Development Appropriations Act (H.R. 1905) and the Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (H.R. 2002). Congress also cleared for the President's signature the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations Act (H.R. 2020) and the Alaska Power Administration Sale Act. (S. 395). These actions, and the expiration of continuing resolution authority on November 13, 1995, changed the current level of budget authority and outlays and revenues. In addition, the revenue aggregates have been revised pursuant to section 205(b)(2) of House Concurrent Resolution 67.

The report follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, November 16, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report for fiscal year 1996 shows the effects of Congressional action on the 1996 budget and is current through November 15, 1995. The estimates of budget authority, outlays and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 1996 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 67). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

Since my last report, dated November 8, 1995, Congress cleared and the President signed the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act Amendments of 1995 (H.R. 1103). The President has also signed the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act (H.R. 1905) and the Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (H.R. 2002). Congress also cleared for the President's signature the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations Act (H.R. 2020) and the Alaska Power Administration Sale Act (S. 395). These actions, and the expiration of continuing resolution authority on November 13, 1995, changed the current level of budget authority, outlays and revenues. In addition, at the request of the Senate Committee on the Budget, the revenue estimates for the concurrent resolution have been revised, pursuant to Section 205(b)(2) of H. Con. Res. 67.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL.

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, FISCAL YEAR 1996, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS NOVEMBER 15, 1995

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 67)	Current level [1]	Current level over/under resolution
ON-BUDGET			
Budget authority	1,285.5	896.1	−389.4
Outlays	1,288.1	1,063.3	−224.8
Revenues: [2]			
1996	1,036.8	1,042.5	5.7
1996–2000	5,543.7	5,690.8	147.0
Deficit	251.3	20.8	−230.5
Debt subject to limit	5,210.7	4,898.9	−311.8
OFF-BUDGET			
Social Security outlays:			
1996	299.4	299.4	0
1996–2000	1,626.5	1,626.5	0
Social Security revenues:			
1996	374.7	374.7	0

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, FISCAL YEAR 1996, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS NOVEMBER 15, 1995—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 67)	Current level [1]	Current level over/under resolution
1996–2000	2,061.0	2,061.0	0

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

[2] The revised revenue aggregate for the Budget Resolution is effective for the purposes of consideration of H.R. 2491, the Balanced Budget Act of 1995.

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS NOVEMBER 15, 1995

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues			1,042,557
Permanents and other spending legislation	830,272	798,924	
Appropriation legislation		242,052	
Offsetting receipts	(200,017)	(200,017)	
Total previously enacted	630,254	840,958	1,042,557
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
Appropriation bills:			
1995 Rescissions and Department of Defense Emergency Supplementals Act (P.L. 104–6)	(100)	(885)	
1995 Rescissions and Emergency Supplementals for Disaster Assistance	22	(3,149)	
Agriculture (P.L. 104–37)	62,602	45,620	
Energy and Water (H.R. 1905)	19,336	11,502	
Military Construction (P.L. 104–32)	11,177	3,110	
Transportation (H.R. 2002)	12,682	11,899	
Authorization bills:			
Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (P.L. 104–42)	1	1	
Fishermen's Protective Act Amendments of 1995 (P.L. 104–43)		(*)	
Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act Amendments of 1995 (H.R. 1103)	1	(*)	1
Self-Employed Health Insurance Act (P.L. 104–7)	(18)	(18)	(101)
Total enacted this session	105,704	68,080	(100)
PENDING SIGNATURE			
Appropriations bills:			
Legislative Branch (H.R. 2492)	2,125	1,977	
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government (H.R. 2020)	23,026	20,530	
Authorization bills:			
Alaska Power Administration Sale Act (S. 395)	(20)	(20)	
Total pending signature	25,132	22,488	
ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	135,049	131,736	
Total Current Level [1]	896,139	1,063,262	1,042,457
Total Budget Resolution	1,285,500	1,288,100	1,036,780
Amount remaining:			
Under Budget Resolution	389,361	224,838	
Over Budget Resolution			5,677

* Less than $500,000.

[1] In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include $3,400 million in budget authority and $1,590 million in outlays for funding of emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress.

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

HOUSE GIFT BAN ACTION

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to comment on what happened last night in the other body with respect to the issue of banning gifts to Members of Congress.

As my colleagues will recall, we had a very spirited and very contentious debate on this issue just a few short months ago. We started with a proposal from the previous Congress, which would have banned gifts and meals from lobbyists and allowed some gifts from non-lobbyists.

As a counterproposal, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] offered a set of rules on gifts, that most of us recognized as being not much of a reform effort. That proposal, in fact, would have allowed a Senator to accept an unlimited number of gifts under $100. By my math, if a Senator accepted a $100 gift from a single lobbyist every day of the year, that proposal would have allowed a Senator to accept $36,500 worth of gifts, at least, from a single lobbyist.

Recognizing how far apart the two sides were, my friend, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] stepped forward with a thoughtful compromise, which essentially applied the executive branch gift rules to the U.S. Senate. The Senator from Arizona argued that what was good for the Secretary of State was good for a U.S. Senator, and of course, he was right.

After much good-faith negotiating, we ended up with a set of new gift rules that passed this body by a vote of 98 to nothing. It was a tough, fair and bipartisan compromise. Those new rules, effective this January 1, will do the following:

First, Senators will be prohibited from accepting any gift with a value of more than $50. Moreover, Senators may not accept from any single source—lobbyists or non-lobbyists—more than $100 total in gifts under $50. Gifts under $10 will not count towards this $100 annual cap. We have also banned all travel that is substantially recreational in nature, including these so-called charity trips that often double as expense-paid vacations for Members and their spouses.

But the key, Mr. President, to what we did in July, was that for the first time there is an aggregate cap on how many gifts Senators can accept from a single source. They cannot accept $36,500 in gifts from a single lobbyist and they cannot be wined and dined by the same lobbyist more than a couple times a year.

Last night, I am pleased to report, the House of Representatives took on the issue of banning gifts, and successfully passed legislation that on a strong bipartisan vote that will essentially ban gifts to Members of the House.

Interestingly, the debate in the House was not all that different to the debate we had here in the Senate. The House began with the Senate-passed

language—that was the underlying language. But much like what happened here in the Senate, there was an effort by the Gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] to gut the Senate-passed language and merely provide for phantom reform.

Had the Burton amendment passed, the House would have passed something that its supporters would have liked to have called a gift ban, but what in reality would have been an enshrinement of the outrageous degree of gift giving that takes place in this city.

Current House rules allow Members to accept up to $250 worth of gifts from a single source. However, gifts under $100 do not count against that aggregate limit. The Burton amendment would have continued the current $250 cap, but would have now stated that gifts under $50 would not count against the cap.

So instead of being allowed to accept at least $36,500 worth of gifts from a single lobbyist per year, a Member could have accepted at least $18,250 worth of gifts from a single lobbyist per year. For the proponents of the Burton amendment, that was their idea of reform.

It would have said to the American people that it is perfectly acceptable for Members of the House to accept an unlimited number of gifts from lobbyists. Thankfully, Mr. President, the Burton amendment met the same fate as the original McConnell proposal. The Burton amendment was, in fact, obliterated on the House floor by a vote of 276–154.

Republicans and Democrats alike in the House stood up and said that they were not going to continue the status quo, they were not going to snub their noses at the American people, and they were going to finally give the American people the kind of gift reform they have been asking for some time now.

The House, in fact, went on to pass a watertight gift ban, one very similar to the rule of the Wisconsin State Legislature which essentially prohibits legislators from accepting anything of value. By an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 422–6, the House passed a new gift rule that is essentially a zero-tolerance rule. It prohibits the acceptance of free gifts, meals and recreational trips.

There is no $10 de minimis. There is no $50 limit on single gifts and there is no $100 limit on aggregate gifts. The House, beginning January 1, will simply prohibit the acceptance of any gifts, other than those of little intrinsic value.

For 20 years, Mr. President, the Wisconsin State Legislature has lived under such a zero-tolerance policy and has achieved a national reputation for its sense of ethics and integrity government. Since I came to the U.S. Senate, my office has lived under these Wisconsin rules, and we have essentially created a gift-free zone in our Senate office building. It has been our experience that it is not all that difficult to say ''no thanks'' to the lobbyists.

Though long overdue, this represents another step on the road to meaningful reform of our political process, and I offer my strongest praise and commendation for the actions taken by our colleagues in the House last night.

As I have said countless times since I first set foot in Washington nearly 3 years ago, it is my preference that the Senate also abide by these Wisconsin-style rules. No gifts, no trips, no free meals. Those are the rules my office lives by and those are the rules that the Wisconsin Legislature has had in place for 20 years.

If the Senate rules can one day be changed so we are on equal ground with the House, I will be the first to stand up and fight for such a change. But the Senate rules are tough, they are fair, and they will have a profound impact on changing the culture of special interest influence that has pervaded this institution for so many years.

I want to briefly acknowledge some of my colleagues in the other body, from both sides of the aisle, who fought the good fight and were instrumental in the House's successful effort. I want to thank Congressman JOHN BRYANT for his longstanding leadership on this issue, as well as Representatives CHRIS SHAYS and TOM BARRETT, who recognized how important bipartisan cooperation and compromise is to this process.

Mr. President, the fight to reform the ways of Washington is far from over. The gift ban is just the first skirmish. We will insist on passage of lobbying reform legislation. We will insist that the Congress take up legislation to shut down the revolving door between public service and special access lobbying. And most important, we will insist that the Congress take up meaningful and comprehensive campaign finance reform.

Like the gift rules that have now passed both the House and Senate, none of these efforts will be successful without bipartisan leadership. Reforming this institution, and working to restore the faith and trust of the American people should not be a partisan issue. It does not make you a good Democrat, or a good Republican—it simply makes you a good American.●

TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

● Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I made a pledge to the people of my State last year that I would fight hard in the U.S. Senate to limit Government spending, reduce taxes, and cut the size of Government. I did not say that just to get elected. I did not say it just to compromise once I got to Washington. I meant what I said.

Mr. President, our government has been spending the Nation into bankruptcy. It has been taxing our people into mediocrity. By trying to do too much for all of us, it has—in the words of former Education Secretary Bill Bennett, ''created inefficiency, sapped individual responsibility, and intruded on personal liberty.''

The people of Arizona—the people of the United States—did not send us here to split the difference with the President when it comes to limiting spending, cutting taxes, or balancing the budget. In fact, they tossed out the Members of Congress whose only solution was the President's solution: to tax more, spend more, and expand Government. They did not send us here for more of the same.

The American people sent us here to make the difficult decisions to put our Nation's fiscal house in order, and they expect us to do it. As of this morning, calls and faxes to my office were running 10-to-1 in support of our staying the course. The great majority know this is crunch time; that it is no time for weak knees and hand-wringing.

Mr. President, this is the fourth day of the Government's partial shutdown, and do you know what? The sky has not fallen. The economy has not collapsed. People have not stopped sending their kids to school, volunteering in their communities, or doing their part to clean up the environment. I suspect that many people haven't even noticed that the Government has been shut down.

Now I know the shutdown has caused hardship and anxiety for many Federal employees. We did not ask for that to happen. Congress passed legislation earlier this week to keep them on the job and keep them paid. The President vetoed that bill and sent them home.

We passed a second bill yesterday to try to get Federal employees back to work—to process Social Security claims and VA widows' benefits, to pay our military, and fund educational and environmental clean-up activities. The bill will ensure that these employees are paid before the holidays, but the President has said that he will veto it, too. In fact, President Clinton is threatening to keep parts of the Government shut down, ''even if it is 90 days, 120 days or 180 days.'' Talk about blackmail: it is the President who is holding the Government hostage until Congress gives him more of the American people's money to spend.

If President Clinton is so bound and determined to prolong this suspension, maybe we should ask ourselves why he thinks he can get away with it. The President's own Office of Management and Budget has determined that 67 percent of the Commerce Department's staff was ''non-essential'' and sent them home. OMB determined that 99 percent—that is right, 99 percent—of the staff at the Department of Housing and Urban Development was non-essential. It determined that 89 percent of the Education Department's staff was non-essential. That is according to President Clinton's own Office of Management and Budget.