appropriate that we remember the brave struggle of Belarusian patriots in 1918. At the same time, we must recognize that the struggle for national sovereignty and democratic freedoms continues today and is greatly threatened by the actions of the Lukashenka regime.

I urge my colleagues to approve this resolution.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 66—COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. MACK (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. Res. 66

Whereas the University of Florida can trace its beginnings to 1853 but was formally established by the State of Florida when Florida Agricultural College merged with East Florida Seminary, South Florida Military College, and St. Petersburg Normal & Industrial School in 1905;

Whereas the University of Florida adopted the colors of orange and blue for its athletic team in 1905 and the alligator as the school's mascot in 1908;

Whereas the origins of intercollegiate football at the University of Florida can be traced back to 1901, when Dr. T.H. Taliaferro, president of the Florida State Agricultural College, enthusiastically endorsed the new sport of football and by that deed ensured that the University of Florida Fightin' Gator football team exists today;

Whereas the University of Florida is a founding member of the Southeastern Conference, considered by many to be the toughest conference in college football;