In the Senate of the United States,

March 25, 1999.

Resolved, That the resolution from the House of Representatives (H. Con. Res. 68) entitled "Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009.", do pass with the following

AMENDMENT:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.

(a) DECLARATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001 through 2009 as authorized by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

★

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

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

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2000: $1,401,979,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $1,435,931,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $1,455,992,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: $1,532,014,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: $1,585,969,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: $1,649,259,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $1,682,788,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $1,737,451,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $1,807,417,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $1,870,513,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000: $0.

Fiscal year 2001: −$6,716,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: −$52,284,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: −$31,305,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: −$48,180,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: −$61,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: −$107,925,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: −$133,949,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: −$148,792,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: −$175,197,000,000.

(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 2000: $1,426,931,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $1,457,294,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $1,488,477,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: $1,561,513,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: $1,613,278,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: $1,666,843,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $1,698,902,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $1,754,567,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $1,815,739,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $1,875,969,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 2001: $1,435,931,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $1,455,992,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: $1,532,014,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: $1,583,070,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: $1,639,428,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $1,667,958,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $1,717,688,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $1,782,597,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $1,842,697,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000: −$6,313,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $0.

Fiscal year 2002: $0.

Fiscal year 2003: $0.

Fiscal year 2004: $2,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $9,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $14,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $19,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $24,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $27,816,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000: $5,635,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,716,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $5,801,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $5,885,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $5,962,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $6,029,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $6,088,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $6,138,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $6,175,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $6,203,500,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000: $3,510,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $3,377,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $3,236,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $3,088,200,000,000.

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302, and 311 of the Con-

gressional 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 2000: $327,256,000,000.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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 2000 through 2009 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $288,812,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $303,616,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, −$650,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, −$3,136,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, −$1,138,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

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

(B) Outlays, −$1,243,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

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

(B) Outlays, −$1,381,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

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

(B) Outlays, −$1,452,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

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

(B) Outlays, −$1,453,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

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

(B) Outlays, −$1,431,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

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

(B) Outlays, −$1,137,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

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

(B) Outlays, −$1,067,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $21,720,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,444,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $22,536,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $22,566,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $22,667,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $22,658,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $23,041,000,000.

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

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $14,831,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $13,519,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $11,288,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $11,955,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $12,072,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $10,553,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $10,609,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $9,664,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,270,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $251,873,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $257,750,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $264,620,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $267,411,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $277,386,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $277,175,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $286,576,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $286,388,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $298,942,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $299,128,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $305,655,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $305,943,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $312,047,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $312,753,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $325,315,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $326,666,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $335,562,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $337,102,000,000.

(14) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $46,724,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $47,064,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

(15) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

(16) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

(17) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

(18) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$10,033,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$10,094,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, −$12,874,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, −$19,976,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, −$4,394,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$4,835,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, −$4,481,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$5,002,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, −$4,515,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$5,067,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, −$4,619,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$5,192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, −$5,210,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$5,780,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, −$5,279,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$5,851,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, −$5,316,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$5,889,000,000.

(19) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$34,260,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$34,260,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$36,876,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$36,876,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$43,626,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$43,626,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, −$37,464,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$37,464,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, −$37,559,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$37,559,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, −$38,497,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$38,497,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, −$39,178,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$39,178,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, −$40,426,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$40,426,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, −$41,237,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$41,237,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, −$42,084,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$42,084,000,000.

SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN THE SENATE.

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

(1) to reduce revenues by not more than $0 in fiscal year 2000, $138,485,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and $765,985,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009; and

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

SEC. 105. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

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

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

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

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry that provides risk management and income assistance for agriculture producers, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of budget authority and outlays to that Committee by an amount that does not exceed—

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

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

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

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

(1) fiscal year 2000;

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

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

(c) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised allocations under subsection (a) shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations contained in this resolution.

SEC. 202. TAX REDUCTION RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the spending and revenue aggregates and may revise committee allocations for legislation that reduces revenues if such legislation will not increase the deficit for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

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

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

(b) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised allocations and aggregates under subsection (a) shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) LIMITATION.—This reserve fund will give priority to the following types of tax relief—

(1) tax relief to help working families afford child care, including assistance for families with a parent staying out of the workforce in order to care for young children;

(2) tax relief to help individuals and their families afford the expense of long-term health care;

(3) tax relief to ease the tax code's marriage penalties on working families;

(4) any other individual tax relief targeted exclusively for families in the bottom 90 percent of the family income distribution;

(5) the extension of the Research and Experimentation tax credit, the Work Opportunity tax credit, and other expiring tax provisions, a number of which are important to help American businesses compete in the modern international economy and to help bring

the benefits of a strong economy to disadvantaged individuals and communities;

(6) tax incentives to help small businesses; and

(7) tax relief provided by accelerating the increase in the deductibility of health insurance premiums for the self-employed.

SEC. 203. CLARIFICATION ON THE APPLICATION OF SECTION 202 OF H. CON. RES. 67.

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

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "the deficit" and inserting "the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit"; and

(2) in paragraph (6), by—

(A) striking "increases the deficit" and inserting "increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit"; and

(B) striking "increase the deficit" and inserting "increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit".

SEC. 204. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION POINT OF ORDER.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In making a designation of a provision of legislation as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced

Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets all the criteria in paragraph (2).

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change is an emergency requirement are whether it is—

(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iv) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(3) JUSTIFICATION FOR FAILURE TO MEET CRITERIA.—If the proposed emergency requirement does not meet all the criteria set forth in paragraph (2), the committee report or the statement of managers, as the case may be, shall provide a written justification of why the requirement should be accorded emergency status.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, upon a point of order being made by a Senator against any provision in that measure designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and the Presiding Officer sustains that point of order, that provision along with the language making the designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) GENERAL POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under this subsection may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(3) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this subsection against a con-

ference report the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 205. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.

In the event there is no joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000, and in conformance with section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives and of the Senate shall submit for printing in the Congressional Record allocations consistent with the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000, as passed by the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

SEC. 206. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR USE OF OCS RECEIPTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation that would use proceeds from Outer Continental Shelf leasing and production to fund historic preservation, recreation and land, water, fish, and wildlife conservation efforts and to support coastal needs and activities, provided that, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of

that legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

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

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

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—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 section 302(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.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate submits an adjustment under this section for legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment to that legislation that would necessitate such submis-

sion, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section 302(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 committees shall report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

SEC. 207. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MANAGED CARE PLANS THAT AGREE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SERVICES TO THE ELDERLY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation to provide: additional funds for medicare managed care plans agreeing to serve elderly patients for at least 2 years and whose reimbursement was reduced because of the risk adjustment regulations, provided that to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of that legislation

will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

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

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

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—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 section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional level and spending aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and spending aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate submits an adjustment under this section for legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment to

that legislation that would necessitate such submission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and spending 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.

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

SEC. 208. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is reported by the Senate Committee on Finance that significantly extends the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund without the use of transfers of new subsidies from the general fund, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may change committee allocations and spending aggregates if such legislation will not cause an on-budget deficit for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

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

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

(b) PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT.—The adjustments made pursuant to subsection (a) may be made to address the cost of the prescription drug benefit.

(c) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—The revision of allocations and aggregates made under this section shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

SEC. 209. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

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.

SEC. 210. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO FOSTER THE EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENCE OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation that finances disability programs designed to allow individuals with disabilities to become employed and remain independent: Provided, That, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of that legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously-passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

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

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

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—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 section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These re-

vised 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.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate submits an adjustment under this section for legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment to that legislation that would necessitate such submission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(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 committees shall report appropriately-revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE CONGRESS AND THE SENATE

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

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

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

(2) according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), 42 percent of married couples incurred "marriage penalties" under the tax code in 1996, averaging nearly $1,400;

(3) measured as a percent of income, marriage penalties are largest for low-income families, as couples with incomes below $20,000 who incurred a marriage penalty in 1996 were forced to pay nearly 8 percent more of their income in taxes than if they had been able to file individual returns;

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

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

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

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

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that there is an urgent and ongoing requirement to improve security for United States diplomatic missions and personnel abroad, which should be met without compromising existing budgets for International Affairs (function 150).

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

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) medicare home health services provide a vitally important option enabling homebound individ-

uals to stay in their own homes and communities rather than go into institutionalized care; and

(2) implementation of the Interim Payment System and other changes to the medicare home health benefit have exacerbated inequalities in payments for home health services between regions, limiting access to these services in many areas and penalizing efficient, low-cost providers.

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

SEC. 304. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE DEDUCTIBILITY OF HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS OF THE SELF-EMPLOYED.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

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

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

(4) it will not be until 2004 that the self-employed will be able to take a full 100-percent deduction for their health insurance premiums for the tax year 2003;

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

(6) the increased cost coupled with the less favorable tax treatment makes health insurance less affordable for the self-employed;

(7) these disadvantages are reflected in the higher rate of uninsured among the self-employed which stands at 24.1 percent compared with 18.2 percent for all wage and salaried workers, for self-employed living at or below the poverty level the rate of uninsured is 53.1 percent, for self-employed living at 100 through 199 percent of poverty the rate of uninsured is 47 percent, and for self-employed living at 200 percent of poverty and above the rate of uninsured is 17.8 percent;

(8) for some self-employed, such as farmers who face significant occupational safety hazards, this lack

of health insurance affordability has even greater ramifications; and

(9) this lack of full deductibility is also adversely affecting the growing number of women who own small businesses.

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

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

It is the sense of the Senate that this concurrent resolution on the budget assumes any reductions in taxes should be structured to benefit working families by providing family tax relief and incentives to stimulate savings, investment, job creation, and economic growth.

SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

(2) these employees perform vital day-to-day functions, ranging from equipment maintenance to leadership and staff roles, that allow the drill weekends and annual active duty training of the traditional Guardsmen to be dedicated to preparation for the National Guard's warfighting and peacetime missions;

(3) when the ability to provide sufficient Active Guard/Reserves and Technicians end strength is reduced, unit readiness, as well as quality of life for soldiers and families is degraded;

(4) the Army National Guard, with agreement from the Department of Defense, requires a minimum essential requirement of 23,500 Active Guard/Reserves and 25,500 Technicians; and

(5) the fiscal year 2000 budget request for the Army National Guard provides resources sufficient for approximately 21,807 Active Guard/Reserves and 22,500 Technicians, end strength shortfalls of 3,000 and 1,693, respectively.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in the budget resolution assume that the Department of Defense will give priority to providing adequate resources to sufficiently fund the Active

Guard/Reserves and Military Technicians at minimum required levels.

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

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) women face unique obstacles in ensuring retirement security and survivor and disability stability;

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

(3) the Congress and the President should take these factors into account when considering proposals to reform the Social Security system.

SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the National Institutes of Health is the Nation's foremost research center;

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

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

(4) funding for the National Institutes of Health should continue to increase in order to prevent the cessation of biomedical research studies and the loss

of medical doctors and research scientists to private research organizations; and

(5) the National Institutes of Health conducts research protocols without proprietary interests, thereby ensuring that the best health care is researched and made available to the Nation.

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

SEC. 309. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FUNDING FOR KYOTO PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION PRIOR TO SENATE RATIFICATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The agreement signed by the Administration on November 12, 1998, regarding legally binding commitments on greenhouse gas reductions is inconsistent with the provisions of S. Res. 98, the Byrd-Hagel Resolution, which passed the Senate unanimously.

(2) The Administration has agreed to allowing at least 2 additional years for negotiations on the Buenos Aires Action Plan to determine the provisions of several vital aspects of the Treaty for the United

States, including emissions trading schemes, carbon sinks, a clean development mechanism, and developing Nation participation.

(3) The Administration has not submitted the Kyoto Protocol to the Senate for ratification and has indicated it has no intention to do so in the foreseeable future.

(4) The Administration has pledged to Congress that it would not implement any portion of the Kyoto Protocol prior to its ratification in the Senate.

(5) Congress agrees that Federal expenditures are required and appropriate for activities which both improve the environment and reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Those activities include programs to promote energy efficient technologies, encourage technology development that reduces or sequesters greenhouse gases, encourage the development and use of alternative and renewable fuel technologies, and other programs justifiable independent of the goals of the Kyoto Protocol.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the levels in this resolution assume that funds should not be provided to put into effect the Kyoto Protocol prior to its Senate ratification in compliance with the require-

ments of the Byrd-Hagel Resolution and consistent with previous Administration assurances to Congress.

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

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

(1) A dozen internationally, prestigious economic studies have shown that technological progress has historically been the single most important factor in economic growth, having more than twice the impact of labor or capital.

(2) The link between economic growth and technology is evident: our dominant high technology industries are currently responsible for 80 percent of the value of today's stock market, 1/3 of our economic output, and half of our economic growth. Furthermore, the link between Federal funding of research and development (R&D) and market products is conclusive: 70 percent of all patent applications cite nonprofit or federally-funded research as a core component to the innovation being patented.

(3) The revolutionary high technology applications of today were spawned from scientific advances that occurred in the 1960's, when the Government intensively funded R&D. In the 3 decades since then, our investment in R&D as a fraction of Gross Domes-

tic Product (GDP) has dropped to half its former value. As a fraction of the Federal budget, the investment in civilian R&D has dropped to only 1/3 its value in 1965.

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

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Federal investment in R&D should be preserved and increased in order to ensure long-term United States economic strength. Funding for Federal agencies performing basic scientific, medical, and precompetitive engineering research pursuant to the Balanced Budget Agreement Act of 1997 should be a priority for the Senate Budget and Appropriations Committees this year, within the Budget as established by this Committee, in order to achieve a goal of doubling the Federal investment in R&D over an 11 year period.

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

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) Front line drug fighting agencies are dedicating more resources for intentional efforts to continue restoring a balanced drug control strategy. Congress should carefully examine the reauthorization of

the United States Customs service and ensure they have adequate resources and authority not only to facilitate the movement of internationally traded goods but to ensure they can aggressively pursue their law enforcement activities.

(3) By pursuing a balanced effort which requires investment in 3 key areas: demand reduction (such as education and treatment); domestic law enforcement; and international supply reduction, Congress believes we can reduce the number of children who are exposed to and addicted to illegal drugs.

SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TRIBAL COLLEGES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

(2) while annual appropriations for tribal colleges have increased modestly in recent years, core operation funding levels are still about ½ of the $6,000 per Indian student level authorized by the Tribally Controlled College or University Act;

(3) although tribal colleges received a $1,400,000 increase in funding in fiscal year 1999, because of rising student populations, these institutions faced an actual per-student decrease in funding over fiscal year 1998; and

(4) per student funding for tribal colleges is only about 63 percent of the amount given to mainstream community colleges ($2,964 per student at tribal colleges versus $4,743 per student at mainstream community colleges).

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

(1) this resolution recognizes the funding difficulties faced by tribal colleges and assumes that priority consideration will be provided to them through funding for the Tribally Controlled College and University Act, the 1994 Land Grant Institutions, and title III of the Higher Education Act; and

(2) the levels in this resolution assume that such priority consideration reflects Congress' intent to continue work toward current statutory Federal funding goals for the tribal colleges.

SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) January 1999 "Economic and Budget Outlook," the Social Security Trust Fund is projected to incur annual surpluses of $126,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, $137,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000, $144,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2001, $153,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, $161,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2003, and $171,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2004;

(2) the fiscal year 2000 budget resolution crafted by Chairman Domenici assumes that Trust Fund surpluses will be used to reduce publicly-held debt and for no other purposes, and calls for the enactment of statutory legislation that would enforce this assumption;

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

(4) using CBO's re-estimate of his budget proposal, the President would spend approximately $40,000,000,000 of the Social Security surplus in fiscal year 2000 on non-Social Security programs;

$41,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2001; $24,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002; $34,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2003; and $20,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2004; and

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

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that Congress shall reject any budget that would spend any portion of the Social Security surpluses generated in any fiscal year for any Federal program other than Social Security.

SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON NEED-BASED STUDENT FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

(2) higher education promotes economic opportunity for individuals, as recipients of bachelor's degrees earn an average of 75 percent per year more than those with high school diplomas and experience half as much unemployment as high school graduates;

(3) higher education promotes social opportunity, as increased education is correlated with re-

duced criminal activity, lessened reliance on public assistance, and increased civic participation;

(4) a more educated workforce will be essential for continued economic competitiveness in an age where the amount of information available to society will double in a matter of days rather than months or years;

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

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

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

(8) grant aid as a portion of all students financial aid has fallen significantly over the past 5 years;

(9) the Nation's neediest students are now borrowing approximately as much as its wealthiest students to finance higher education; and

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

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that within the discretionary allocation provided to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate for function 500—

(1) the maximum amount of Federal Pell Grants should be increased by $400;

(2) funding for the Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants Program should be increased by $65,000,000;

(3) funding for the Federal capital contributions under the Federal Perkins Loan Program should be increased by $35,000,000;

(4) funding for the Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership Program should be increased by $50,000,000;

(5) funding for the Federal Work-Study Program should be increased by $64,000,000;

(6) funding for the Federal TRIO Programs should be increased by $100,000,000.

SEC. 315. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE PROTECTION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) The Congress finds that—

(1) Congress and the President should balance the budget excluding the surpluses generated by the Social Security Trust Funds;

(2) reducing the Federal debt held by the public is a top national priority, strongly supported on a bipartisan basis, as evidenced by Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan's comment that debt reduction "is a very important element in sustaining economic growth", as well as President Clinton's comments that it "is very, very important that we get the Government debt down" when referencing his own plans to use the budget surplus to reduce Federal debt held by the public;

(3) according to the Congressional Budget Office, balancing the budget excluding the surpluses generated by the Social Security Trust Funds will reduce debt held by the public by a total of $1,723,000,000,000 by the end of fiscal year 2009, $417,000,000,000, or 32 percent, more than it would be reduced under the President's fiscal year 2000 budget submission;

(4) further, according to the Congressional Budget Office, that the President's budget would actually spend $40,000,000,000 of the Social Security surpluses in fiscal year 2000 on new spending programs,

and spend $158,000,000,000 of the Social Security surpluses on new spending programs from fiscal year 2000 through 2004; and

(5) Social Security surpluses should be used for Social Security reform or to reduce the debt held by the public and should not be used for other purposes.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that Congress shall pass legislation which—

(1) reaffirms the provisions of section 13301 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 that provides that the receipts and disbursements of the Social Security Trust Funds shall not be counted for the purposes of the budget submitted by the President, the congressional budget, or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and provides for a point of order within the Senate against any concurrent resolution on the budget, an amendment thereto, or a conference report thereon that violates that section;

(2) mandates that the Social Security surpluses are used only for the payment of Social Security benefits, Social Security reform or to reduce the Federal debt held by the public, and not spent on non-Social Security programs or used to offset tax cuts;

(3) provides for a Senate super-majority point of order against any bill, resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that would use Social Security surpluses on anything other than the payment of Social Security benefits, Social Security reform or the reduction of the Federal debt held by the public;

(4) ensures that all Social Security benefits are paid on time; and

(5) accommodates Social Security reform legislation.

SEC. 316. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PROVIDING ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) United States international leadership is essential to maintaining security and peace for all Americans;

(2) such leadership depends on effective diplomacy as well as a strong military;

(3) effective diplomacy requires adequate resources both for embassy security and for international programs;

(4) in addition to building peace, prosperity and democracy around the world, programs in the International Affairs (150) account serve United States in-

terests by ensuring better jobs and a higher standard of living, promoting the health of our citizens and preserving our natural environment, and protecting the rights and safety of those who travel or do business overseas;

(5) real spending for International Affairs has declined more than 50 percent since the mid-1980s, at the same time that major new challenges and opportunities have arisen from the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the worldwide trends toward democracy and free markets;

(6) current ceilings on discretionary spending will impose severe additional cuts in funding for International Affairs; and

(7) improved security for United States diplomatic missions and personnel will place further strain on the International Affairs budget absent significant additional resources.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that additional budgetary resources should be identified for function 150 to enable successful United States international leadership.

SEC. 317. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT INVEST THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS IN PRIVATE FINANCIAL MARKETS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that the Federal Government should not directly invest contributions made to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401) in private financial markets.

SEC. 318. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING ON-BUDGET SURPLUS.

(a) It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions in this resolution assume that if the Congressional Budget Office determines there is an on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2000, $2,000,000,000 of that surplus will be restored to the programs cut in function 920.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying this budget resolution assume that none of these offsets will come from defense or veterans, and to the extent possible should come from administrative functions.

SEC. 319. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TEA-21 FUNDING AND THE STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) on May 22, 1998, the Senate overwhelmingly approved the conference committee report on H.R. 2400, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, in a 88–5 roll call vote;

(2) also on May 22, 1998, the House of Representatives approved the conference committee report on this bill in a 297–86 recorded vote;

(3) on June 9, 1998, President Clinton signed this bill into law, thereby making it Public Law 105–178;

(4) the TEA–21 legislation was a comprehensive reauthorization of Federal highway and mass transit programs, which authorized approximately $216,000,000,000 in Federal transportation spending over the next 6 fiscal years;

(5) section 1105 of this legislation called for any excess Federal gasoline tax revenues to be provided to the States under the formulas established by the final version of TEA–21; and

(6) the President's fiscal year 2000 budget request contained a proposal to distribute approximately $1,000,000,000 in excess Federal gasoline tax revenues that was not consistent with the provisions of section 1105 of TEA–21 and would deprive States of needed revenues.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and any legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that the President's fiscal year 2000 budget proposal to change the manner in which any excess Federal gasoline tax revenues are distributed to the States will not be implemented, but rather any of these funds will be distributed to the States pursuant to section 1105 of TEA–21.

SEC. 320. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT AGRICULTURAL RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS SHOULD BENEFIT LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) extremes in weather-related and natural conditions have a profound impact on the economic viability of producers;

(2) these extremes, such as drought, excessive rain and snow, flood, wind, insect infestation are certainly beyond the control of livestock producers;

(3) these extremes do not impact livestock producers within a State, region or the Nation in the same manner or during the same time frame or for the same duration of time;

(4) the livestock producers have few effective risk management tools at their disposal to adequately

manage the short and long term impacts of weather-related or natural disaster situations; and

(5) ad hoc natural disaster assistance programs, while providing some relief, are not sufficient to meet livestock producers' needs for rational risk management planning.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that any consideration of reform of Federal crop insurance and risk management programs should include the needs of livestock producers.

SEC. 321. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

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

(1) The health insurance coverage provided under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) is an integral part of the financial security for retired and disabled individuals, as such coverage protects those individuals against the financially ruinous costs of a major illness.

(2) Expenditures under the medicare program for hospital, physician, and other essential health care services that are provided to nearly 39,000,000 retired

and disabled individuals will be $232,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000.

(3) During the nearly 35 years since the medicare program was established, the Nation's health care delivery and financing system has undergone major transformations. However, the medicare program has not kept pace with such transformations.

(4) Former Congressional Budget Office Director Robert Reischauer has described the medicare program as it exists today as failing on the following 4 key dimensions (known as the "Four I's"):

(A) The program is inefficient.

(B) The program is inequitable.

(C) The program is inadequate.

(D) The program is insolvent.

(5) The President's budget framework does not devote 15 percent of the budget surpluses to the medicare program. The Federal budget process does not provide a mechanism for setting aside current surpluses for future obligations. As a result, the notion of saving 15 percent of the surplus for the medicare program cannot practically be carried out.

(6) The President's budget framework would transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund more than $900,000,000,000 over 15 years in

new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes on American workers, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public, and these new IOUs would increase the gross debt of the Federal Government by the amounts transferred.

(7) The Congressional Budget Office has stated that the transfers described in paragraph (6), which are strictly intragovernmental, have no effect on the unified budget surpluses or the on-budget surpluses and therefore have no effect on the debt held by the public.

(8) The President's budget framework does not provide access to, or financing for, prescription drugs.

(9) The Comptroller General of the United States has stated that the President's medicare proposal does not constitute reform of the program and "is likely to create a public misperception that something meaningful is being done to reform the medicare program".

(10) The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 enacted changes to the medicare program which strengthen and extend the solvency of that program.

(11) The Congressional Budget Office has stated that without the changes made to the medicare program by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, the deple-

tion of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund would now be imminent.

(12) The President's budget proposes to cut medicare program spending by $19,400,000,000 over 10 years, primarily through reductions in payments to providers under that program.

(13) The recommendations by Senator John Breaux and Representative William Thomas received the bipartisan support of a majority of members on the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

(14) The Breaux-Thomas recommendations provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the medicare program without transferring new IOUs to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions contained in this budget resolution assume the following:

(1) This resolution does not adopt the President's proposals to reduce medicare program spending by $19,400,000,000 over 10 years, nor does this resolu-

tion adopt the President's proposal to spend $10,000,000,000 of medicare program funds on unrelated programs.

(2) Congress will not transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes on American workers, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(3) Congress should work in a bipartisan fashion to extend the solvency of the medicare program and to ensure that benefits under that program will be available to beneficiaries in the future.

(4) The American public will be well and fairly served in this undertaking if the medicare program reform proposals are considered within a framework that is based on the following 5 key principles offered in testimony to the Senate Committee on Finance by the Comptroller General of the United States:

(A) Affordability.

(B) Equity.

(C) Adequacy.

(D) Feasibility.

(E) Public acceptance.

(5) The recommendations by Senator Breaux and Congressman Thomas provide for new prescrip-

tion drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the medicare program without transferring to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(6) Congress should move expeditiously to consider the bipartisan recommendations of the Chairmen of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

(7) Congress should continue to work with the President as he develops and presents his plan to fix the problems of the medicare program.

SEC. 322. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PROVIDING TAX RELIEF TO ALL AMERICANS BY RETURNING NON-SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS TO TAXPAYERS.

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

(1) Every cent of Social Security surplus should be reserved to pay Social Security benefits, for Social Security reform, or to pay down the debt held by the public and not be used for other purposes.

(2) Medicare should be fully funded.

(3) Even after safeguarding Social Security and medicare, a recent Congressional Research Service

study found that an average American family will pay $5,307 more in taxes over the next 10 years than the Government needs to operate.

(4) The Administration's budget returns none of the excess surplus back to the taxpayers and instead increases net taxes and fees by $96,000,000,000 over 10 years.

(5) The burden of the Administration's tax increases falls disproportionately on low- and middle-income taxpayers. A recent Tax Foundation study found that individuals with incomes of less than $25,000 would bear 38.5 percent of the increased tax burden, while taxpayers with incomes between $25,000 and $50,000 would pay 22.4 percent of the new taxes.

(6) The budget resolution returns most of the non-Social Security surplus to those who worked so hard to produce it by providing $142,000,000,000 in real tax relief over 5 years and almost $800,000,000,000 in tax relief over 10 years.

(7) The budget resolution builds on the following tax relief since 1995:

(A) In 1996, Congress provided, and the President signed, tax relief for small business and health care-related tax relief.

(B) In 1997, Congress once again pushed for tax relief in the context of a balanced budget, and President Clinton signed into law a $500 per child tax credit, expanded individual retirement accounts and the new Roth IRA, a cut in the capital gains tax rate, education tax relief, and estate tax relief.

(C) In 1998, Congress pushed for reform of the Internal Revenue Service, and provided tax relief for America's farmers.

(8) Americans deserve further tax relief because they are still overpaying. They deserve a refund. Federal taxes currently consume nearly 21 percent of national income, the highest percentage since World War II. Families are paying more in Federal, State, and local taxes than for food, clothing, and shelter combined.

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

(1) the levels in this resolution assume that the Senate not only puts a priority on protecting Social Security and medicare and reducing the Federal debt, but also on middle-class tax relief by returning some of the non-Social Security surplus to those from whom it was taken; and

(2) such middle-class tax relief could include broad-based tax relief, marriage penalty relief, retirement savings incentives, estate tax relief, savings and investment incentives, health care-related tax relief, education-related tax relief, and tax simplification proposals.

SEC. 323. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX INCENTIVES FOR EDUCATION SAVINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) families in the United States have accrued more college debt in the 1990s than during the previous 3 decades combined; and

(2) families should have every resource available to them to meet the rising cost of higher education.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that additional tax incentives should be provided for education savings, including—

(1) excluding from gross income distributions from qualified State tuition plans; and

(2) providing a tax deferral for private prepaid tuition plans in years 2000 through 2003 and excluding from gross income distributions from such plans in years 2004 and after.

SEC. 324. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION SHOULD REAUTHORIZE FUNDS FOR THE FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings—

(1) nineteen States and dozens of localities have spent nearly $1,000,000,000 to protect over 600,000 acres of important farmland;

(2) the Farmland Protection Program has provided cost-sharing for 19 States and dozens of localities to protect over 123,000 acres on 432 farms since 1996;

(3) the Farmland Protection Program has generated new interest in saving farmland in communities around the country;

(4) the Farmland Protection Program represents an innovative and voluntary partnership, rewards local ingenuity, and supports local priorities;

(5) the Farmland Protection Program is a matching grant program that is completely voluntary in which the Federal Government does not acquire the land or easement;

(6) funds authorized for the Farmland Protection Program were expended at the end of fiscal year

1998, and no funds were appropriated in fiscal year 1999;

(7) the United States is losing two acres of our best farmland to development every minute of every day;

(8) these lands produce three quarters of the fruits and vegetables and over one half of the dairy in the United States.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals contained in this resolution assume that the One Hundred Sixth Congress, First Session will reauthorize funds for the Farmland Protection Program.

SEC. 325. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TAX CUTS FOR LOWER AND MIDDLE INCOME TAXPAYERS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that Congress will not approve an across-the-board cut in income tax rates, or any other tax legislation, that would provide substantially more benefits to the top 10 percent of taxpayers than to the remaining 90 percent.

SEC. 326. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING REFORM OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (referred to in this section as the "tax code") is unnecessarily complex and burdensome, consisting of 2,000 pages of tax code, and resulting in 12,000 pages of regulations and 200,000 pages of court proceedings;

(2) the complexity of the tax code results in taxpayers spending approximately 5,400,000,000 hours and $200,000,000,000 on tax compliance each year;

(3) the impact of the complexity of the tax code is inherently inequitable, rewarding taxpayers which hire professional tax preparers and penalizing taxpayers which seek to comply with the tax code without professional assistance;

(4) the percentage of the income of an average family of four that is paid for taxes has grown significantly, comprising nearly 40 percent of the family's earnings, a percentage which represents more than a family spends in the aggregate on food, clothing, and housing;

(5) the total amount of Federal, State, and local tax collections in 1998 increased approximately 5.7 percent over such collections in 1997;

(6) the tax code penalizes saving and investment by imposing tax on these important activities twice

while promoting consumption by only taxing income used for consumption once;

(7) the tax code stifles economic growth by discouraging work and capital formation through high tax rates;

(8) Congress and the President have found it necessary on several occasions to enact laws to protect taxpayers from abusive actions and procedures of the Internal Revenue Service in enforcement of the tax code; and

(9) the complexity of the tax code is largely responsible for the growth in size of the Internal Revenue Service.

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

(1) the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 needs comprehensive reform; and

(2) Congress should move expeditiously to consider comprehensive proposals to reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 327. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING DAVIS-BACON.

It is the sense of the Senate that in carrying out the assumptions in this budget resolution, the Senate will con-

sider reform of the Davis-Bacon Act as an alternative to repeal.

SEC. 328. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ACCESS TO ITEMS AND SERVICES UNDER MEDICARE PROGRAM.

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

(1) Total hospital operating margins with respect to items and services provided to medicare beneficiaries are expected to decline from 4.3 percent in fiscal year 1997 to 0.1 percent in fiscal year 1999.

(2) Total operating margins for small rural hospitals are expected to decline from 4.2 percent in fiscal year 1998 to negative 5.6 percent in fiscal year 2002, a 233 percent decline.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office recently has estimated that the amount of savings to the medicare program in fiscal years 1998 through 2002 by reason of the amendments to that program contained in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 is $88,500,000 more than the amount of savings to the program by reason of those amendments that the Congressional Budget Office estimated for those fiscal years immediately prior to the enactment of that Act.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions contained in this budget resolution assume that the Senate should—

(1) consider whether the amendments to the medicare program contained in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 have had an adverse impact on access to items and services under that program; and

(2) if it is determined that additional resources are available, additional budget authority and outlays shall be allocated to address the unintended consequences of change in medicare program policy made by the Balanced Budget Act, including inpatient and outpatient hospital services, to ensure fair and equitable access to all items and services under the program.

SEC. 329. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING AUTISM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Infantile autism and autism spectrum disorders are biologically-based neurodevelopmental diseases that cause severe impairments in language and communication and generally manifest in young children sometime during the first two years of life.

(2) Best estimates indicate that 1 in 500 children born today will be diagnosed with an autism

spectrum disorder and that 400,000 Americans have autism or an autism spectrum disorder.

(3) There is little information on the prevalence of autism and other pervasive developmental disabilities in the United States. There have never been any national prevalence studies in the United States, and the two studies that were conducted in the 1980s examined only selected areas of the country. Recent studies in Canada, Europe, and Japan suggest that the prevalence of classic autism alone may be 300 percent to 400 percent higher than previously estimated.

(4) Three quarters of those with infantile autism spend their adult lives in institutions or group homes, and usually enter institutions by the age of 13.

(5) The cost of caring for individuals with autism and autism spectrum disorder is great, and is estimated to be $13,300,000,000 per year solely for direct costs.

(6) The rapid advancements in biomedical science suggest that effective treatments and a cure for autism are attainable if—

(A) there is appropriate coordination of the efforts of the various agencies of the Federal Gov-

ernment involved in biomedical research on autism and autism spectrum disorders;

(B) there is an increased understanding of autism and autism spectrum disorders by the scientific and medical communities involved in autism research and treatment; and

(C) sufficient funds are allocated to research.

(7) The discovery of effective treatments and a cure for autism will be greatly enhanced when scientists and epidemiologists have an accurate understanding of the prevalence and incidence of autism.

(8) Recent research suggests that environmental factors may contribute to autism. As a result, contributing causes of autism, if identified, may be preventable.

(9) Finding the answers to the causes of autism and related developmental disabilities may help researchers to understand other disorders, ranging from learning problems, to hyperactivity, to communications deficits that affect millions of Americans.

(10) Specifically, more knowledge is needed concerning—

(A) the underlying causes of autism and autism spectrum disorders, how to treat the under-

lying abnormality or abnormalities causing the severe symptoms of autism, and how to prevent these abnormalities from occurring in the future;

(B) the epidemiology of, and the identification of risk factors for, infantile autism and autism spectrum disorders;

(C) the development of methods for early medical diagnosis and functional assessment of individuals with autism and autism spectrum disorders, including identification and assessment of the subtypes within the autism spectrum disorders, for the purpose of monitoring the course of the disease and developing medically sound strategies for improving the outcomes of such individuals;

(D) existing biomedical and diagnostic data that are relevant to autism and autism spectrum disorders for dissemination to medical personnel, particularly pediatricians, to aid in the early diagnosis and treatment of this disease; and

(E) the costs incurred in educating and caring for individuals with autism and autism spectrum disorders.

(11) In 1998, the National Institutes of Health announced a program of research on autism and au-

tism spectrum disorders. A sufficient level of funding should be made available for carrying out the program.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying this resolution assume that additional resources will be targeted towards autism research through the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

SEC. 330. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON WOMEN'S ACCESS TO OBSTETRIC AND GYNECOLOGICAL SERVICES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that:

(1) In the One Hundred Fifth Congress, the House of Representatives acted favorably on The Patient Protection Act (H.R. 4250), which included provisions which required health plans to allow women direct access to a participating physician who specializes in obstetrics and gynecological services.

(2) Women's health historically has received little attention.

(3) Access to an obstetrician-gynecologist improves the health care of a woman by providing routine and preventive health care throughout the women's lifetime, encompassing care of the whole patient, while also focusing on the female reproductive system.

(4) 60 percent of all office visits to obstetrician-gynecologists are for preventive care.

(5) Obstetrician-gynecologists are uniquely qualified on the basis of education and experience to provide basic women's health care services.

(6) While more than 36 States have acted to promote residents' access to obstetrician-gynecologists, patients in other States or in federally-governed health plans are not protected from access restrictions or limitations.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that the Congress shall enact legislation that requires health plans to provide women with direct access to a participating provider who specializes in obstetrics and gynecological services.

SEC. 331. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LIHEAP.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) home energy assistance for working and low-income families with children, the elderly on fixed incomes, the disabled, and others who need such aid is a critical part of the social safety net in cold-weather areas during the winter, and a source of necessary cooling aid during the summer;

(2) the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) is a highly targeted, cost-effective way to help millions of low-income Americans pay their home energy bills. More than two-thirds of LIHEAP-eligible households have annual incomes of less than $8,000, approximately one-half have annual incomes below $6,000; and

(3) LIHEAP funding has been substantially reduced in recent years, and cannot sustain further spending cuts if the program is to remain a viable means of meeting the home heating and other energy-related needs of low-income families, especially those in cold-weather States.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—The assumptions underlying this budget resolution assume that it is the sense of the Senate that the funds made available for LIHEAP for fiscal year 2000 will not be less than the current services for LIHEAP in fiscal year 1999.

SEC. 332. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TRANSPORTATION FIREWALLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) domestic firewalls greatly limit funding flexibility as Congress manages budget priorities in a fiscally constrained budget;

(2) domestic firewalls inhibit congressional oversight of programs and organizations under such protections;

(3) domestic firewalls mask mandatory spending under the guise of discretionary spending, thereby presenting a distorted picture of overall discretionary spending;

(4) domestic firewalls impede the ability of Congress to react to changing circumstances or to fund other equally important programs;

(5) the Congress implemented "domestic discretionary budget firewalls" for approximately 70 percent of function 400 spending in the One Hundred Fifth Congress;

(6) if the aviation firewall proposal circulating in the House of Representatives were to be enacted, firewalled spending would exceed 100 percent of total function 400 spending called for under this resolution; and

(7) if the aviation firewall proposal circulating in the House of Representatives were to be enacted, drug interdiction activities by the Coast Guard, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration activities, rail safety inspections, Federal support for Amtrak, all National Transportation Safety Board ac-

tivities, Pipeline and Hazardous materials safety programs, and Coast Guard search and rescue activities would be drastically cut or eliminated.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that no additional firewalls should be enacted for function 400 transportation activities.

SEC. 333. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING EXISTING, EFFECTIVE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS BEFORE CREATING NEW PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the establishment of new categorical funding programs has led to proposed cuts in the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant to States for broad, public health missions;

(2) Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant dollars fill gaps in the otherwise-categorical funding States and localities receive, funding such major public health threats as cardiovascular disease, injuries, emergency medical services and poor diet, for which there is often no other source of funding;

(3) in 1981, Congress consolidated a number of programs, including certain public health programs, into block grants for the purpose of best advancing the

health, economics and well-being of communities across the country;

(4) the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant can be used for programs for screening, outreach, health education and laboratory services;

(5) the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant gives States the flexibility to determine how funding available for this purpose can be used to meet each State's preventive health priorities;

(6) the establishment of new public health programs that compete for funding with the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant could result in the elimination of effective, localized public health programs in every State.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that there shall be a continuation of the level of funding support for existing public health programs, specifically the Prevention Block Grant, prior to the funding of new public health programs.

SEC. 334. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) (referred to in this

resolution as the "Act"), Congress found that improving educational results for children with disabilities is an essential element of our national policy of ensuring equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities.

(2) In the Act, the Secretary of Education is instructed to make grants to States to assist them in providing special education and related services to children with disabilities.

(3) The Act represents a commitment by the Federal Government to fund 40 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States.

(4) The budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 2000 ignores the commitment by the Federal Government under the Act to fund special education and instead proposes the creation of new programs that limit the manner in which States may spend the limited Federal education dollars received.

(5) The budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 2000 fails to increase funding for special education, and leaves States and localities with an enormous unfunded mandate to pay for growing special education costs.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) should be fully funded at the originally promised level before any funds are appropriated for new education programs.

SEC. 335. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL SECURITY FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO BECOME DISABLED.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in addition to providing retirement income, Social Security also protects individuals from the loss of income due to disability;

(2) according to the most recent report from the Social Security Board of Trustees nearly 1 in 7 Social Security beneficiaries, 6,000,000 individuals in total, were receiving benefits as a result of disability;

(3) more than 60 percent of workers have no long-term disability insurance protection other than that provided by Social Security;

(4) according to statistics from the Society of Actuaries, the odds of a long-term disability versus death are 2.7 to 1 at age 27, 3.5 to 1 at age 42, and 2.2 to 1 at age 52; and

(5) in 1998, the average monthly benefit for a disabled worker was $722.

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

(1) Social Security plays a vital role in providing adequate income for individuals who become disabled;

(2) individuals who become disabled face circumstances much different than those who rely on Social Security for retirement income;

(3) Social Security reform proposals that focus too heavily on retirement income may adversely affect the income protection provided to individuals with disabilities; and

(4) Congress and the President should take these factors into account when considering proposals to reform the Social Security program.

SEC. 336. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FUNDING FOR INTENSIVE FIREARMS PROSECUTION PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) gun violence in America, while declining somewhat in recent years, is still unacceptably high;

(2) keeping firearms out of the hands of criminals can dramatically reduce gun violence in America;

(3) States and localities often do not have the investigative or prosecutorial resources to locate and convict individuals who violate their firearms laws. Even when they do win convictions, States and localities often lack the jail space to hold such convicts for their full prison terms;

(4) there are a number of Federal laws on the books which are designed to keep firearms out of the hands of criminals. These laws impose mandatory minimum sentences upon individuals who use firearms to commit crimes of violence and convicted felons caught in possession of a firearm;

(5) the Federal Government does have the resources to investigate and prosecute violations of these Federal firearms laws. The Federal Government also has enough jail space to hold individuals for the length of their mandatory minimum sentences;

(6) an effort to aggressively and consistently apply these Federal firearms laws in Richmond, Virginia, has cut violent crime in that city. This program, called Project Exile, has produced 288 indictments during its first two years of operation and has

been credited with contributing to a 15 percent decrease in violent crimes in Richmond during the same period. In the first three-quarters of 1998, homicides with a firearm in Richmond were down 55 percent compared to 1997;

(7) the fiscal year 1999 Commerce-State-Justice Appropriations Act provided $1,500,000 to hire additional Federal prosecutors and investigators to enforce Federal firearms laws in Philadelphia. The Philadelphia project—called Operation Cease Fire—started on January 1, 1999. Since it began, the project has resulted in 31 indictments of 52 defendants on firearms violations. The project has benefited from help from the Philadelphia Police Department and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms which was not paid for out of the $1,500,000 grant;

(8) in 1993, the office of the United States Attorney for the Western District of New York teamed up with the Monroe County District Attorney's Office, the Monroe County Sheriff's Department, the Rochester Police Department, and others to form a Violent Crimes Task Force. In 1997, the Task Force created an Illegal Firearms Suppression Unit, whose mission is to use prosecutorial discretion to bring firearms cases in the judicial forum where penalties for gun

violations would be the strictest. The Suppression Unit has been involved in three major prosecutions of interstate gun-purchasing activities and currently has 30 to 40 open single-defendant felony gun cases;

(9) Senator Hatch has introduced legislation to authorize Project CUFF, a Federal firearms prosecution program;

(10) the Administration has requested $5,000,000 to conduct intensive firearms prosecution projects on a national level;

(11) given that at least $1,500,000 is needed to run an effective program in one American city—Philadelphia—$5,000,000 is far from enough funding to conduct such programs nationally.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that function 750 in the budget resolution assumes that $50,000,000 will be provided in fiscal year 2000 to conduct intensive firearms prosecution projects to combat violence in the 25 American cities with the highest crime rates.

SEC. 337. HONEST REPORTING OF THE DEFICIT.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective for fiscal year 2001, the President's budget and the budget report of CBO required under section 202(e) of the Congressional

Budget Act of 1974 and the concurrent resolution on the budget should include—

(A) the receipts and disbursements totals of the on-budget trust funds, including the projected levels for at least the next 5 fiscal years; and

(B) the deficit or surplus excluding the on-budget trust funds, including the projected levels for at least the next 5 fiscal years.

(2) ITEMIZATION.—Effective for fiscal year 2001, the President's budget and the budget report of CBO required under section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 should include an itemization of the on-budget trust funds for the budget year, including receipts, outlays, and balances.

SEC. 338. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FOSTERING THE EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENCE OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Health care is important to all Americans.

(2) Health care is particularly important to individuals with disabilities and special health care needs who often cannot afford the insurance available to them through the private market, are uninsurable by the plans available in the private sector, or are at

great risk of incurring very high and economically devastating health care costs.

(3) Americans with significant disabilities often are unable to obtain health care insurance that provides coverage of the services and supports that enable them to live independently and enter or rejoin the workforce. Coverage for personal assistance services, prescription drugs, durable medical equipment, and basic health care are powerful and proven tools for individuals with significant disabilities to obtain and retain employment.

(4) For individuals with disabilities, the fear of losing health care and related services is one of the greatest barriers keeping the individuals from maximizing their employment, earning potential, and independence.

(5) Individuals with disabilities who are beneficiaries under title II or XVI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq., 1381 et seq.) risk losing medicare or medicaid coverage that is linked to their cash benefits, a risk that is an equal, or greater, work disincentive than the loss of cash benefits associated with working.

(6) Currently, less than 1/2 of 1 percent of Social Security disability insurance (SSDI) and supple-

mental security income (SSI) beneficiaries cease to receive benefits as a result of employment.

(7) Beneficiaries have cited the lack of adequate employment training and placement services as an additional barrier to employment.

(8) If an additional 1/2 of 1 percent of the current Social Security disability insurance (SSDI) and supplemental security income (SSI) recipients were to cease receiving benefits as a result of employment, the savings to the Social Security Trust Funds in cash assistance would total $3,500,000,000 over the worklife of the individuals.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that the Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999 (S. 331, 106th Congress) will be passed by the Senate and enacted early this year, and thereby provide individuals with disabilities with the health care and employment preparation and placement services that will enable those individuals to reduce their dependency on cash benefit programs.

SEC. 339. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ASSET-BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

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

(1) 33 percent of all American households and 60 percent of African American households have no or negative financial assets.

(2) 46.9 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African American children.

(3) In order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment, incentives which encourage asset-building should be established.

(4) Across the Nation, numerous small public, private, and public-private asset-building incentives, including individual development accounts, are demonstrating success at empowering low-income workers.

(5) Middle and upper income Americans currently benefit from tax incentives for building assets.

(6) The Federal Government should utilize the Federal tax code to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to escape poverty permanently.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that Congress should modify the Federal tax law to include provisions which encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying a first home, starting a business, obtaining

an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

SEC. 340. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE PROVISIONS OF THIS RESOLUTION ASSUME THAT IT IS THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROVIDE AS SOON AS IS TECHNOLOGICALLY POSSIBLE AN EDUCATION FOR EVERY AMERICAN CHILD THAT WILL ENABLE EACH CHILD TO EFFECTIVELY MEET THE CHALLENGES OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Pell Grants require an increase of $5,000,000,000 per year to fund the maximum award established in the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1998;

(2) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act needs at least $13,000,000,000 more per year to fund the Federal commitment to fund 40 percent of the excess costs for special education services;

(3) title I needs at least $4,000,000,000 more per year to serve all eligible children;

(4) over $11,000,000,000 over the next six years will be required to hire 100,000 teachers to reduce class size to an average of 18 in grades 1–3;

(5) according to the General Accounting Office, it will cost $112,000,000,000 just to bring existing school buildings up to good overall condition. According to GAO, one-third of schools serving 14,000,000 children require extensive repair or replacement of one or more of their buildings. GAO also found that almost half of all schools lack even the basic electrical wiring needed to support full-scale use of computers;

(6) the Federal share of education spending has declined from 11.9 percent in 1980 to 7.6 percent in 1998;

(7) Federal spending for education has declined from 2.5 percent of all Federal spending in fiscal year 1980 to 2.0 percent in fiscal year 1999.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that it is the policy of the United States to provide as soon as is technologically possible an education for every American child that will enable each child to effectively meet the challenges of the twenty-first century.

SEC. 341. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING EXEMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND PRODUCTS, MEDICINES, AND MEDICAL PRODUCTS FROM UNILATERAL ECONOMIC SANCTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) prohibiting or otherwise restricting the donation or sale of agricultural commodities or products, medicines, or medical products in order to unilaterally sanction a foreign government for actions or policies that the United States finds objectionable unnecessarily harms innocent populations in the targeted country and rarely causes the sanctioned government to alter its actions or policies;

(2) for the United States as a matter of policy to deny access to agricultural commodities or products, medicines, or medical products by innocent men, women, and children in other countries weakens the international leadership and moral authority of the United States; and

(3) unilateral sanctions on the sale or donation of agricultural commodities or products, medicines, or medical products needlessly harm agricultural producers and workers employed in the agricultural or medical sectors in the United States by foreclosing markets for the commodities, products, or medicines.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that the President should—

(1) subject to paragraph (2), exempt agricultural commodities and products, medicines, and medical products from any unilateral economic sanction imposed on a foreign government; and

(2) apply the sanction to the commodities, products, or medicines if the application is necessary—

(A) for health or safety reasons; or

(B) due to a domestic shortage of the commodities, products, or medicines.

SEC. 342. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CAPITAL GAINS TAX FAIRNESS FOR FAMILY FARMERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) one of the most popular provisions included in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 permits many families to exclude from Federal income taxes up to $500,000 of gain from the sale of their principal residences;

(2) under current law, family farmers are not able to take full advantage of this $500,000 capital gains exclusion that families living in urban or suburban areas enjoy on the sale of their homes;

(3) for most urban and suburban residents, their homes are their major financial asset and as a result such families, who have owned their homes through many years of appreciation, can often benefit from a

large portion of this new $500,000 capital gains exclusion;

(4) most family farmers plow any profits they make back into the whole farm rather than into the house which holds little or no value;

(5) unfortunately, farm families receive little benefit from this capital gains exclusion because the Internal Revenue Service separates the value of their homes from the value of the land the homes sit on;

(6) we should recognize in our tax laws the unique character and role of our farm families and their important contributions to our economy, and allow them to benefit more fully from the capital gains tax exclusion that urban and suburban homeowners already enjoy; and

(7) we should expand the $500,000 capital gains tax exclusion to cover sales of the farmhouse and the surrounding farmland over their lifetimes.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that if we pass tax relief measures in accordance with the assumptions in the budget resolution, we should ensure that such legislation removes the disparity between farm families and their urban and suburban counterparts with respect to the new $500,000 capital gains tax exclusion for principal residence

sales by expanding it to cover gains from the sale of farmland along with the sale of the farmhouse.

SEC. 343. BUDGETING FOR THE DEFENSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.

It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels for National Defense (function 050) for fiscal years 2000 through 2008 assume funding for the Defense Science and Technology Program that is consistent with section 214 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, which expresses a sense of the Congress that for each of those fiscal years it should be an objective of the Secretary of Defense to increase the budget request for the Defense Science and Technology Program by at least 2 percent over inflation.

SEC. 344. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR THE URBAN PARKS AND RECREATION RECOVERY (UPARR) PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) every analysis of national recreation issues in the last 3 decades has identified the importance of close-to-home recreation opportunities, particularly for residents in densely-populated urban areas;

(2) the Land and Water Conservation Fund grants program under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460l–4 et seq.) was

established partly to address the pressing needs of urban areas;

(3) the National Urban Recreation Study of 1978 and the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors of 1987 revealed that critical urban recreation resources were not being addressed;

(4) older city park structures and infrastructures worth billions of dollars are at risk because government incentives favored the development of new areas over the revitalization of existing resources, ranging from downtown parks established in the 19th century to neighborhood playgrounds and sports centers built from the 1920's to the 1950's;

(5) the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) program, established under the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), authorized $725,000,000 to provide matching grants and technical assistance to economically distressed urban communities;

(6) the purposes of the UPARR program is to provide direct Federal assistance to urban localities for rehabilitation of critically needed recreation facilities, and to encourage local planning and a commitment to continuing operation and maintenance of recreation programs, sites, and facilities; and

(7) funding for UPARR is supported by a wide range of organizations, including the National Association of Police Athletic Leagues, the Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association, the Conference of Mayors, and Major League Baseball.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that Congress considers the UPARR program to be a high priority, and should appropriate such amounts as are necessary to carry out the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) program established under the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.).

SEC. 345. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOCIAL PROMOTION.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that funds will be provided for legislation—

(1) to provide remedial educational and other instructional interventions to assist public elementary and secondary school students in meeting achievement levels; and

(2) to terminate practices which advance students from one grade to the next who do not meet State achievement standards in the core academic curriculum.

SEC. 346. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON WOMEN AND SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) without Social Security benefits, the elderly poverty rate among women would have been 52.2 percent, and among widows would have been 60.6 percent;

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

(3) during their working years, women earn an average of 70 cents for every dollar men earn; and

(4) women spend an average of 11.5 years out of their careers to care for their families, and are more likely to work part-time than full-time.

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

(1) women face unique obstacles in ensuring retirement security and survivor and disability stability;

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

(3) the Congress and the Administration should act, as part of Social Security reform, to ensure that widows and other poor elderly women receive more adequate benefits that reduce their poverty rates and

that women, under whatever approach is taken to reform Social Security, should receive no lesser a share of overall federally-funded retirement benefits than they receive today; and

(4) the sacrifice that women make to care for their family should be recognized during reform of Social Security and that women should not be penalized by taking an average of 11.5 years out of their careers to care for their family.

SEC. 347. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING SOUTH KOREA'S INTERNATIONAL TRADE PRACTICES ON PORK AND BEEF.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) Asia is the largest regional export market for America's farmers and ranchers, traditionally purchasing approximately 40 percent of all United States agricultural exports;

(2) the Department of Agriculture forecasts that over the next year American agricultural exports to Asian countries will decline by several billion dollars due to the Asian financial crisis;

(3) the United States is the producer of the safest agricultural products from farm to table, customizing goods to meet the needs of customers worldwide, and

has established the image and reputation as the world's best provider of agricultural products;

(4) American farmers and ranchers, and more specifically, American pork and beef producers, are dependent on secure, open, and competitive Asian export markets for their product;

(5) United States pork and beef producers not only have faced the adverse effects of depreciated and unstable currencies and lowered demand due to the Asian financial crisis, but also have been confronted with South Korea's pork subsidies and its failure to keep commitments on market access for beef;

(6) it is the policy of the United States to prohibit South Korea from using United States and International Monetary Fund assistance to subsidize targeted industries and compete unfairly for market share against United States products;

(7) the South Korean Government has been subsidizing its pork exports to Japan, resulting in a 973 percent increase in its exports to Japan since 1992, and a 71 percent increase in the last year;

(8) pork already comprises 70 percent of South Korea's agriculture exports to Japan, yet the South Korean Government has announced plans to invest 100,000,000,000 won in its agricultural sector in

order to flood the Japanese market with even more South Korean pork;

(9) the South Korean Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries reportedly has earmarked 25,000,000,000 won for loans to Korea's pork processors in order for them to purchase more Korean pork and to increase exports to Japan;

(10) any export subsidies on pork, including those on exports from South Korea to Japan, would violate South Korea's international trade agreements and may be actionable under the World Trade Organization;

(11) South Korea's subsidies are hindering United States pork and beef producers from capturing their full potential in the Japanese market, which is the largest export market for United States pork and beef, importing nearly $700,000,000 of United States pork and over $1,500,000,000 of United States beef last year alone;

(12) under the United States-Korea 1993 Record of Understanding on Market Access for Beef, which was negotiated pursuant to a 1989 GATT Panel decision against Korea, South Korea was allowed to delay full liberalization of its beef market (in an exception to WTO rules) if it would agree to import increasing

minimum quantities of beef each year until the year 2001;

(13) South Korea fell woefully short of its beef market access commitment for 1998; and

(14) United States pork and beef producers are not able to compete fairly with Korean livestock producers, who have a high cost of production, because South Korea has violated trade agreements and implemented protectionist policies.

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

(1) believes strongly that while a stable global marketplace is in the best interest of America's farmers and ranchers, the United States should seek a mutually beneficial relationship without hindering the competitiveness of American agriculture;

(2) calls on South Korea to abide by its trade commitments;

(3) calls on the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to promote vigorously policies that encourage the opening of markets for beef and pork products by requiring South Korea to abide by its existing international trade commitments and to reduce trade barriers, tariffs, and export subsidies;

(4) calls on the President and the Secretaries of Treasury and Agriculture to monitor and report to Congress that resources will not be used to stabilize the South Korean market at the expense of United States agricultural goods or services; and

(5) requests the United States Trade Representative and the United States Department of Agriculture to pursue the settlement of disputes with the Government of South Korea on its failure to abide by its international trade commitments on beef market access, to consider whether Korea's reported plans for subsidizing its pork industry would violate any of its international trade commitments, and to determine what impact Korea's subsidy plans would have on United States agricultural interests, especially in Japan.

SEC. 348. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING SUPPORT FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) as national crime rates are beginning to fall as a result of State and local efforts, with Federal support, it is important for the Federal Government to continue its support for State and local law enforcement;

(2) Federal support is crucial to the provision of critical crime fighting programs;

(3) Federal support is also essential to the provision of critical crime fighting services and the effective administration of justice in the States, such as State and local crime laboratories and medical examiners' offices;

(4) current needs exceed the capacity of State and local crime laboratories to process their forensic examinations, resulting in tremendous backlogs that prevent the swift administration of justice and impede fundamental individual rights, such as the right to a speedy trial and to exculpatory evidence;

(5) last year, Congress passed the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998, which authorizes $250,000,000 each year for 5 years to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in developing and integrating their anticrime technology systems, and in upgrading their forensic laboratories and information and communications infrastructures upon which these crime fighting systems rely; and

(6) the Federal Government must continue efforts to significantly reduce crime by maintaining Federal funding for State and local law enforcement, and wisely targeting these resources.

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

(1) the amounts made available for fiscal year 2000 to assist State and local law enforcement efforts should be comparable to or greater than amounts made available for that purpose for fiscal year 1999;

(2) the amounts made available for fiscal year 2000 for crime technology programs should be used to further the purposes of the program under section 102 of the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 14601); and

(3) Congress should consider legislation that specifically addresses the backlogs in State and local crime laboratories and medical examiners' offices.

SEC. 349. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MERGER ENFORCEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is charged with the civil and criminal enforcement of the antitrust laws, including review of corporate mergers likely to reduce competition in particular markets, with a goal to promote and protect the competitive process;

(2) the Antitrust Division requests a 16 percent increase in funding for fiscal year 2000;

(3) justification for such an increase is based, in part, on increasingly numerous and complex merger filings pursuant to the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976;

(4) the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 sets value thresholds which trigger the requirement for filing premerger notification;

(5) the number of merger filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, which the Department, in conjunction with the Federal Trade Commission, is required to review, increased by 38 percent in fiscal year 1998;

(6) the Department expects the number of merger filings to increase in fiscal years 1999 and 2000;

(7) the value thresholds, which relate to both the size of the companies involved and the size of the transaction, under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 have not been adjusted since passage of that Act.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Antitrust Division needs adequate resources and that the levels in this resolution assume the Division will have such adequate resources, including necessary increases in funding, notwithstanding any report language to the contrary, to enable it to meet its statutory require-

ments, including those related to reviewing and investigating increasingly numerous and complex mergers, but that Congress should pursue consideration of modest, budget neutral, adjustments to the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 to account for inflation in the value thresholds of the Act, and in so doing, ensure that the Antitrust Division's resources are focused on matters and transactions most deserving of the Division's attention.

SEC. 350. SENSE OF THE SENATE TO CREATE A TASK FORCE TO PURSUE THE CREATION OF A NATURAL DISASTER RESERVE FUND.

(a) It is the sense of the Senate that a task force be created for the purpose of studying the possibility of creating a reserve fund for natural disasters. The task force should be composed of three Senators appointed by the Majority Leader, and two Senators appointed by the Minority Leader. The task force should also be composed of three members appointed by the Speaker of the House, and two members appointed by the Minority Leader in the House.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the task force make a report to the appropriate committees in Congress within 90 days of being convened. The report should be available for the purposes of consideration during comprehensive overhaul of budget procedures.

SEC. 351. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FEDERAL TAX RELIEF.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Congressional Budget Office has reported that payroll taxes will exceed income taxes for 74 percent of all taxpayers in 1999.

(2) The Federal Government will collect nearly $50,000,000,000 in income taxes this year through its practice of taxing the income Americans sacrifice to the Government in the form of Social Security payroll taxes.

(3) American taxpayers are currently shouldering the heaviest tax burden since 1944.

(4) According to the nonpartisan Tax Foundation, the median dual-income family sacrificed a record 37.6 percent of its income to the Government in 1997.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that a significant portion of the tax relief will be devoted to working families who are double-taxed by—

(1) providing taxpayers with an above-the-line income tax deduction for the Social Security payroll

taxes they pay so that they no longer pay income taxes on such payroll taxes, and/or

(2) gradually reducing the lowest marginal income tax rate from 15 percent to 10 percent, and/or

(3) other tax reductions that do not reduce the tax revenue devoted to the Social Security Trust Fund.

SEC. 352. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ELIMINATING THE MARRIAGE PENALTY AND ACROSS-THE-BOARD INCOME TAX RATE CUTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the institution of marriage is the cornerstone of the family and civil society;

(2) strengthening of the marriage commitment and the family is an indispensable step in the renewal of America's culture;

(3) the Federal income tax punishes marriage by imposing a greater tax burden on married couples then on their single counterparts;

(4) America's tax code should give each married couple the choice to be treated as one economic unit, regardless of which spouse earns the income; and

(5) all American taxpayers are responsible for any budget surplus and deserve broad-based tax relief

after the Social Security Trust Fund has been protected.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that Congress should eliminate the marriage penalty in a manner that treats all married couples equally, regardless of which spouse earns the income.

SEC. 353. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON IMPORTANCE OF FUNDING FOR EMBASSY SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Enhancing security at United States diplomatic missions overseas is essential to protect United States Government personnel serving on the front lines of our national defense;

(2) 80 percent of United States diplomatic missions do not meet current security standards;

(3) the Accountability Review Boards on the Embassy Bombings in Nairobi and Dar Es Salaam recommended that the Department of State spend $1,400,000,000 annually on embassy security over each of the next 10 years;

(4) the amount of spending recommended for embassy security by the Accountability Review Boards is approximately 36 percent of the operating budget re-

quested for the Department of State in fiscal year 2000; and

(5) the funding requirements necessary to improve security for United States diplomatic missions and personnel abroad cannot be borne within the current budgetary resources of the Department of State.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this budget resolution assume that as the Congress contemplates changes in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to reflect projected on-budget surpluses, provisions similar to those set forth in section 314(b) of that Act should be considered to ensure adequate funding for enhancements to the security of United States diplomatic missions.

SEC. 354. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR AFTER SCHOOL EDUCATION.

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

(1) The demand for after school education is very high. In fiscal year 1998 the Department of Education's after school grant program was the most competitive in the Department's history. Nearly 2,000 school districts applied for over $540,000,000.

(2) After school programs help to fight juvenile crime. Law enforcement statistics show that youth who are ages 12 through 17 are most at risk of com-

mitting violent acts and being victims of violent acts between 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. After school programs have been shown to reduce juvenile crime, sometimes by up to 75 percent according to the National Association of Police Athletic and Activity Leagues.

(3) After school programs can improve educational achievement. They ensure children have safe and positive learning environments in the after school hours. In the Sacramento START after school program 75 percent of the students showed an increase in their grades.

(4) After school programs have widespread support. Over 90 percent of the American people support such programs. Over 450 of the Nation's leading police chiefs, sheriffs, and prosecutors, along with presidents of the Fraternal Order of Police, and the International Union of Police Associations support government funding of after school programs. And many of our Nation's governors endorse increasing the number of after school programs through a Federal of State partnership.

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

will provide $600,000,000 for the President's after school initiative in fiscal year 2000.

SEC. 355. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING RECOVERY OF FUNDS BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN TOBACCO-RELATED LITIGATION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Federal Tobacco Recovery and Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit Resolution of 1999".

(b) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The President, in his January 19, 1999 State of the Union address—

(A) announced that the Department of Justice would develop a litigation plan for the Federal Government against the tobacco industry;

(B) indicated that any funds recovered through such litigation would be used to strengthen the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); and

(C) urged Congress to pass legislation to include a prescription drug benefit in the medicare program.

(2) The traditional medicare program does not include most outpatient prescription drugs as part of its benefit package.

(3) Prescription drugs are a central element in improving quality of life and in routine health maintenance.

(4) Prescription drugs are a key component to early health care intervention strategies for the elderly.

(5) Eighty percent of retired individuals take at least 1 prescription drug every day.

(6) Individuals 65 years of age or older represent 12 percent of the population of the United States but consume more than 1/3 of all prescription drugs consumed in the United States.

(7) Exclusive of health care-related premiums, prescription drugs account for almost 1/3 of the health care costs and expenditures of elderly individuals.

(8) Approximately 10 percent of all medicare beneficiaries account for nearly 50 percent of all prescription drug spending by the elderly.

(9) Research and development on new generations of pharmaceuticals represent new opportunities for healthier, longer lives for our Nation's elderly.

(10) Prescription drugs are among the key tools in every health care professional's medical arsenal to help combat and prevent the onset, recurrence, or debilitating effects of illness and disease.

(11) While possible Federal litigation against tobacco companies will take time to develop, Congress should continue to work to address the immediate need among the elderly for access to affordable prescription drugs.

(12) Treatment of tobacco-related illness is estimated to cost the medicare program approximately $10,000,000,000 every year.

(13) In 1998, 50 States reached a settlement with the tobacco industry for tobacco-related illness in the amount of $206,000,000,000.

(14) Recoveries from possible Federal tobacco-related litigation, if successful, will likely be comparable to or exceed the dollar amount recovered by the States under the 1998 settlement.

(15) In the event Federal tobacco-related litigation is valid, undertaken and is successful, funds recovered under such litigation should first be used for the purpose of strengthening the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and second to finance a medicare prescription drug benefit.

(16) The scope of any medicare prescription drug benefit should be as comprehensive as possible, with drugs used in fighting tobacco-related illnesses given a first priority.

(17) Most Americans want the medicare program to cover the costs of prescription drugs.

(c) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that funds recovered under any tobacco-related litigation commenced by the Federal Government should be used first for the purpose of strengthening the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and second to fund a medicare prescription drug benefit.

SEC. 356. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON OFFSETTING INAPPROPRIATE EMERGENCY SPENDING.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) some emergency expenditures made at the end of the One Hundred Fifth Congress for fiscal year 1999 were inappropriately deemed as emergencies;

(2) Congress and the President should identify these inappropriate expenditures and fully pay for these expenditures during the fiscal year in which they will be incurred; and

(3) Congress should only apply the emergency designation for occurrences that meet the criteria set forth in the Congressional Budget Act.

SEC. 357. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2000 BUDGET PROPOSAL TO TAX ASSOCIATION INVESTMENT INCOME.

(a) The Congress finds that:

(1) The President's fiscal year 2000 Federal budget proposal to impose a tax on the interest, dividends, capital gains, rents, and royalties in excess of $10,000 of trade associations and professional societies exempt under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 represents an unjust and unnecessary penalty on legitimate association activities.

(2) At a time when the Government is projecting on-budget surpluses of more than $800,000,000,000 over the next 10 years, the President proposes to increase the tax burden on trade and professional associations by $1,440,000,000 over the next 5 years.

(3) The President's association tax increase proposal will impose a tremendous burden on thousands of small and mid-sized trade associations and professional societies.

(4) Under the President's association tax increase proposal, most associations with annual oper-

ating budgets of as low as $200,000 or more will be taxed on investment income and as many as 70,000 associations nationwide could be affected by this proposal.

(5) Associations rely on this targeted investment income to carry out tax-exempt status related activities, such as training individuals to adapt to the changing workplace, improving industry safety, providing statistical data, and providing community services.

(6) Keeping investment income free from tax encourages associations to maintain modest surplus funds that cushion against economic and fiscal downturns.

(7) Corporations can increase prices to cover increased costs, while small and medium sized local, regional, and State-based associations do not have such an option, and thus increased costs imposed by the President's association tax increase would reduce resources available for the important standard setting, educational training, and professionalism training performed by associations.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that Congress shall reject the President's proposed tax increase

on investment income of associations as defined under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 358. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FUNDING FOR COUNTER-NARCOTICS INITIATIVES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) from 1985–1992, the Federal Government's drug control budget was balanced among education, treatment, law enforcement, and international supply reduction activities and this resulted in a 13-percent reduction in total drug use from 1988 to 1991;

(2) since 1992, overall drug use among teens aged 12 to 17 rose by 70 percent, cocaine and marijuana use by high school seniors rose 80 percent, and heroin use by high school seniors rose 100 percent;

(3) during this same period, the Federal investment in reducing the flow of drugs outside our borders declined both in real dollars and as a proportion of the Federal drug control budget;

(4) while the Federal Government works with State and local governments and numerous private organizations to reduce the demand for illegal drugs, seize drugs, and break down drug trafficking organizations within our borders, only the Federal Government can seize and destroy drugs outside of our borders;

(5) in an effort to restore Federal international eradication and interdiction efforts, in 1998, Congress passed the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act which authorized an additional $2,600,000,000 over 3 years for international interdiction, eradication, and alternative development activities;

(6) Congress appropriated over $800,000,000 in fiscal year 1999 for anti-drug activities authorized in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act; and

(7) the proposed Drug Free Century Act would build upon many of the initiatives authorized in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, including additional funding for the Department of Defense for counter-drug intelligence and related activities.

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

(1) funding for Federal drug control activities should be at a level higher than that proposed in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2000; and

(2) funding for Federal drug control activities should allow for investments in programs authorized in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act and in the proposed Drug Free Century Act.

SEC. 359. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MODERNIZING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS.

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

(1) The General Accounting Office has performed a comprehensive survey of the Nation's public elementary and secondary school facilities and has found severe levels of disrepair in all areas of the United States.

(2) The General Accounting Office has concluded that more than 14,000,000 children attend schools in need of extensive repair or replacement; 7,000,000 children attend schools with life safety code violations; and 12,000,000 children attend schools with leaky roofs.

(3) The General Accounting Office has found that the problem of crumbling schools transcends demographic and geographic boundaries. At 38 percent of urban schools, 30 percent of rural schools, and 29 percent of suburban schools, at least 1 building is in need of extensive repair or should be completely replaced.

(4) The condition of school facilities has a direct effect on the safety of students and teachers and on the ability of students to learn. Academic research has provided a direct correlation between the condition of school facilities and student achievement. At George-

town University, researchers have found the test scores of students assigned to schools in poor condition can be expected to fall 10.9 percentage points below the test scores of students in buildings in excellent condition. Similar studies have demonstrated up to a 20 percent improvement in test scores when students were moved from a poor facility to a new facility.

(5) The General Accounting Office has found most schools are not prepared to incorporate modern technology in the classroom. 46 percent of schools lack adequate electrical wiring to support the full-scale use of technology. More than a third of schools lack the requisite electrical power. 56 percent of schools have insufficient phone lines for modems.

(6) The Department of Education has reported that elementary and secondary school enrollment, already at a record high level, will continue to grow over the next 10 years, and that in order to accommodate this growth, the United States will need to build an additional 6,000 schools.

(7) The General Accounting Office has determined that the cost of bringing schools up to good, overall condition to be $112,000,000,000, not including the cost of modernizing schools to accommodate

technology, or the cost of building additional facilities needed to meet record enrollment levels.

(8) Schools run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) for Native American children are also in dire need of repair and renovation. The General Accounting Office has reported that the cost of total inventory repairs needed for BIA facilities is $754,000,000. The December 1997 report by the Comptroller General of the United States states that, "Compared with other schools nationally, BIA schools are generally in poorer physical condition, have more unsatisfactory environmental factors, more often lack key facilities requirements for education reform, and are less able to support computer and communications technology.

(9) State and local financing mechanisms have proven inadequate to meet the challenges facing today's aging school facilities. Large numbers of local educational agencies have difficulties securing financing for school facility improvement.

(10) The Federal Government has provided resources for school construction in the past. For example, between 1933 and 1939, the Federal Government assisted in 70 percent of all new school construction.

(11) The Federal Government can support elementary and secondary school facilities without inter-

fering in issues of local control, and should help communities leverage additional funds for the improvement of elementary and secondary school facilities.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this budget resolution assume that Congress will enact measures to assist school districts in modernizing their facilities, including—

(1) legislation to allow States and school districts to issue at least $24,800,000,000 worth of zero-interest bonds to rebuild and modernize our Nation's schools, and to provide Federal income tax credits to the purchasers of those bonds in lieu of interest payments; and

(2) appropriate funding for the Education Infrastructure Act of 1994 during the period 2000 through 2004, which would provide grants to local school districts for the repair, renovation and construction of public school facilities.

SEC. 360. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) amounts in the land and water conservation fund finance the primary Federal program for acquiring land for conservation and recreation and for

supporting State and local efforts for conservation and recreation;

(2) Congress has appropriated only $10,000,000,000 out of the more than $21,000,000,000 covered into the fund from revenues payable to the United States under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.); and

(3) 38 Senators cosigned 2 letters to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget urging that the land and water conservation fund be fully funded.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that Congress should appropriate $200,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 to provide financial assistance to the States under section 6 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C 460l–8), in addition to such amounts as are made available for Federal land acquisition under that Act for fiscal year 2000.

SEC. 361. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING SUPPORT FOR FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AND FOR THE VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION TRUST FUND.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) our Federal, State and local law enforcement officers provide essential services that preserve and protect our freedom and safety, and with the support of Federal assistance such as the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program, the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program, the COPS Program, and the Byrne Grant Program, State and local law enforcement officers have succeeded in reducing the national scourge of violent crime, illustrated by a violent crime rate that has dropped in each of the past four years;

(2) assistance, such as the Violent Offender Incarceration/Truth in Sentencing Incentive Grants, provided to State corrections systems to encourage truth in sentencing laws for violent offenders has resulted in longer time served by violent criminals and safer streets for law abiding people across the Nation;

(3) through a comprehensive effort by State and local law enforcement to attack violence against women, in concert with the efforts of dedicated volunteers and professionals who provide victim services, shelter, counseling and advocacy to battered women and their children, important strides have been made against the national scourge of violence against women;

(4) despite recent gains, the violent crime rate remains high by historical standards;

(5) Federal efforts to investigate and prosecute international terrorism and complex interstate and international crime are vital aspects of a national anticrime strategy, and should be maintained;

(6) the recent gains by Federal, State and local law enforcement in the fight against violent crime and violence against women are fragile, and continued financial commitment from the Federal Government for funding and financial assistance is required to sustain and build upon these gains; and

(7) the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, enacted as a part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, funds the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, the Violence against Women Act of 1994, and the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, without adding to the Federal budget deficit.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions and the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that the Federal Government's commitment to fund Federal law enforcement programs and programs to assist State and local efforts to combat violent crime shall be maintained, and that funding for the Violent

Crime Reduction Trust Fund shall continue to at least fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 362. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING SOCIAL SECURITY NOTCH BABIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95–216) substantially altered the way Social Security benefits are computed;

(2) those amendments resulted in disparate benefits depending upon the year in which a worker becomes eligible for benefits; and

(3) those individuals born between the years 1917 and 1926, and who are commonly referred to as "notch babies" receive benefits that are lower than those retirees who were born before or after those years.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Congress should reevaluate the benefits of workers who attain age 65 after 1981 and before 1992.

Attest:

Secretary.

106TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. CON. RES. 68

AMENDMENT

HCON 68 EAS1S——2

HCON 68 EAS1S——3

HCON 68 EAS1S——4

HCON 68 EAS1S——5

HCON 68 EAS1S——6

HCON 68 EAS1S——7

HCON 68 EAS1S——8

HCON 68 EAS1S——9

HCON 68 EAS1S——10

HCON 68 EAS1S——11

HCON 68 EAS1S——12

HCON 68 EAS1S——13

HCON 68 EAS1S——14

HCON 68 EAS1S——15