

the 1999 budget and is current through July 14, 1999. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Res. 209, a resolution to provide budget levels in the Senate for purposes of fiscal year 1999, as amended by S. Res. 312. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

Since my last report, dated June 17, 1999, the Congress has taken no action that changed the current level of budget authority, outlays, and revenues.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON

(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosures.

TABLE 1.—FISCAL YEAR 1999 SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS, JULY 14, 1999
[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution S. Res. 312 (Adjusted)	Current level	Current level over/under resolution
ON-BUDGET			
Budget Authority	1,465.3	1,465.7	0.4
Outlays	1,414.9	1,415.2	0.2
Revenues:			
1999	1,358.9	1,359.1	0.2
1999–2003	7,187.0	7,187.7	0.7
Deficit	56.0	56.1	0.1
Debt Subject to Limit	(¹)	5,536.1	(²)
OFF-BUDGET			
Social Security Outlays:			
1999	321.3	321.3	0.0
1999–2003	1,720.7	1,720.7	0.0
Social Security Revenues:			
1999	441.7	441.7	(³)
1999–2003	2,395.6	2,395.5	-0.1

¹ Not included in S. Res. 312.

² =not applicable.

³ Less than \$50 million.

Note.—Current level numbers are the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that the 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 information from the U.S. Treasury.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1999 ON-BUDGET SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS, JULY 14, 1999
[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues			1,359,099
Permanents and other spending legislation	919,197	880,664
Appropriation legislation	820,578	813,987
Offsetting receipts	-296,825	-296,825
Total previously enacted	1,442,950	1,397,826	1,359,099
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations (Act (P.L. 106–31))	11,348	3,677
1999 Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act (P.L. 106–36)			5
ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	11,393	13,661
TOTALS			
Total Current Level	1,465,691	1,415,164	1,359,104
Total Budget Resolution	1,465,294	1,414,916	1,358,919
Amount remaining:			
Under Budget Resolution	397	248	185

Note.—Estimates include the following in emergency funding: \$34,226 million in budget authority and \$16,802 million in outlays.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S EXECUTIVE ORDER TO INCREASE ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to speak for just few minutes today in support of President Clinton's Executive Order of June 3, 1999, which ordered the Federal Government to undertake a comprehensive program to save energy, save money and cut pollution.

The Federal Government is the nation's largest consumer of energy, purchasing energy to light, heat and cool more than 500,000 buildings and power millions of vehicles. Each year the Federal Government purchases more than \$200 billion worth of products, including enormous quantities of energy-intensive goods. Current efficiency programs already save more than \$1 billion a year according to an estimate in the Wall Street Journal of July 15, 1999. In addition, the government's vast purchases give it significant market influence to impact the development, manufacture and use of clean energy technologies.

This Executive Order sets worthwhile—and unfortunately too long overlooked—goals, including the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, energy efficiency improvements, increased use of renewable energy, reduced use of petroleum, water conservation and changes in how we measure energy use. I believe these goals have tremendous merit and will deliver the "win-win" results of sound environmental and energy policy, because each goal stresses reduced pollution and reduced costs.

To achieve these goals, the Order sets in place several new administrative policies for organization and accountability. To begin, each agency will designate a single officer to oversee implementation. Agencies will submit a budget request to the Office of Management and Budget for investments that will reduce energy use, pollution and life-cycle costs, and they will track and report progress. The Order applies to all Federal departments and agencies, with an appropriate exception for the Department of Defense when compliance may hinder military operations and training.

Federal agencies will be able to employ a range of Federal programs including Energy Star, sustainable building design research from the Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency and others. For example, to the extent practicable, agencies will strive to achieve the Energy Star standards for energy performance and indoor environmental quality for all facilities by 2002. Agencies will apply sustainable design principles to the siting, design and construction of new facilities—meaning energy use, costs and reduced pollution will be optimized across a facility's life. And such measures will extend to transportation, including the use of efficient and renewable-fuel vehicles.

Finally, the Executive Order endorses the use of "source energy" as a measure of efficiency. Measuring energy consumption by "source"—as opposed to "site"—means taking into account not only the energy consumed by a light bulb, appliance or other product to perform a certain function, but also the energy consumed in the generation, transmission and distribution of that energy to the product in question. Research in energy use increasingly shows that a "source" measurement is a more accurate measure of the total costs that we pay to operate appliances and other equipment.

Mr. President, I add my sincere appreciation to President Clinton for executing this Order and endorsing its policies. I believe that if this Executive Order is properly implemented, it will pay dividends for the environment and taxpayers.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, July 16, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,626,175,786,965.76 (Five trillion, six hundred twenty-six billion, one hundred seventy-five million, seven hundred eighty-six thousand, nine hundred sixty-five dollars and seventy-six cents).

One year ago, July 16, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,531,080,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred thirty-one billion, eighty million).

Fifteen years ago, July 16, 1984, the Federal debt stood at \$1,532,716,000,000 (One trillion, five hundred thirty-two billion, seven hundred sixteen million).

Twenty-five years ago, July 16, 1974, the Federal debt stood at \$473,710,000,000 (Four hundred seventy-three billion, seven hundred ten million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,152,465,786,965.76 (Five trillion, one hundred fifty-two billion, four hundred sixty-five million, seven hundred eighty-six thousand, nine hundred sixty-five dollars and seventy-six cents) during the past 25 years.

THE TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act, a bill that has been reported from the Finance Committee and was filed on July 16th. I believe this bill is critical for American workers, companies and their communities. The bill as written would extend authorization for trade adjustment assistance for two years, and would allow workers and companies that are negatively impacted by international trade to receive the assistance currently allowed by law. If we do not pass this legislation, trade adjustment assistance will expire this October, and workers and companies that are presently receiving benefits will be completely cut off from government support. In specific terms, this

means over 340,000 workers across the country, and several thousand workers in my state of New Mexico, will be without support needed to maintain their lives and re-train for the future. These are real people and real lives we are talking about, and we simply can't let this happen. We must act now to ensure the programs continue.

Let me briefly explain what this legislation is about. In 1962, when the Trade Expansion Act was under consideration, the Kennedy Administration came up with a very straightforward proposition concerning international trade and American workers and companies: if and when Americans lose their jobs as a result of trade agreements entered into by the U.S. government, then the U.S. government should assist these Americans in finding new employment. If you lose a job because of U.S. trade policy, you should have some help from the federal government in re-training to get a job.

I find this a reasonable and fair proposition. It suggests that the U.S. government supports a open trading system, but recognizes that it is responsible to repair the negative impacts this policy has on its citizens. It suggests that the U.S. government believes that an open trading system provides long-term advantages for the United States and its people, but that the short-terms costs must be addressed if the policy is to continue and the United States is to remain competitive. It suggests that there is a collective interest that must be pursued, but that individual interests must be protected for the greater good.

This commitment to American workers and companies has continued over the years, and should not be ended now. The reason for continuity is obvious: globalization is only moving at a faster pace, with the potential for ever more significant impacts on our country. In my opinion, the process of globalization is inevitable. It is not going to stop. Therefore, the question for us in this chamber is not whether we can stop it, but how we can manage it to benefit the national interest of the United States.

The picture we see of globalization is that of a double-edged sword, with some individuals and companies gaining and others losing. The gains are clear-cut. Exports now generate over one-third of all economic growth in the United States. Export jobs pay ten to fifteen percent more than the average wage. Depending upon who you listen to, it has generated anywhere from two to eleven million jobs over the last ten years. For those who dislike globalization, I say look in your kitchen, your living room, your driveway, your office, and see the products that are there as a result of a more open and interdependent trading system. Without expanded trade brought on as a result of globalization we will end up fighting over an ever-decreasing domestic economic pie.

But in spite of these obvious benefits we cannot ignore the problems in-

volved with globalization. Every day we hear disturbing stories about what this has meant for people across the country. In my state we have seen over the last year a large number of lay-offs and closings in small rural towns that cannot afford to have this happen. The closing of three plants in Roswell, Las Cruces, and Albuquerque meant 1,600 people lost their jobs. Next came lay-offs in the copper mines in my home town of Silver City. These people cannot simply go across the street and look for new work. They are people who have been dedicated to their companies and have played by the rules over the years. What they deserve when they lose their job is an opportunity to get income support and re-training to rebuild their lives. What they deserve is a program that creates skills that are needed, that moves them into new jobs faster, that provides opportunities for the future, that keeps families and communities intact.

TAA offers the potential for this outcome. Although in need of revision in several key areas—and I am focusing on these areas at this time—it has over the years consistently helped individuals and companies in communities across the United States deal with the transitions that are an inevitable part of a changing international economic system. It helps people that can work and want to work to continue to work in productive jobs that contribute to the economic welfare of our country. We have made this promise to workers in every administration, both Democrat and Republican, and we should continue to do so. Although TAA is not without its flaws, it remains the only program that allows workers and companies to adjust and remain competitive. Without it, in my opinion we are saying unequivocally that we don't care what happens to you, that we bear no responsibility for the position that you are in, that you are on your own.

Senators ROTH, MOYNIHAN, and others think otherwise, and I agree wholeheartedly with them. I believe that this commitment to individuals and companies and communities must be kept. I urge all my colleagues to support the passage of this bill when it comes to a vote on the floor.

THE F-15 AND ISRAEL

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the F-15, the world's dominant air superiority fighter. The future of this fighter, perhaps the most successful in the history of U.S. aviation warfare, is in jeopardy. While both the Senate and the House have taken steps to save the F-15, the Administration has resisted efforts to preserve a plan that is critical for our national security.

I was heartened by the recent action of the House Appropriations Committee to follow the Senate's lead and provide additional funding for the F-15. Last month, Senator BOND and I successfully added an amendment to the

Defense Appropriations bill to provide \$220 million for four F-15s. Last week, the House Appropriations Committee provided \$440 million to purchase eight F-15 fighters.

While securing domestic dollars is essential to keep the F-15 alive, foreign sales are just as important for the long-term health of the program. Hence, my disappointment that the Israeli Government had selected the F-16 to fill their latest Air Force needs goes without saying. As Angelo Codevilla writes today in the Wall Street Journal—and I will ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks—the F-15 gives Israel critical long-range strike capability to counter regional threats. As one who is keenly interested in the security of Israel, it was my hope that the new Barak Government would select the F-15 to enhance its long-range deterrent capability.

Mr. Codevilla also implies that the Administration was pushing Israel to buy the F-16, a less capable plane that would not defend Israel as well—particularly against the threat posed by missiles from Iran, Iraq, and Syria. While Israel must make its own decisions with regard to its security, I sincerely hope the Administration was not pushing our ally to purchase a less capable plane just so that Syria or Iran would not be offended. Lasting peace in the Middle East will be based on a sustainable settlement that can be defended through strength, not by pushing Israel to take steps which limit its ability to defend itself.

Mr. President, sustaining the F-15 is essential for U.S. airpower as we enter the 21st century. Preserving the F-15 is also essential to my home state of Missouri. The 7,000 Missourians who build the F-15 are a national security asset. Both houses of Congress have sent clear signals to the Administration that this plane should be saved. It is time for the President to start listening and take steps immediately to ensure funding for the F-15 is included in the defense budget.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 19, 1999]
CLINTON'S DREAMS OF PEACE IGNORE MIDEAST REALITIES

(By Angelo M. Codevilla)

What exactly does President Clinton expect from Israel's new prime minister, Ehud Barak? At a joint news conference last week, Mr. Clinton declared that he wants Mr. Barak "to widen the circle of peace to include Syria and Lebanon and to revitalized talks among Israel and the Arab world and to solve regional problems." Mr. Barak spoke more cautiously, declaring his commitment to "change and renewal" but also his uneasiness at Americans who have acted "as a kind of policeman, judge and arbitrator at the same time."

Mr. Barak may be indebted to Mr. Clinton for undermining his predecessor, but he also