

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives*
2 *concurring)*

3 **SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET**
4 **FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.**

5 (a) DECLARATION.—Congress determines and de-
6 clares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on
7 the budget for fiscal year 1999 including the appropriate
8 budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and
9 2003 as required by section 301 of the Congressional
10 Budget Act of 1974 and revising the budgetary levels for
11 fiscal year 1998 set forth in the concurrent resolution on
12 the budget for fiscal year 1998 as authorized by section
13 304 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Social Security.

Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

- Sec. 201. Tax cut reserve fund.
- Sec. 202. Tobacco reserve fund.
- Sec. 203. Separate environmental allocation.
- Sec. 204. Dedication of offsets to transportation.
- Sec. 205. Adjustments for line item veto litigation.
- Sec. 206. Extension of Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.
- Sec. 207. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS AND THE SENATE

- Sec. 301. Sense of the Senate regarding passage of the Senate Finance Committee's IRS restructuring bill.
- Sec. 302. Sense of Congress regarding the sunset of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.
- Sec. 303. Sense of Congress on the tax treatment of home mortgage interest and charitable giving.
- Sec. 304. Sense of the Senate on preservation of Social Security for the future.
- Sec. 305. Sense of the Senate on annual statement of accrued liability of Social Security and Medicare.
- Sec. 306. Sense of the Senate on full funding for IDEA.
- Sec. 307. Sense of the Senate on Social Security.
- Sec. 308. Sense of the Senate on School-to-Work programs.
- Sec. 309. Sense of the Senate regarding taxpayer rights.
- Sec. 310. Sense of the Senate on National Guard funding.
- Sec. 311. Sense of the Senate on Medicare payment.
- Sec. 312. Sense of the Senate on long-term care.
- Sec. 313. Sense of the Senate on climate change research and other funding.
- Sec. 314. Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant.
- Sec. 315. Sense of the Senate on the formula change for Federal Family Education Loan.
- Sec. 316. Sense of the Senate regarding the deductibility of health insurance premiums of the self-employed.
- Sec. 317. Sense of the Senate on objection to Kyoto Protocol implementation prior to Senate ratification.
- Sec. 318. Sense of the Senate on price increase on tobacco products of \$1.50 per pack.
- Sec. 319. Findings; sense of Congress.
- Sec. 320. Sense of the Senate concerning immunity.
- Sec. 321. Sense of Senate regarding agricultural trade programs.
- Sec. 322. Sense of the Senate supporting long-term entitlement reforms.
- Sec. 323. Sense of Congress regarding freedom of health care choice for Medicare seniors.
- Sec. 324. Sense of the Senate regarding repair and construction needs of Indian schools.
- Sec. 325. Sense of the Senate on Social Security personal retirement accounts and the budget surplus.
- Sec. 326. Sense of the Senate regarding the elimination of the marriage penalty.
- Sec. 327. Findings and sense of Congress regarding affordable, high-quality health care for seniors.
- Sec. 328. Sense of Congress regarding permanent extension of income averaging for farmers.
- Sec. 329. Sense of the Senate to maintain full funding for the Section 202 Elderly Housing program.

- Sec. 330. Sense of the Senate regarding outlay estimates of the Department of Defense budget.
- Sec. 331. Sense of the Senate regarding outlay estimates for the budgets of Federal agencies other than the Department of Defense.
- Sec. 332. Sense of the Senate regarding an evaluation of the outcome of welfare reform.
- Sec. 333. Sense of the Senate regarding the establishment of a national background check system for long-term care workers.
- Sec. 334. Sense of the Senate on expanding Medicare benefits.
- Sec. 335. Sense of the Senate on battlefield preservation.
- Sec. 336. A resolution regarding the Senate's support for Federal, State and local law enforcement.
- Sec. 337. Sense of the Senate on analysis of civilian science and technology programs in the Federal budget.
- Sec. 338. Sense of the Senate on civilian science and technology programs in the Federal budget.
- Sec. 339. Sense of the Senate on long-term budgeting and repayment of the public debt.
- Sec. 340. Sense of the Senate regarding President's budget.
- Sec. 341. Sense of the Senate regarding the value of the Social Security system for future retirees.
- Sec. 342. Sense of the Senate on the Land and Water Conservation Fund.
- Sec. 343. Sense of the Senate on education goals.
- Sec. 344. Findings and sense of the Senate.
- Sec. 345. Sense of the Senate on INS circuit riders in the former Soviet Union.
- Sec. 346. Sense of the Senate regarding funding for the airport improvement program.
- Sec. 347. Sense of the Senate that the One Hundred Fifth Congress, Second Session should reauthorize funds for the farmland protection program.
- Sec. 348. Sense of the Senate on health care quality.
- Sec. 349. Sense of the Senate regarding wasteful spending in Defense Department acquisition practices.
- Sec. 350. Sense of the Senate regarding the United States response to the changing nature of terrorism.
- Sec. 351. Sense of the Senate on economic growth, Social Security, and Government efficiency.
- Sec. 352. Sense of the Senate regarding a supermajority requirement for raising taxes.
- Sec. 353. Sense of the Senate on health care quality.
- Sec. 354. Sense of the Senate on the use of budget surplus for tax relief or debt reduction.
- Sec. 355. Use of budget surplus to reform Social Security.
- Sec. 356. Sense of the Senate on Colombian drug war helicopters.
- Sec. 357. Sense of the Senate on funding for medical care for veterans.
- Sec. 358. Sense of the Senate on objection to the use of the sale of public lands to fund certain programs.
- Sec. 359. Sense of the Senate regarding a multinational alliance against drug trafficking.
- Sec. 360. Sense of the Senate regarding legislation that increases complexity of tax returns.
- Sec. 361. General prohibition on the use of marijuana for medicinal purposes.
- Sec. 362. Sense of the Senate regarding Amtrak funding.
- Sec. 363. Sense of the Senate regarding market access program.

Sec. 364. Sense of the Senate regarding the National Institutes of Health.

Sec. 365. Sense of the Senate regarding display of Ten Commandments.

1 **TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

2 **SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

3 The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the
4 fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003.

5 (1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the en-
6 forcement of this resolution—

7 (A) The recommended levels of Federal reve-
8 nues are as follows:

9 Fiscal year 1998: \$1,262,400,000,000.

10 Fiscal year 1999: \$1,300,200,000,000.

11 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,325,800,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,369,400,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,431,900,000,000.

14 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,486,900,000,000.

15 (B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels
16 of Federal revenues should be changed are as fol-
17 lows:

18 Fiscal year 1998: \$0.

19 Fiscal year 1999: \$0.

20 Fiscal year 2000: \$0.

21 Fiscal year 2001: \$0.

22 Fiscal year 2002: \$0.

23 Fiscal year 2003: \$0.

1 (C) The amounts for Federal Insurance Con-
 2 tributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within
 3 the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as
 4 follows:

5 Fiscal year 1998: \$117,700,000,000.

6 Fiscal year 1999: \$123,900,000,000.

7 Fiscal year 2000: \$129,700,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2001: \$135,300,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2002: \$141,400,000,000.

10 Fiscal year 2003: \$148,100,000,000.

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

14 Fiscal year 1998: \$1,374,700,000,000.

15 Fiscal year 1999: \$1,425,300,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,471,100,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,513,200,000,000.

18 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,547,200,000,000.

19 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,615,800,000,000.

20 (3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforce-
 21 ment of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total
 22 budget outlays are as follows:

23 Fiscal year 1998: \$1,358,000,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 1999: \$1,408,400,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,450,100,000,000.

1 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,490,000,000,000.

2 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,507,000,000,000.

3 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,579,200,000,000.

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

6 Fiscal year 1998: —\$95,600,000,000.

7 Fiscal year 1999: —\$108,200,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2000: —\$124,300,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2001: —\$120,600,000,000.

10 Fiscal year 2002: —\$75,100,000,000.

11 Fiscal year 2003: —\$92,300,000,000.

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

14 Fiscal year 1998: \$5,482,000,000,000.

15 Fiscal year 1999: \$5,668,300,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2000: \$5,868,700,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2001: \$6,064,400,000,000.

18 Fiscal year 2002: \$6,220,000,000,000.

19 Fiscal year 2003: \$6,392,700,000,000.

20 **SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.**

21 (a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of
22 Senate enforcement under sections 302, 602, and 311 of
23 the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of
24 revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance

1 Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust
2 Fund are as follows:

3 Fiscal year 1998: \$417,300,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 1999: \$438,200,000,000.

5 Fiscal year 2000: \$457,800,000,000.

6 Fiscal year 2001: \$477,100,000,000.

7 Fiscal year 2002: \$497,900,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2003: \$520,700,000,000.

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

15 Fiscal year 1998: \$313,300,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 1999: \$212,600,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2000: \$331,600,000,000.

18 Fiscal year 2001: \$344,100,000,000.

19 Fiscal year 2002: \$355,700,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2003: \$369,400,000,000.

21 **SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

22 Congress determines and declares that the appro-
23 priate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new
24 direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee

1 commitments for fiscal years 1998 through 2003 for each
2 major functional category are:

3 (1) National Defense (050):

4 Fiscal year 1998:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$267,700,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$268,100,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 1999:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$270,500,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$265,500,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2000:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$274,300,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$268,000,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2001:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$280,800,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$269,700,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2002:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$288,600,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$272,100,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2003:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$296,800,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$279,800,000,000.

4 (2) International Affairs (150):

5 Fiscal year 1998:

6 (A) New budget authority,
7 \$15,200,000,000.

8 (B) Outlays, \$14,100,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 1999:

10 (A) New budget authority,
11 \$14,600,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, \$14,200,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2000:

14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$14,300,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$14,700,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2001:

18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$15,100,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2002:

22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$15,200,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2003:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$15,200,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$14,400,000,000.

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

5 Fiscal year 1998:

6 (A) New budget authority,
7 \$18,000,000,000.

8 (B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 1999:

10 (A) New budget authority,
11 \$18,300,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, \$17,900,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2000:

14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$17,800,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$17,900,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2001:

18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$17,700,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$17,600,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2002:

22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$17,300,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$17,400,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2003:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$17,000,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.

4 (4) Energy (270):

5 Fiscal year 1998:

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

7 (B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 1999:

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

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

11 Fiscal year 2000:

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

13 (B) Outlays, \$0.

14 Fiscal year 2001:

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

16 (B) Outlays, -\$200,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2002:

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

19 (B) Outlays, -\$400,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

23 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

24 Fiscal year 1998:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$24,200,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$23,000,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 1999:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$23,400,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$23,400,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2000:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$23,300,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$23,500,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2001:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$23,000,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$23,400,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2002:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$22,900,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$23,000,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2003:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$22,900,000,000.

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

24 (6) Agriculture (350):

25 Fiscal year 1998:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$11,800,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$10,800,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 1999:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$12,000,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$10,500,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2000:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$11,600,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$9,900,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2001:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$10,300,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$8,700,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2002:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$10,200,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$8,500,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2003:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$10,400,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$8,800,000,000.

24 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

25 Fiscal year 1998:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$7,300,000,000.

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

4 Fiscal year 1999:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$4,200,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$3,200,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2000:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$15,100,000,000.

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

12 Fiscal year 2001:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$15,300,000,000.

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

16 Fiscal year 2002:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$15,600,000,000.

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

20 Fiscal year 2003:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$14,900,000,000.

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

24 (8) Transportation (400):

25 Fiscal year 1998:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$46,000,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$42,500,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 1999:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$51,500,000,000.

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

8 Fiscal year 2000:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$51,800,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$44,700,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2001:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$52,100,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$45,700,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2002:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$51,400,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$45,800,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2003:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$52,000,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$46,900,000,000.

24 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):

25 Fiscal year 1998:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 \$8,700,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$11,200,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 1999:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 \$8,700,000,000.

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

8 Fiscal year 2000:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 \$7,900,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$9,700,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2001:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 \$7,600,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$8,900,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2002:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 \$7,600,000,000.

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

20 Fiscal year 2003:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 \$7,600,000,000.

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

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

1 Fiscal year 1998:
2 (A) New budget authority,
3 \$61,300,000,000.
4 (B) Outlays, \$56,100,000,000.
5 Fiscal year 1999:
6 (A) New budget authority,
7 \$63,050,000,000.
8 (B) Outlays, \$61,006,000,000.
9 Fiscal year 2000:
10 (A) New budget authority,
11 \$63,350,000,000.
12 (B) Outlays, \$62,740,000,000.
13 Fiscal year 2001:
14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$64,550,000,000.
16 (B) Outlays, \$63,849,000,000.
17 Fiscal year 2002:
18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$64,950,000,000.
20 (B) Outlays, \$63,750,000,000.
21 Fiscal year 2003:
22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$68,450,000,000.
24 (B) Outlays, \$67,150,000,000.
25 (11) Health (550):

1 Fiscal year 1998:

2 (A) New budget authority,

3 \$136,200,000,000.

4 (B) Outlays, \$132,000,000,000.

5 Fiscal year 1999:

6 (A) New budget authority,

7 \$145,800,000,000.

8 (B) Outlays, \$143,700,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2000:

10 (A) New budget authority,

11 \$152,600,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, \$151,600,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2001:

14 (A) New budget authority,

15 \$161,500,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$160,400,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2002:

18 (A) New budget authority,

19 \$170,100,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$169,900,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2003:

22 (A) New budget authority,

23 \$181,200,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$181,100,000,000.

25 (12) Medicare (570):

1 Fiscal year 1998:
2 (A) New budget authority,
3 \$199,200,000,000.
4 (B) Outlays, \$199,700,000,000.

5 Fiscal year 1999:
6 (A) New budget authority,
7 \$210,300,000,000.
8 (B) Outlays, \$210,900,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2000:
10 (A) New budget authority,
11 \$221,800,000,000.
12 (B) Outlays, \$221,100,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2001:
14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$239,400,000,000.
16 (B) Outlays, \$242,300,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2002:
18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$251,200,000,000.
20 (B) Outlays, \$248,800,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2003:
22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$273,400,000,000.
24 (B) Outlays, \$273,600,000,000.

25 (13) Income Security (600):

1 Fiscal year 1998:

2 (A) New budget authority,

3 \$229,500,000,000.

4 (B) Outlays, \$234,700,000,000.

5 Fiscal year 1999:

6 (A) New budget authority,

7 \$243,300,000,000.

8 (B) Outlays, \$248,100,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2000:

10 (A) New budget authority,

11 \$257,300,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, \$259,400,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2001:

14 (A) New budget authority,

15 \$268,500,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, \$266,700,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2002:

18 (A) New budget authority,

19 \$279,200,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, \$274,200,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2003:

22 (A) New budget authority,

23 \$289,800,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, \$282,400,000,000.

25 (14) Social Security (650):

1 Fiscal year 1998:
2 (A) New budget authority,
3 \$12,000,000,000.
4 (B) Outlays, \$12,200,000,000.
5 Fiscal year 1999:
6 (A) New budget authority,
7 \$12,600,000,000.
8 (B) Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.
9 Fiscal year 2000:
10 (A) New budget authority,
11 \$13,100,000,000.
12 (B) Outlays, \$13,100,000,000.
13 Fiscal year 2001:
14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$12,500,000,000.
16 (B) Outlays, \$12,500,000,000.
17 Fiscal year 2002:
18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$14,500,000,000.
20 (B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
21 Fiscal year 2003:
22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$15,300,000,000.
24 (B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.
25 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

1 Fiscal year 1998:
2 (A) New budget authority,
3 \$42,600,000,000.
4 (B) Outlays, \$42,500,000,000.
5 Fiscal year 1999:
6 (A) New budget authority,
7 \$42,800,000,000.
8 (B) Outlays, \$43,300,000,000.
9 Fiscal year 2000:
10 (A) New budget authority,
11 \$43,400,000,000.
12 (B) Outlays, \$44,000,000,000.
13 Fiscal year 2001:
14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$44,800,000,000.
16 (B) Outlays, \$45,200,000,000.
17 Fiscal year 2002:
18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$46,200,000,000.
20 (B) Outlays, \$46,600,000,000.
21 Fiscal year 2003:
22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$48,200,000,000.
24 (B) Outlays, \$48,600,000,000.
25 (16) Administration of Justice (750):

1 Fiscal year 1998:
2 (A) New budget authority,
3 \$25,100,000,000.
4 (B) Outlays, \$22,500,000,000.
5 Fiscal year 1999:
6 (A) New budget authority,
7 \$25,800,000,000.
8 (B) Outlays, \$24,600,000,000.
9 Fiscal year 2000:
10 (A) New budget authority,
11 \$24,500,000,000.
12 (B) Outlays, \$24,900,000,000.
13 Fiscal year 2001:
14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$24,500,000,000.
16 (B) Outlays, \$24,800,000,000.
17 Fiscal year 2002:
18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$24,700,000,000.
20 (B) Outlays, \$24,300,000,000.
21 Fiscal year 2003:
22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$25,000,000,000.
24 (B) Outlays, \$24,200,000,000.
25 (17) General Government (800):

1 Fiscal year 1998:
2 (A) New budget authority,
3 \$14,500,000,000.
4 (B) Outlays, \$14,300,000,000.
5 Fiscal year 1999:
6 (A) New budget authority,
7 \$14,400,000,000.
8 (B) Outlays, \$13,400,000,000.
9 Fiscal year 2000:
10 (A) New budget authority,
11 \$13,900,000,000.
12 (B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.
13 Fiscal year 2001:
14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$13,600,000,000.
16 (B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.
17 Fiscal year 2002:
18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$13,400,000,000.
20 (B) Outlays, \$13,600,000,000.
21 Fiscal year 2003:
22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$13,500,000,000.
24 (B) Outlays, \$13,500,000,000.
25 (18) Net Interest (900):

1 Fiscal year 1998:
2 (A) New budget authority,
3 \$291,600,000,000.
4 (B) Outlays, \$291,600,000,000.

5 Fiscal year 1999:
6 (A) New budget authority,
7 \$300,100,000,000.
8 (B) Outlays, \$300,100,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2000:
10 (A) New budget authority,
11 \$301,700,000,000.
12 (B) Outlays, \$301,700,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2001:
14 (A) New budget authority,
15 \$302,100,000,000.
16 (B) Outlays, \$302,100,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2002:
18 (A) New budget authority,
19 \$302,600,000,000.
20 (B) Outlays, \$302,600,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2003:
22 (A) New budget authority,
23 \$304,900,000,000.
24 (B) Outlays, \$304,900,000,000.

25 (19) Allowances (920):

1 Fiscal year 1998:

2 (A) New budget authority, — \$0.

3 (B) Outlays, — \$0.

4 Fiscal year 1999:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 — \$300,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, — \$1,900,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2000:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 — \$1,200,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, — \$4,600,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2001:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 — \$2,700,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, — \$3,000,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2002:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 — \$3,800,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, — \$7,000,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2003:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 — \$5,400,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, — \$5,000,000,000.

24 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

25 Fiscal year 1998:

1 (A) New budget authority,
2 – \$36,700,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, – \$36,700,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 1999:

5 (A) New budget authority,
6 – \$36,300,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, – \$36,300,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2000:

9 (A) New budget authority,
10 – \$36,000,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, – \$36,000,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2001:

13 (A) New budget authority,
14 – \$37,900,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, – \$37,900,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2002:

17 (A) New budget authority,
18 – \$45,000,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, – \$45,000,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2003:

21 (A) New budget authority,
22 – \$35,700,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, – \$35,700,000,000.

1 **TITLE II—BUDGETARY**
2 **RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING**

3 **SEC. 201. TAX CUT RESERVE FUND.**

4 (a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spend-
5 ing aggregates may only be reduced and allocations may
6 be reduced only for legislation that reduces revenues by
7 providing family tax relief (including relief from the “mar-
8 riage penalty” and support for child care expenses in-
9 curred by all parents), and incentives to stimulate savings,
10 investment, job creation, and economic growth (including
11 community renewal initiatives) if such legislation will not
12 increase the deficit or reduce the surplus for—

- 13 (1) fiscal year 1999;
14 (2) the period of fiscal years 1999–2003; or
15 (3) the period of fiscal years 2004–2008.

16 (b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the consideration
17 of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of
18 the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with
19 the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section
20 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and re-
21 vised aggregates to carry out this section. These revised
22 allocations and aggregates shall be considered for the pur-
23 poses of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as alloca-
24 tions and aggregates contained in this resolution.

1 **SEC. 202. TOBACCO RESERVE FUND.**

2 (a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue aggregates
3 may be increased for legislation which reserves the Federal
4 share of receipts from tobacco legislation only for the
5 Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

6 (b) REVISED AGGREGATES.—Upon the consideration
7 of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of
8 the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file in-
9 creased aggregates to carry out this section. These aggre-
10 gates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congres-
11 sional Budget Act of 1974 as the aggregates contained
12 in this resolution.

13 (c) APPLICATION OF SECTION 202 OF H. CON. RES.
14 67.—For the purposes of enforcement of section 202 of
15 H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) with respect to this
16 resolution, the increase in receipts resulting from tobacco
17 legislation shall not be taken into account.

18 **SEC. 203. SEPARATE ENVIRONMENTAL ALLOCATION.**

19 (a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spend-
20 ing aggregates may be increased and allocations may be
21 increased only for legislation that reauthorizes and re-
22 forms the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of
23 hazardous waste sites if such legislation will not increase
24 the deficit or reduce the surplus for—

25 (1) fiscal year 1999;

26 (2) the period of fiscal years 1999–2003; or

1 (3) the period of fiscal years 2004–2008.

2 (b) REVISED AGGREGATES.—In the Senate, after the
3 Committee on Environment and Public Works reports a
4 bill (or after the submission of a conference report there-
5 on) to reform the Superfund program to facilitate the
6 cleanup of hazardous waste sites that does not exceed—

7 (1) \$200,000,000 in budget authority and out-
8 lays for fiscal year 1999; and

9 (2) \$1,000,000,000 in budget authority and
10 outlays for the period of fiscal years 1999 through
11 2003;

12 the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Sen-
13 ate may increase the appropriate aggregates and the ap-
14 propriate allocations of budget authority in this resolution
15 by the amounts provided in that bill for that purpose and
16 the outlays flowing in all years from such budget author-
17 ity. These revised allocations and aggregates shall be con-
18 sidered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act
19 of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this
20 resolution.

21 **SEC. 204. DEDICATION OF OFFSETS TO TRANSPORTATION.**

22 (a) SPENDING RESERVE.—In accordance with sec-
23 tion 312(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and
24 for the purposes of title III of that Act, the Chairman
25 of the Committee on the Budget may reserve the esti-

1 mated reductions in new budget authority and outlays re-
2 sulting from changes in legislation affecting the programs
3 specified in subsection (b), if contained in the Department
4 of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations
5 Act, for the purpose of offsetting—

6 (1) additional outlays not to exceed
7 \$1,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1999 and
8 \$18,500,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003
9 for discretionary highway programs as called for in
10 the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency
11 Act of 1998; and

12 (2) additional budget authority not to exceed
13 \$1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1999 and
14 \$5,000,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003
15 for discretionary transit programs as called for in
16 the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency
17 Act of 1998.

18 (b) OFFSETS.—The following reductions in manda-
19 tory spending are reserved in function 920, Allowances,
20 for purposes of subsection (a):

21 (1) For reductions in programs in function 350,
22 Agriculture: For fiscal year 1999, \$107,000,000 in
23 budget authority and \$107,000,000 in outlays; For
24 fiscal years 1999–2003, \$603,000,000 in budget au-
25 thority and \$598,000,000 in outlays.

1 (2) For reductions in programs in function 370,
2 Commerce and Housing Credit: For fiscal year
3 1999, \$242,000,000 in budget authority and
4 \$242,000,000 in outlays; For fiscal years 1999–
5 2003, \$1,195,000,000 in budget authority and
6 \$1,195,000,000 in outlays.

7 (3) For reductions in programs in function 500,
8 Education, Training, Employment, and Social Serv-
9 ices: For fiscal year 1999, \$471,000,000 in budget
10 authority and \$424,000,000 in outlays; For fiscal
11 years 1999–2003, \$3,182,000,000 in budget author-
12 ity and \$3,079,000,000 in outlays.

13 (4) For reductions in programs in function 550,
14 Health: For fiscal year 1999, \$250,000,000 in budg-
15 et authority and \$250,000,000 in outlays; For fiscal
16 years 1999–2003, \$1,900,000,000 in budget author-
17 ity and \$1,900,000,000 in outlays.

18 (5) For reductions in programs in function 600,
19 Income Security: For fiscal year 1999,
20 \$260,000,000 in budget authority and \$260,000,000
21 in outlays; For fiscal years 1999–2003,
22 \$1,700,000,000 in budget authority and
23 \$1,700,000,000 in outlays.

24 (6) For reductions in programs in function 700,
25 Veterans Benefits and Services: For fiscal year

1 1999, \$500,000,000 in budget authority and
2 \$500,000,000 in outlays; For fiscal years 1999–
3 2003, \$10,500,000,000 in budget authority and
4 \$10,500,000,000 in outlays.

5 (c) SENSE OF THE SENATE ON VA COMPENSATION
6 AND POST-SERVICE SMOKING-RELATED ILLNESSES.—

7 (1) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

8 (A) the President has twice included in his
9 budgets a prohibition on the entitlement expan-
10 sion that the Department of Veterans Affairs
11 (referred to as the “VA”) is proposing to allow
12 post-service smoking-related illness to be eligible
13 for VA compensation;

14 (B) Congress has never acted on this enti-
15 tlement expansion;

16 (C) the Congressional Budget Office and
17 the Office of Management and Budget have
18 concluded that this change in VA policy would
19 result in at least \$10,000,000,000 over 5 years
20 and \$45,000,000,000 over 10 years in addi-
21 tional mandatory costs to the VA;

22 (D) these increased number of claims and
23 the resulting costs may present undue delay
24 and hardship on veterans seeking claim review;

1 (E) the entitlement expansion apparently
2 runs counter to all existing VA policy, including
3 a statement by former Secretary Brown that
4 “It is inappropriate to compensate for death or
5 disability resulting from veterans’ personal
6 choice to engage in conduct damaging to their
7 health.”; and

8 (F) Secretary Brown’s comment was re-
9 cently reaffirmed by Acting Secretary of Vet-
10 erans Affairs Togo West, who stated “It has
11 been the position of the Department and of my
12 predecessor that the decision to use tobacco by
13 service members is a personal decision and is
14 not a requirement for military service. And that
15 therefore to compensate veterans for diseases
16 whose sole connection to service is a veteran’s
17 own tobacco use should not rest with the Gov-
18 ernment.”.

19 (2) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of
20 the Senate that the function totals and assumptions
21 underlying this resolution assume the following:

22 (A) The support of the President’s pro-
23 posal to not allow post-service smoking related
24 illnesses to be eligible for VA.

1 (B) The study and report required by sub-
2 paragraph (C) will be completed.

3 (C) The Secretary of the Department of
4 Veterans Affairs, the Office of Management and
5 Budget, and the General Accounting Office are
6 jointly required to—

7 (i) jointly study (referred to in this
8 section as the “study”) the VA General
9 Counsel’s determination and the resulting
10 actions to change the compensation rules
11 to include disability and death benefits for
12 conditions related to the use of tobacco
13 products during service; and

14 (ii) deliver an opinion as to whether
15 illnesses resulting from post-service smok-
16 ing should be considered as a compensable
17 disability.

18 (D) The study should include—

19 (i) the estimated numbers of those fil-
20 ing such claims, the cost resulting from
21 such benefits, the time necessary to review
22 such claims, and how such a number of
23 claims will affect the VA’s ability to review
24 its current claim load;

1 (ii) an examination of how the pro-
2 posed change corresponds to prior VA pol-
3 icy relating to post-service actions taken by
4 an individual; and

5 (iii) what Federal benefits, both VA
6 and non-VA, former service members hav-
7 ing smoking-related illnesses are eligible to
8 receive.

9 (E) The study shall be completed no later
10 than July 1, 1999.

11 (F) The Department of Veterans Affairs
12 and the Office of Management and Budget shall
13 report their finding to the Majority and Minor-
14 ity Leaders of the Senate and the chairmen and
15 ranking minority members of the Senate Budg-
16 et and Veterans' Affairs Committees.

17 **SEC. 205. ADJUSTMENTS FOR LINE ITEM VETO LITIGATION.**

18 If the Supreme Court rules that the Line Item Veto
19 Act is unconstitutional, the Chairman of the Committee
20 on the Budget may make appropriate adjustments to the
21 allocations and aggregates in this resolution to reflect the
22 effects of the President's cancellations becoming null and
23 void.

1 **SEC. 206. EXTENSION OF VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION**
2 **TRUST FUND.**

3 (a) **DISCRETIONARY LIMITS.**—In the Senate, in this
4 section and for the purposes of allocations made for the
5 discretionary category pursuant to section 302(a) of the
6 Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the term “discre-
7 tionary spending limit” means—

8 (1) with respect to fiscal year 1999—

9 (A) for the defense category:
10 \$271,570,000,000 in new budget authority and
11 \$266,635,000,000 in outlays;

12 (B) for the nondefense category:
13 \$255,450,000,000 in new budget authority and
14 \$289,547,000,000 in outlays; and

15 (C) for the violent crime reduction cat-
16 egory: \$5,800,000,000 in new budget authority
17 and \$4,953,000,000 in outlays;

18 (2) with respect to fiscal year 2000—

19 (A) for the discretionary category:
20 \$532,693,000,000 in new budget authority and
21 \$558,711,000,000 in outlays; and

22 (B) for the violent crime reduction cat-
23 egory: \$4,500,000,000 in new budget authority
24 and \$5,554,000,000 in outlays;

25 (3) with respect to fiscal year 2001—

1 (A) for the discretionary category:
 2 \$537,632,000,000 in new budget authority and
 3 \$558,415,000,000 in outlays; and

4 (B) for the violent crime reduction cat-
 5 egory: \$4,400,000,000 in new budget authority
 6 and \$5,981,000,000 in outlays; and

7 (4) with respect to fiscal year 2002—

8 (A) for the discretionary category:
 9 \$546,574,000,000 in new budget authority and
 10 \$556,269,000,000 in outlays; and

11 (B) for the violent crime reduction cat-
 12 egory: \$4,500,000,000 in new budget authority
 13 and \$4,530,000,000 in outlays;

14 as adjusted in strict conformance with subsection (b) of
 15 section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Defi-
 16 cit Control Act of 1985 and section 314 of the Congres-
 17 sional Budget Act.

18 (b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

19 (1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in para-
 20 graph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to
 21 consider—

22 (A) a revision of this resolution or any con-
 23 current resolution on the budget for fiscal years
 24 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 (or amendment,
 25 motion, or conference report on such a resolu-

1 tion) that provides discretionary spending in ex-
2 cess of the discretionary spending limit or limits
3 for such fiscal year; or

4 (B) any bill or resolution (or amendment,
5 motion, or conference report on such bill or res-
6 olution) for fiscal year 1999, 2000, 2001, or
7 2002 that would cause any of the limits in this
8 section (or suballocations of the discretionary
9 limits made pursuant to section 302(b) of the
10 Congressional Budget Act of 1974) to be ex-
11 ceeded.

12 (2) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply if
13 a declaration of war by the Congress is in effect or
14 if a joint resolution pursuant to section 258 of the
15 Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control
16 Act of 1985 has been enacted.

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

20 (d) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the deci-
21 sions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section
22 shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between,
23 and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the
24 concurrent resolution, bill, or joint resolution, as the case
25 may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members

1 of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required
2 in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the
3 Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

4 (e) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For pur-
5 poses of this section, the levels of new budget authority,
6 outlays, new entitlement authority, revenues, and deficits
7 for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of esti-
8 mates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Sen-
9 ate.

10 **SEC. 207. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

11 Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

12 (1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of
13 the Senate and the House of Representatives, re-
14 spectively, and as such they shall be considered as
15 part of the rules of each House, or of that House
16 to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall
17 supersede other rules only to the extent that they
18 are inconsistent therewith; and

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

1 **TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS**
2 **AND THE SENATE**

3 **SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PASSAGE OF**
4 **THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE'S IRS RE-**
5 **STRUCTURING BILL.**

6 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

7 (1) the House of Representatives passed H.R.
8 2676 on November 5, 1997;

9 (2) the Finance Committee of the Senate has
10 held several days of hearings this year on Internal
11 Revenue Service restructuring proposals;

12 (3) the hearings demonstrated many areas in
13 which the House-passed bill could be improved;

14 (4) on March 31, 1998, the Senate Finance
15 Committee voted 20–0 to report an Internal Reve-
16 nue Service restructuring package that contains
17 more oversight over the Internal Revenue Service,
18 more accountability for employees, and a new arse-
19 nal of taxpayer protections; and

20 (5) the Senate Finance package includes the
21 following items which were not included in the
22 House bill—

23 (A) removal of the statutory impediments
24 to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue's ef-

1 forts to reorganize the agency to create a more
2 streamlined, taxpayer-friendly organization,

3 (B) the providing of real oversight author-
4 ity for the Internal Revenue Service Oversight
5 Board to help prevent taxpayer abuse,

6 (C) the creation of a new Treasury Inspec-
7 tor General for Tax Administration to ensure
8 independence and accountability,

9 (D) real, meaningful relief for innocent
10 spouses,

11 (E) provisions which abate penalties and
12 interest after 1 year so that the Internal Reve-
13 nue Service does not profit from its own delay,

14 (F) provisions which ensure due process of
15 law to taxpayers by granting them a right to a
16 hearing before the Internal Revenue Service can
17 pursue a lien, levy, or seizure,

18 (G) provisions which forbid the Internal
19 Revenue Service from coercing taxpayers to ex-
20 tend the 10-year statute of limitations for col-
21 lection,

22 (H) provisions which require the Internal
23 Revenue Service to terminate employees who
24 abuse taxpayers or other Internal Revenue
25 Service employees,

1 (I) provisions which make the Taxpayer
2 Advocate more independent, and

3 (J) provisions enabling the Commissioner
4 of Internal Revenue to manage employees more
5 effectively.

6 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
7 Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional to-
8 tals in this budget resolution assume that the Senate shall,
9 as expeditiously as possible, consider and pass an Internal
10 Revenue Service restructuring bill which provides the most
11 taxpayer protections, the greatest degree of Internal Reve-
12 nue Service employee accountability, and enhanced over-
13 sight.

14 **SEC. 302. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE SUNSET**
15 **OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.**

16 (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that a simple and fair
17 Federal tax system is one that—

18 (1) applies a low tax rate, through easily under-
19 stood laws, to all Americans;

20 (2) provides tax relief for working Americans;

21 (3) protects the rights of taxpayers and reduces
22 tax collection abuses;

23 (4) eliminates the bias against savings and in-
24 vestment;

25 (5) promotes economic growth and job creation;

1 (6) does not penalize marriage or families; and

2 (7) provides for a taxpayer-friendly collections
3 process to replace the Internal Revenue Service.

4 (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con-
5 gress that the provisions of this resolution assume that
6 all taxes imposed under the Internal Revenue Code of
7 1986 shall sunset for any taxable year beginning after De-
8 cember 31, 2001 (or in the case of any tax not imposed
9 on the basis of a taxable year, on any taxable event or
10 for any period after December 31, 2001) and that a new
11 Federal tax system will be enacted that is both simple and
12 fair as described in subsection (a) and that provides only
13 those resources for the Federal Government that are need-
14 ed to meet its responsibilities to the American people.

15 **SEC. 303. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE TAX TREATMENT**
16 **OF HOME MORTGAGE INTEREST AND CHARITABLE GIVING.**
17 **TABLE GIVING.**

18 (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

19 (1) current Federal income tax laws embrace a
20 number of fundamental tax policies including long-
21 standing encouragement for home ownership and
22 charitable giving, expanded health and retirement
23 benefits;

24 (2) the mortgage interest deduction is among
25 the most important incentives in the income tax code

1 and promotes the American Dream of home owner-
2 ship—the single largest investment for most fami-
3 lies, and preserving it is critical for the more than
4 20,000,000 families claiming it now and for millions
5 more in the future;

6 (3) favorable tax treatment to encourage gifts
7 to charities is a longstanding principle that helps
8 charities raise funds needed to provide services to
9 poor families and others when government is simply
10 unable or unwilling to do so, and maintaining this
11 tax incentive will help charities raise money to meet
12 the challenges of their charitable missions in the
13 decades ahead;

14 (4) legislation has been proposed to repeal the
15 entire income tax code at the end of the year 2001
16 without providing a specific replacement; and

17 (5) sunseting the entire income tax code with-
18 out describing a replacement threatens our Nation's
19 future economic growth and unwisely eliminates ex-
20 isting tax incentives that are crucial for taxpayers
21 who are often making the most important financial
22 decisions of their lives.

23 (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con-
24 gress that the levels in this resolution assume that Con-
25 gress supports the continued tax deductibility of home

1 mortgage interest and charitable contributions and that
2 a sunset of the tax code that does not provide a replace-
3 ment tax system that preserves this deductibility could
4 damage the American dream of home ownership and could
5 threaten the viability of nonprofit institutions.

6 **SEC. 304. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PRESERVATION OF SO-**
7 **CIAL SECURITY FOR THE FUTURE.**

8 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

9 (1) Social Security is one of the Nation’s most
10 important income security programs;

11 (2) the preservation of Social Security both for
12 those now retired and for future generations of
13 working Americans is a vital national priority;

14 (3) the Trustees of the Federal Old Age and
15 Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust
16 Funds have reported to Congress that—

17 (A) the retirement of the baby boom gen-
18 eration will cause Social Security expenditures
19 to accelerate rapidly beginning around 2010;

20 (B) Social Security expenditures will ex-
21 ceed Social Security revenues after 2012 and
22 the trust funds will be depleted of reserves in
23 2029; and

24 (C) after 2029, tax revenues will be suffi-
25 cient to cover only three-fourths of the benefits

1 promised under current law, and, by the end of
2 the 75 year projection period, the annual deficit
3 in the trust funds will reach 2.1 percent of the
4 GDP;

5 (4) Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal
6 Reserve Board, has testified before Congress that
7 Social Security's unfunded liability stands at around
8 \$3,000,000,000,000 and advised Congress to move
9 expeditiously to reform the program so that current
10 workers will have sufficient time to adjust to any
11 changes in the program;

12 (5) the \$124,000,000,000 in new domestic
13 spending programs in the President's budget under-
14 mines Social Security by diverting resources from
15 budget surpluses to a bigger government and more
16 spending; and

17 (6) the Medicare Hospital Insurance program is
18 projected to become insolvent in 2010 and a study
19 by the National Center on Addiction and Substance
20 Abuse at Columbia University estimated that 14
21 percent of Medicare spending in 1995 was for to-
22 bacco-related illnesses.

23 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
24 Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume
25 that—

1 (1) Congress should use unified budget sur-
2 pluses to reform Social Security for future genera-
3 tions; and

4 (2) Congress should reserve the Federal pro-
5 ceeds from any tobacco settlement for saving Medi-
6 care until legislation is enacted to make Medicare
7 actuarially sound.

8 **SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ANNUAL STATEMENT**
9 **OF ACCRUED LIABILITY OF SOCIAL SECU-**
10 **RITY AND MEDICARE.**

11 It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of
12 this resolution assume that—

13 (1) the concurrent resolution on the budget
14 should include a statement of the current accrued li-
15 ability of the Federal Government for future pay-
16 ments under the Social Security and Medicare pro-
17 grams; and

18 (2) the President's budget should include for
19 fiscal years beginning with 1999 a statement of the
20 current accrued liability of the Federal Government
21 for future payments under the Social Security and
22 Medicare programs.

1 **SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FULL FUNDING FOR**
2 **IDEA.**

3 It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels
4 in this resolution assume that part B of the Individuals
5 with Disabilities Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.) should be
6 fully funded at the originally promised level before any
7 funds are appropriated for new education programs.

8 **SEC. 307. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**

9 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

10 (1) the Social Security program, created in
11 1935 to provide old-age survivors, and disability in-
12 surance benefits, has been one of the most successful
13 government programs ever;

14 (2) in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act
15 of 1990, Congress created section 13301 of the Con-
16 gressional Budget Act, which removed Social Secu-
17 rity spending and revenues from all Federal budget
18 calculations;

19 (3) under current budget law, the Federal
20 budget is still in deficit; and

21 (4) in his State of the Union message on Janu-
22 ary 27, 1998, President Clinton called on Congress
23 to “save Social Security first” and to “reserve one
24 hundred percent of the surplus, that is any penny of
25 the surplus, until we have taken all the necessary

1 measures to strengthen the Social Security system
2 for the twenty-first century”.

3 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
4 Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional to-
5 tals included in this resolution assume—

6 (1) Congress and the President should continue
7 to rid our country of debt and work to balance the
8 budget without counting Social Security trust fund
9 surpluses; and

10 (2) Congress and the President should work in
11 a bipartisan way on specific legislation to reform the
12 Social Security system, to ensure that it is finan-
13 cially sound over the long term and will be available
14 for all future generations.

15 **SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SCHOOL-TO-WORK**
16 **PROGRAMS.**

17 It is the sense of the Senate that the budget totals
18 and levels in this resolution assume the President’s policy
19 with respect to the School-to-Work program under the
20 Education Reform Account and any such savings as a re-
21 sult should be applied to local initiatives focusing on early
22 childhood development.

1 **SEC. 309. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAXPAYER**
2 **RIGHTS.**

3 It is the sense of the Senate that of revenues des-
4 ignated under section 201 for tax relief, a portion be set
5 aside for—

6 (1) improvement of taxpayer rights, including
7 protections for taxpayers in cases involving seizure
8 of property by the Internal Revenue Service; and

9 (2) reform of the penalty rules under the Inter-
10 nal Revenue Code of 1986.

11 **SEC. 310. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON NATIONAL GUARD**
12 **FUNDING.**

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

14 (1) The Army National Guard represents 34
15 percent of total Army forces, including 55 percent of
16 combat divisions and brigades, 46 percent of combat
17 support, and 25 percent of combat service support.

18 (2) The Army National Guard receives just 9.5
19 percent of Army funds.

20 (3) A recent military study estimates the aver-
21 age cost to train and equip an active duty soldier is
22 \$73,000 per year, while the average cost to train
23 and equip a National Guard soldier is just \$17,000
24 per year.

1 (4) The Constitution of the United States pro-
2 vides for a specific role for the National Guard in
3 our national defense.

4 (5) The National Guard will play an increasing
5 role in a variety of ongoing worldwide operations by
6 relieving active units and reducing the operational
7 and personnel burdens of the Army's frequent and
8 lengthy deployments.

9 (6) The home land defense is a mission of
10 growing importance for our military forces and the
11 National Guard forces will play an increasingly key
12 role in that mission.

13 (7) Congress created the National Defense
14 Panel to recommend ways in which to transform
15 United States defense and national security policy
16 for the 21st century and it reached the following
17 recommendations:

18 (A) Some portion of the Army National
19 Guard's divisional combat units (including com-
20 bat support) should become part of active divi-
21 sions and brigades.

22 (B) The National Guard's enhanced bri-
23 gades should report to an active Army com-
24 mand.

1 (C) The Guard should develop selected
2 early-deploying units that would join the active
3 component.

4 (D) Some additional reserve or Guard
5 units may be needed to reduce pressure on the
6 active Army.

7 (E) The Guard should assume the entire
8 U.S. Army South (USARSO) mission, the
9 Army component of the United States Southern
10 Command (Southcom) based in Panama.

11 (F) The National Guard should continue
12 to provide general purpose forces to give
13 prompt military support to civil authorities.

14 (G) The National Guard should provide
15 forces organized and equipped for training of
16 civil agencies and the immediate reinforcement
17 of first-response efforts in domestic emer-
18 gencies.

19 (H) New homeland defense missions de-
20 velop (e.g., National Missile Defense and infor-
21 mation warfare), the Guard should be used in
22 lieu of active forces wherever possible.

23 (8) The National Guard estimates it was under-
24 funded by \$743,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 and by
25 \$634,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

1 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
2 Senate that the functional totals in the budget resolution
3 assume that the Department of Defense will give the high-
4 est priority to moving toward fully funding the National
5 Guard.

6 **SEC. 311. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MEDICARE PAYMENT.**

7 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

8 (1) one of the goals of the Balanced Budget Act
9 of 1997 was to expand options for Medicare bene-
10 ficiaries under the new Medicare+Choice program;
11 and

12 (2) the new Medicare payment formula in the
13 Balanced Budget Act of 1997 was intended to make
14 these choices available to all Americans, but because
15 of the low update and specific budget neutrality pro-
16 visions of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, the
17 blending of rates to create greater equity for rural
18 and other lower payment areas was not implemented
19 in 1998 or 1999.

20 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
21 Senate that the functional totals underlying this concur-
22 rent resolution on the budget assume that funding the
23 blending of local and national payment rates pursuant to
24 the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 should be a priority for

1 the Senate Finance Committee this year within the budget
2 as established by this Committee.

3 **SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LONG-TERM CARE.**

4 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

5 (1) our Nation is not financially prepared to
6 meet the long-term care needs of its rapidly aging
7 population and that long-term care needs threaten
8 the financial security of American families; and

9 (2) many people are unaware that most long-
10 term care costs are not covered by Medicare and
11 that Medicaid covers long-term care only after the
12 person's assets have been exhausted.

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

15 (1) this concurrent resolution on the budget as-
16 sumes that the National Bipartisan Commission on
17 the Future of Medicare should, as part of its delib-
18 erations, describe long-term care needs and make all
19 appropriate recommendations including private sec-
20 tor options that reflect the need for a continuum of
21 care that spans from acute to long-term care. This
22 is not a specific recommendation that any new pro-
23 gram be added to Medicare;

24 (2) the Federal Government should take all ap-
25 propriate steps to inform the public about the finan-

1 cial risks posed by long-term care costs and about
2 the need for families to plan for their long-term care
3 needs;

4 (3) the Federal Government should take all ap-
5 propriate steps to inform the public that Medicare
6 does not cover most long-term care costs and that
7 Medicaid covers long-term care costs only when the
8 beneficiary has exhausted his or her assets;

9 (4) the appropriate committees of the Senate,
10 together with the Department of Health and Human
11 Services and other appropriate Executive Branch
12 agencies, should develop specific ideas for encourag-
13 ing Americans to plan for their own long-term care
14 needs; and

15 (5) the upcoming National Summit on Retire-
16 ment Income Savings should ensure that planning
17 for long-term care is an integral part of any discus-
18 sion of retirement security.

19 **SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CLIMATE CHANGE RE-**
20 **SEARCH AND OTHER FUNDING.**

21 It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions
22 underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume
23 the following:

24 (1) To the extent that funding is made avail-
25 able through grants or other Federal expenditures to

1 reduce emissions of carbon dioxide or other green-
2 house gases or to increase sequestration of carbon to
3 offset such emissions, such funding shall be made
4 available through competitive, merit-based awards
5 designed to select cost-effective methods for reduc-
6 ing, sequestering, or mitigating such emissions. Such
7 awards shall consider all technologies, methods, and
8 research for reducing, sequestering, or mitigating
9 emissions, including sustainable agricultural prac-
10 tices and forest management and conservation strat-
11 egies. Funding criteria shall be comprehensive in
12 scope, not limited to specific technologies or indus-
13 tries, awarded on a nondiscriminatory basis, and
14 target cost-effectiveness in reducing, sequestering, or
15 mitigating carbon dioxide and other greenhouse
16 gases through natural resource management pro-
17 grams or products. In considering the cost-effective-
18 ness of various reduction, sequestration, or mitiga-
19 tion technologies, other environmental benefits
20 should be considered.

21 (2) To the extent any tax credits or other tax
22 incentives are created to stimulate the adoption of
23 technologies or practices that reduce, sequester, or
24 mitigate emissions of carbon dioxide and other
25 greenhouse gases (“emissions tax incentives”), such

1 emission tax incentives shall also be available to any
2 person that employs an alternative technology or
3 practice that reduces, sequesters, or mitigates emis-
4 sions of carbon dioxide or other greenhouse gases as
5 effectively as those technologies or practices for
6 which a tax credit or other incentive is provided.
7 Only payments for technologies or in support of
8 practices not legally required when payment is made
9 shall qualify for tax incentives.

10 **SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING**
11 **FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT**
12 **BLOCK GRANT.**

13 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

14 (1) 54 percent of women in the labor force have
15 children under 13 and are either single parents or
16 have husbands who earn less than \$30,000 per year;

17 (2) in 1995, 62 percent of women with children
18 younger than age 6, and 77 percent of women with
19 children ages 6–17 were in the labor force, and 59
20 percent of women with children younger than 3 were
21 in the labor force;

22 (3) a 1997 General Accounting Office study
23 found that the increased work participation require-
24 ments of the welfare reform law will cause the need
25 for child care to exceed the known supply;

1 (4) a 1995 study by the Urban Institute of
2 child care prices in 6 cities found that the average
3 cost of care for a 2-year-old in a child care center
4 ranged from \$3,100 to \$8,100;

5 (5) for an entry-level worker, the family's child
6 care costs at the average price of care for an infant
7 in a child care center would be at least 50 percent
8 of family income in 5 of the 6 cities examined;

9 (6) 40 percent of children under the age of 5
10 are taken care of at home by 1 parent;

11 (7) a large number of low- and middle-income
12 families sacrifice a second full-time income so that
13 a parent may be at home with the child;

14 (8) the average income of 2-parent families with
15 a single income is \$20,000 less than the average in-
16 come of 2-parent families with 2 incomes;

17 (9) the recent National Institute for Child
18 Health and Development study found that the great-
19 est factor in the development of a young child is
20 "what is happening at home and in families"; and

21 (10) increased tax relief directed at making
22 child care more affordable, and increased funding
23 for the Child Care and Development Block Grant,
24 would take significant steps toward bringing quality
25 child care within the reach of many parents, and

1 would increase the options available to parents in de-
2 ciding how best to care for their children.

3 (b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate
4 that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted
5 pursuant to this resolution assume—

6 (1) that tax relief should be directed at parents
7 who are struggling to afford quality child care, in-
8 cluding those who wish to stay at home to care for
9 a child, and should be included in any tax cut pack-
10 age; and

11 (2) doubling funding for the Child Care and
12 Development Block Grant will significantly increase
13 the States' ability to deliver quality child care to
14 low-income working families.

15 **SEC. 315. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE FORMULA**
16 **CHANGE FOR FEDERAL FAMILY EDUCATION**
17 **LOAN.**

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

19 (1) Postsecondary students receive critical ac-
20 cess to a higher education through student loans
21 made available by lenders in the Federal Family
22 Education Loan (FFEL) program.

23 (2) Guaranteed student loan borrowers cur-
24 rently pay an interest rate on their FFEL loans
25 equal to the 91-day Treasury bill rate plus 2.5 per-

1 cent while the borrower attends school, and the 91-
2 day Treasury bill rate plus 3.1 percent during repay-
3 ment. In addition, the maximum FFEL student loan
4 rate is capped at 8.25 percent.

5 (3) As a result of the Omnibus Budget Rec-
6 onciliation Act of 1993, the new formula for FFEL
7 student loans, effective July 1, 1998, will be equal
8 to the 10-year Treasury bond rate plus 1 percent. In
9 addition, the same 8.25 percent rate cap would
10 apply to these new loans.

11 (4) Lenders in the FFEL program have alerted
12 Congress that the scheduled formula change will
13 make these loans unprofitable. As a result, lenders
14 may withdraw from the FFEL program or signifi-
15 cantly reduce their participation in the program
16 after July 1, 1998.

17 (5) A July 25, 1997 report by the Congres-
18 sional Research Service stated that the scheduled
19 formula change “can result in a greater likelihood
20 that the program will become unprofitable at certain
21 points in the business cycle,” and “the result could
22 be a shutdown of the guaranteed delivery system.”.

23 (6) In a report by the Treasury Department on
24 February 26, 1998, the Clinton Administration con-
25 cluded that the new formula will provide a rate of

1 return on student loans that is below the target rate
2 of return of for-profit bank lenders in the guaran-
3 teed student loan program. Furthermore, the Ad-
4 ministration concluded that there are inefficiencies
5 associated with the proposed formula, and joint ben-
6 efits could be realized to students and lenders from
7 moving back to a short-term index.

8 (7) At the time that the proposed formula
9 change was adopted in 1993, the rate of return to
10 lenders would have been higher under the proposed
11 formula than under the existing formula.

12 (8) The withdrawal of lenders from the FFEL
13 program, who now account for approximately 70
14 percent of all student loans, would be devastating to
15 students because, as the Administration has ac-
16 knowledged, the Federal direct loan program would
17 be unable to absorb the demand for student loans
18 that would arise from the absence of guaranteed
19 lenders.

20 (9) A variety of proposals have been put for-
21 ward to resolve this pending crisis in the FFEL pro-
22 gram by modifying the scheduled formula change.

23 (b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate
24 that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted
25 pursuant to this resolution assume that the documented

1 problems that will rise from the scheduled formula change
2 for the Federal Family Education Loan program should
3 be resolved in a manner that ensures that students are
4 not harmed by the withdrawal of lenders from this pro-
5 gram.

6 **SEC. 316. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE DEDUCT-**
7 **IBILITY OF HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS**
8 **OF THE SELF-EMPLOYED.**

9 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

14 (2) at present, the self-employed can deduct
15 only 45 percent of their health insurance premiums;

16 (3) scheduled changes in the deductible amount
17 of health insurance premiums will rise slowly, to
18 only 60 percent by 2002;

19 (4) only by 2007 will the self-employed enjoy
20 equitable treatment with their corporate competitors
21 with respect to the deductibility of their health in-
22 surance premiums;

23 (5) the limited deductibility available to the
24 self-employed greatly reduces the affordability of
25 their health insurance;

1 (6) these disadvantages faced by the self-em-
2 ployed are exacerbated by the fact that the self-em-
3 ployed generally pay higher premium rates because
4 they do not have access to group insurance plans;

5 (7) these disadvantages are reflected in the
6 higher rate of lack of insurance among self-employed
7 individuals that stands at 23.6 percent compared
8 with 17.4 percent for all other wage and salaried
9 workers, for self-employed living at or below the pov-
10 erty level the rate of uninsured is over 57 percent,
11 for self-employed living at 100–150 percent poverty
12 the rate of uninsured is 47 percent, and for self-em-
13 ployed living at 150–199 percent the rate of unin-
14 sured is 40 percent;

15 (8) for some self-employed, such as farmers
16 who face significant occupational safety hazards, this
17 lack of health insurance affordability has even great-
18 er ramifications; and

19 (9) this lack of full deductibility is adversely af-
20 fecting the growing number of women who own
21 small businesses.

22 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
23 Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional to-
24 tals in this resolution assume that legislation implement-
25 ing this concurrent resolution on the budget should in-

1 clude accelerated movement toward parity between the
2 self-employed and corporations with respect to the tax
3 treatment of health insurance premiums, while maintain-
4 ing deficit neutrality.

5 **SEC. 317. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON OBJECTION TO KYOTO**
6 **PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION PRIOR TO SEN-**
7 **ATE RATIFICATION.**

8 (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

9 (1) The agreement reached by the Administra-
10 tion in Kyoto, Japan, regarding legally binding com-
11 mitments on greenhouse gas reductions is inconsis-
12 tent with the provisions of S. Res. 98, The Byrd-
13 Hagel Resolution, that passed the United States
14 Senate unanimously.

15 (2) The Administration has pledged to Con-
16 gress that it would not implement any portion of the
17 Kyoto Protocol prior to its ratification in the Senate.

18 (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con-
19 gress that funds should not be provided to put in effect
20 the Kyoto Protocol prior to the Senate ratification in com-
21 pliance with the requirements of the Byrd-Hagel Resolu-
22 tion and consistent with Administration assurances to
23 Congress.

1 **SEC. 318. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PRICE INCREASE ON**
2 **TOBACCO PRODUCTS OF \$1.50 PER PACK.**

3 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

4 (1) smoking rates among children and teen-
5 agers have reached epidemic proportions;

6 (2) of the 3,000 children and teenagers who
7 begin smoking every day, 1,000 will eventually die of
8 smoking-related disease; and

9 (3) public health experts and economists agree
10 that the most effective and efficient way to achieve
11 major reduction in youth smoking rates is to raise
12 the price of tobacco products by at least \$1.50 per
13 pack.

14 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
15 Senate that comprehensive tobacco legislation should in-
16 crease the price of each pack of cigarettes sold by at least
17 \$1.50 through a per-pack fee or other mechanism that will
18 guarantee a price increase of \$1.50 per pack within 3
19 years, not including existing scheduled Federal, State, and
20 local tax increases, with equivalent price increases on
21 other tobacco products, and should index these price in-
22 creases by an appropriate measure of inflation.

23 **SEC. 319. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

24 (a) Congress finds that—

25 (1) studies have found that quality child care,
26 particularly for infants and young children, requires

1 a sensitive, interactive, loving, and consistent care-
2 giver;

3 (2) as most parents meet and exceed the cri-
4 teria described in paragraph (1), circumstances al-
5 lowing, parental care is the best form of child care;

6 (3) a recent National Institute for Child Health
7 and Development study found that the greatest fac-
8 tor in the development of a young child is “what is
9 happening at home and in families”;

10 (4) as a child’s interaction with his or her par-
11 ents has the most significant impact on the develop-
12 ment of the child, any Federal child care policy
13 should enable and encourage parents to spend more
14 time with their children;

15 (5) nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ of preschool children have at-
16 home mothers and only $\frac{1}{3}$ of preschool children have
17 mothers who are employed full time;

18 (6) a large number of low- and middle-income
19 families sacrifice a second full-time income so that
20 a mother may be at home with her child;

21 (7) the average income of 2-parent families with
22 a single income is \$20,000 less than the average in-
23 come of 2-parent families with 2 incomes;

24 (8) only 30 percent of preschool children are in
25 families with paid child care and the remaining 70

1 percent of preschool children are in families that do
2 not pay for child care, many of which are low- to
3 middle-income families struggling to provide child
4 care at home;

5 (9) child care proposals should not provide fi-
6 nancial assistance solely to the 30 percent of fami-
7 lies that pay for child care and should not discrimi-
8 nate against families in which children are cared for
9 by an at-home parent; and

10 (10) any congressional proposal that increases
11 child care funding should provide financial relief to
12 families that sacrifice an entire income in order that
13 a mother or father may be at home for a young
14 child.

15 (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con-
16 gress that the functional totals in this concurrent resolu-
17 tion on the budget assume that—

18 (1) many families in the United States make
19 enormous sacrifices to forego a second income in
20 order to have a parent care for a child at home;

21 (2) there should be no bias against at-home
22 parents;

23 (3) parents choose many different forms of
24 child care to meet the needs of their families, such
25 as child care provided by an at-home parent, grand-

1 parent, aunt, uncle, neighbor, nanny, preschool, or
2 child care center;

3 (4) any quality child care proposal should in-
4 clude, as a key component, financial relief for those
5 families where there is an at-home parent; and

6 (5) mothers and fathers who have chosen and
7 continue to choose to be at home should be ap-
8 plauded for their efforts.

9 **SEC. 320. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING IMMUNITY.**

10 It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this
11 resolution assume that no immunity will be provided to
12 any tobacco product manufacturer with respect to any
13 health-related civil action commenced by a State or local
14 governmental entity or an individual or class of individuals
15 prior to or after the date of the adoption of this resolution.

16 **SEC. 321. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING AGRICULTURAL**
17 **TRADE PROGRAMS.**

18 It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals
19 in this concurrent resolution assume the Secretary of Agri-
20 culture will use agricultural trade programs established by
21 law to promote, to the maximum extent practicable, the
22 export of United States agricultural commodities and
23 products.

1 **SEC. 322. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING LONG-TERM**
2 **ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.**

3 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that the resolution
4 assumes the following—

5 (1) entitlement spending has risen dramatically
6 over the last thirty-five years;

7 (2) in 1963, mandatory spending (i.e. entitle-
8 ment spending and interest on the debt) made up 30
9 percent of the budget, this figure rose to 45 percent
10 by 1973, to 56 percent by 1983 and to 61 percent
11 by 1993;

12 (3) mandatory spending is expected to make up
13 68 percent of the Federal budget in 1998;

14 (4) absent changes, that spending is expected to
15 take up over 70 percent of the Federal budget short-
16 ly after the year 2000 and 74 percent of the budget
17 by the year 2008;

18 (5) if no action is taken, mandatory spending
19 will consume 100 percent of the budget by the year
20 2030;

21 (6) this mandatory spending will continue to
22 crowd out spending for the traditional “discre-
23 tionary” functions of Government like clean air and
24 water, a strong National defense, parks and recre-
25 ation, education, our transportation system, law en-

1 enforcement, research and development and other in-
2 frastructure spending;

3 (7) taking significant steps sooner rather than
4 later to reform entitlement spending will not only
5 boost economic growth in this country, it will also
6 prevent the need for drastic tax and spending deci-
7 sions in the next century.

8 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
9 Senate that the levels in this budget resolution assume
10 that Congress and the President should work to enact
11 structural reforms in entitlement spending in 1998 and
12 beyond which sufficiently restrain the growth of manda-
13 tory spending in order to keep the budget in balance over
14 the long term, extend the solvency of the Social Security
15 and Medicare Trust Funds, avoid crowding out funding
16 for basic Government functions and that every effort
17 should be made to hold mandatory spending to no more
18 than seventy percent of the budget.

19 **SEC. 323. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FREEDOM OF**
20 **HEALTH CARE CHOICE FOR MEDICARE SEN-**
21 **IORS.**

22 (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

23 (1) Medicare beneficiaries should have the same
24 right to obtain health care from the physician or

1 provider of their choice as do Members of Congress
2 and virtually all other Americans.

3 (2) Most seniors are denied this right by cur-
4 rent restrictions on their health care choices.

5 (3) Affording seniors this option would create
6 greater health-care choices and result in fewer
7 claims being paid out of the near-bankrupt Medicare
8 trust funds.

9 (4) Legislation to uphold this right of health
10 care choice for seniors must protect beneficiaries and
11 Medicare from fraud and abuse. Such legislation
12 must include provisions that—

13 (A) require that such contracts providing
14 this right be in writing, be signed by the Medi-
15 care beneficiary, and provide that no claim be
16 submitted to the Health Care Financing Ad-
17 ministration;

18 (B) preclude such contracts when the bene-
19 ficiary is experiencing a medical emergency;

20 (C) allow for the Medicare beneficiary to
21 modify or terminate the contract prospectively
22 at any time and to return to Medicare; and

23 (D) are subject to stringent fraud and
24 abuse law, including the Medicare anti-fraud

1 provisions in the Health Insurance Portability
2 and Accountability Act of 1996.

3 (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con-
4 gress that seniors have the right to see the physician or
5 health care provider of their choice, and not be limited
6 in such right by the imposition of unreasonable conditions
7 on providers who are willing to treat seniors on a private
8 basis, and that the assumptions underlying the functional
9 totals in this resolution assume that legislation will be en-
10 acted to ensure this right.

11 **SEC. 324. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING REPAIR AND**
12 **CONSTRUCTION NEEDS OF INDIAN SCHOOLS.**

13 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

14 (1) many of our Nation’s tribal schools are in
15 a state of serious disrepair. The Bureau of Indian
16 Affairs (BIA) operates 187 school facilities nation-
17 wide. Enrollment in these schools, which presently
18 numbers 47,214 students, has been growing rapidly.
19 A recent General Accounting Office report indicates
20 that the repair backlog in these schools totals
21 \$754,000,000, and that the BIA schools are in gen-
22 erally worse condition than all schools nationally;

23 (2) approximately 60 of these schools are in
24 need of complete replacement or serious renovation.
25 Many of the renovations include basic structural re-

1 pair for the safety of children, new heating compo-
2 nents to keep students warm, and roofing replace-
3 ment to keep the snow and rain out of the class-
4 room. In addition to failing to provide adequate
5 learning environments for Indian children, these re-
6 pair and replacement needs pose a serious liability
7 issue for the Federal Government;

8 (3) sixty-three percent of the BIA schools are
9 over 30 years old, and 26 percent are over 50 years
10 old. Approximately 40 percent of all students in BIA
11 schools are in portable classrooms. Originally in-
12 tended as temporary facilities while tribes awaited
13 new construction funds, these “portables” have a
14 maximum 10 year life-span. Because of the con-
15 struction backlog, children have been shuffling be-
16 tween classrooms in the harsh climates of the North-
17 ern plains and Western States for 10 to 15 years;

18 (4) annual appropriations for BIA education fa-
19 cilities replacement and repair combined have aver-
20 aged \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000 annually, meeting
21 only 4 percent of total need. At the present rate, one
22 deteriorating BIA school can be replaced each year,
23 with estimates of completion of nine schools in the
24 next seven years. Since the new construction and re-
25 pair backlog is so great and growing, the current

1 focus at BIA construction must remain on emer-
2 gency and safety needs only, without prioritizing
3 program needs such as increasing enrollment or
4 technology in the classroom; and

5 (5) unlike most schools, the BIA schools are a
6 responsibility of the Federal Government. Unfortu-
7 nately, the failure of the Federal Government to live
8 up to this responsibility has come at the expense of
9 quality education for some of this Nation's poorest
10 children with the fewest existing opportunities to
11 better themselves.

12 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
13 Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional to-
14 tals in this budget resolution assume that the repair and
15 construction backlog affecting Bureau of Indian Affairs
16 school facilities should be eliminated over a period of no
17 more than 5 years beginning with fiscal year 1999, and
18 that the President should submit to Congress a plan for
19 the orderly elimination of this backlog.

20 **SEC. 325. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOCIAL SECURITY**
21 **PERSONAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS AND**
22 **THE BUDGET SURPLUS.**

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

1 (1) The Social Security program is the founda-
2 tion of retirement income for most Americans, and
3 solving the financial problems of the Social Security
4 program is a vital national priority and essential for
5 the retirement security of today's working Ameri-
6 cans and their families.

7 (2) There is a growing bipartisan consensus
8 that personal retirement accounts should be an im-
9 portant feature of Social Security reform.

10 (3) Personal retirement accounts can provide a
11 substantial retirement nest egg and real personal
12 wealth. For an individual 28 years old on the date
13 of the adoption of this resolution, earning an aver-
14 age wage, and retiring at age 65 in 2035, just 1 per-
15 cent of that individual's wages deposited each year
16 in a personal retirement account and invested in se-
17 curities consisting of the Standard & Poors 500
18 would grow to \$132,000, and be worth approxi-
19 mately 20 percent of the benefits that would be pro-
20 vided to the individual under the current provisions
21 of the Social Security program.

22 (4) Personal retirement accounts would give the
23 majority of Americans who do not own any invest-
24 ment assets a new stake in the economic growth of
25 America.

1 (5) Personal retirement accounts would dem-
2 onstrate the value of savings and the magic of com-
3 pound interest to all Americans. Today, Americans
4 save less than people in almost every other country.

5 (6) Personal retirement accounts would help
6 Americans to better prepare for retirement gen-
7 erally. According to the Congressional Research
8 Service, 60 percent of Americans are not actively
9 participating in a retirement plan other than Social
10 Security, although Social Security was never in-
11 tended to be the sole source of retirement income.

12 (7) Personal retirement accounts would allow
13 partial prefunding of retirement benefits, thereby
14 providing for Social Security's future financial sta-
15 bility.

16 (8) The Federal budget will register a surplus
17 of \$671,000,000,000 over the next 10 years, offering
18 a unique opportunity to begin a permanent solution
19 to Social Security's financing.

20 (9) Using the Federal budget surplus to fund
21 personal retirement accounts would be an important
22 first step in comprehensive Social Security reform
23 and ensuring the delivery of promised retirement
24 benefits.

1 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
2 Senate that this resolution assumes that the Committee
3 on Finance shall consider and report a legislative proposal
4 this year that would dedicate the Federal budget surplus
5 to the establishment of a program of personal retirement
6 accounts for working Americans and reduce the unfunded
7 liabilities of the Social Security program.

8 **SEC. 326. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ELIMI-**
9 **NATION OF THE MARRIAGE PENALTY.**

10 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that:

11 (1) Marriage is the foundation of the American
12 society and the key institution preserving our values.

13 (2) The tax code should not penalize those who
14 choose to marry.

15 (3) However, the Congressional Budget Office
16 found that 42 percent of married couples face a
17 marriage penalty under the current tax system.

18 (4) The Congressional Budget Office found that
19 the average penalty amounts to \$1,380 a year.

20 (5) This penalty is one of the factors behind the
21 decline of marriage.

22 (6) In 1970, just 0.5 percent of the couples in
23 the United States were unmarried. By 1996, this
24 percentage had risen to 7.2 percent.

1 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
2 Senate that the provisions in this budget resolution as-
3 sume that the Congress shall begin to phase out the mar-
4 riage penalty this year.

5 **SEC. 327. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING**
6 **AFFORDABLE, HIGH-QUALITY HEALTH CARE**
7 **FOR SENIORS.**

8 (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

9 (1) Seniors deserve affordable, high quality
10 health care.

11 (2) The Medicare program under title XVIII of
12 the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) has
13 made health care affordable for millions of seniors.

14 (3) Beneficiaries under the Medicare program
15 deserve to know that such program will cover the
16 benefits that they are currently entitled to.

17 (4) Beneficiaries under the Medicare program
18 can pay out-of-pocket for health care services when-
19 ever they—

20 (A) do not want a claim for reimbursement
21 for such services submitted to such program; or

22 (B) want or need to obtain health care
23 services that such program does not cover.

1 (5) Beneficiaries under the Medicare program
2 can use doctors who do not receive any reimburse-
3 ment under such program.

4 (6) Close to 75 percent of seniors have annual
5 incomes below \$25,000, including 4 percent who
6 have annual incomes below \$5,000, making any ad-
7 ditional out-of-pocket costs for health care services
8 extremely burdensome.

9 (7) Very few beneficiaries under the Medicare
10 program report having difficulty obtaining access to
11 a physician who accepts reimbursement under such
12 program.

13 (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con-
14 gress that the assumptions underlying the functional to-
15 tals in this resolution assume that seniors have the right
16 to affordable, high-quality health care, that they have the
17 right to choose their physicians, and that no change should
18 be made to the Medicare program that could—

19 (1) impose unreasonable and unpredictable out-
20 of-pocket costs for seniors or erode the benefits that
21 the 38,000,000 beneficiaries under the Medicare
22 program are entitled to;

23 (2) compromise the efforts of the Secretary of
24 Health and Human Services to screen inappropriate

1 or fraudulent claims for reimbursement under such
2 program; and

3 (3) allow unscrupulous providers under such
4 program to bill twice for the same services.

5 **SEC. 328. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PERMANENT**
6 **EXTENSION OF INCOME AVERAGING FOR**
7 **FARMERS.**

8 It is the sense of Congress that the provisions of this
9 resolution assume that if the revenue levels are reduced
10 pursuant to section 201 of this resolution for tax legisla-
11 tion, such amount as is necessary shall be used to perma-
12 nently extend income averaging for farmers for purposes
13 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

14 **SEC. 329. SENSE OF THE SENATE TO MAINTAIN FULL FUND-**
15 **ING FOR THE SECTION 202 ELDERLY HOUS-**
16 **ING PROGRAM.**

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

18 (1) The Section 202 Elderly Housing program
19 is the most important housing program for elderly,
20 low-income Americans, providing both affordable
21 low-income housing and supportive services designed
22 to meet the special needs of the elderly.

23 (2) Since 1959, the Section 202 Elderly Hous-
24 ing program has funded some 5,400 elderly housing
25 projects with over 330,000 housing units, with the

1 current average tenant in Section 202 housing being
2 a frail, older woman in her seventies, living alone
3 with an income of less than \$10,000 per year.

4 (3) The combination of affordable housing and
5 supportive services under the Section 202 Elderly
6 Housing program is critical to promoting independ-
7 ent living, self-sufficiency, and dignity for the elderly
8 while delaying more costly institutional care.

9 (4) There are over 1.4 million elderly Ameri-
10 cans currently identified as having “worst case hous-
11 ing needs” and in need of affordable housing.

12 (5) There are 33 million Americans aged 65
13 and over, some 13 percent of all Americans. The
14 number of elderly Americans is anticipated to grow
15 to over 69 million by the year 2030, which would be
16 some 20 percent of all Americans, and continue to
17 increase to almost 80 million by 2050.

18 (6) The President’s Budget Request for fiscal
19 year 1999 proposes reducing funding for the Section
20 202 Elderly Housing program from the fiscal year
21 1998 level of \$645,000,000 to \$109,000,000 in fis-
22 cal year 1999. This represents a reduction of over
23 83 percent in funding, which will result in reducing
24 the construction of Section 202 housing units from

1 amounts of budget authority and outlays, requiring
2 the Department of Defense to properly plan its fu-
3 ture activities in the new, constrained budget envi-
4 ronment.

5 (3) The Department of Defense worked with
6 the Office of Management and Budget to develop a
7 fiscal year 1999 budget which complies with the Bal-
8 anced Budget Act of 1997.

9 (4) Based on Department of Defense program
10 plans and policy changes, the Office of Management
11 and Budget and the Department of Defense made
12 detailed estimates of fiscal year 1999 Department of
13 Defense outlay rates to ensure that the budget sub-
14 mitted would comply with the Balanced Budget Act
15 of 1997.

16 (5) The Congressional Budget Office outlay es-
17 timate of the fiscal year 1999 Department of De-
18 fense budget request exceeds both the outlay limit
19 imposed by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and
20 the Office of Management and Budget's outlay esti-
21 mate, a disagreement which would force a total re-
22 structuring of the Department of Defense's fiscal
23 year 1999 budget.

24 (6) The restructuring imposed on the Depart-
25 ment of Defense would have a devastating impact on

1 readiness, troop morale, military quality of life, and
2 ongoing procurement and development programs.

3 (7) The restructuring of the budget would be
4 driven solely by differing statistical estimates made
5 by capable parties.

6 (8) In a letter currently under review, the Di-
7 rector of the Office of Management and Budget will
8 identify multiple differences between the Office of
9 Management and Budget's estimated outlay rates
10 and the Congressional Budget Office's estimated
11 outlay rates.

12 (9) New information on Department of Defense
13 policy changes and program execution plans now
14 permit the Office of Management and Budget and
15 the Congressional Budget Office to reevaluate their
16 initial projections of fiscal year 1999 outlay rates.

17 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
18 Senate that the totals underlying this concurrent resolu-
19 tion on the budget assume that not later than April 22,
20 1998, the Director of the Office of Management and
21 Budget, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the
22 Congressional Budget Office shall complete discussions
23 and develop a common estimate of the projected fiscal year
24 1999 outlay rates for Department of Defense accounts.

1 **SEC. 331. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING OUTLAY ES-**
2 **TIMATES FOR THE BUDGETS OF FEDERAL**
3 **AGENCIES OTHER THAN THE DEPARTMENT**
4 **OF DEFENSE.**

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

7 (1) The Federal civilian workforce in non-De-
8 fense Department agencies shrank by 125,000 em-
9 ployees, or 10 percent, between 1992 and 1997.

10 (2) The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 assumed
11 over \$60,000,000,000 in reductions in nondefense
12 discretionary spending over the period 1998–2002.

13 (3) These reductions were agreed to notwith-
14 standing ever-increasing responsibilities in agencies
15 engaged in fighting crime, combating the drug war,
16 countering terrorist threats, cleaning the environ-
17 ment, enforcing the law, improving education, con-
18 ducting health research, conducting energy research
19 and development, enhancing the Nation’s physical
20 infrastructure, and providing veterans programs.

21 (4) All Federal agencies have worked closely
22 with the Office of Management and Budget to bal-
23 ance much-needed programmatic needs with fiscal
24 prudence and to submit budget requests for fiscal
25 year 1999 that comply with the Balanced Budget
26 Act of 1997.

1 (5) Reductions in the President's requests, as
2 estimated by the Office of Management and Budget,
3 to comply with the Congressional Budget Office's es-
4 timates could seriously jeopardize priority domestic
5 discretionary programs.

6 (6) There is no mechanism through which the
7 Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Man-
8 agement and Budget identify their differences in
9 outlay rates for nondefense agencies.

10 (7) Such consultation would lead to greater un-
11 derstanding between the two agencies and poten-
12 tially fewer and/or smaller differences in the future.

13 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
14 Senate that the totals underlying this concurrent resolu-
15 tion on the budget assume that not later than April 22,
16 1998, the Director of the Office of Management and
17 Budget and the Director of the Congressional Budget Of-
18 fice, in consultation with the Secretaries of the affected
19 nondefense agencies, shall complete discussions and de-
20 velop a common estimate of the projected fiscal year 1999
21 outlay rates for accounts in nondefense agencies.

1 **SEC. 332. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING AN EVALUA-**
2 **TION OF THE OUTCOME OF WELFARE RE-**
3 **FORM.**

4 It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels
5 in this resolution assume that—

6 (1) the Secretary of Health and Human Serv-
7 ices will, as part of the annual report to Congress
8 under section 411 of the Social Security Act (42
9 U.S.C. 611), include data regarding the rate of em-
10 ployment, job retention, and earnings characteristics
11 of former recipients of assistance under the State
12 programs funded under part A of title IV of the So-
13 cial Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) for each
14 such State program; and

15 (2) for purposes of the annual report for fiscal
16 year 1997, the information described in paragraph
17 (1) will be transmitted to Congress not later than
18 September 1, 1998.

19 **SEC. 333. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ESTAB-**
20 **LISHMENT OF A NATIONAL BACKGROUND**
21 **CHECK SYSTEM FOR LONG-TERM CARE**
22 **WORKERS.**

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

25 (1) The impending retirement of the baby boom
26 generation will greatly increase the demand and

1 need for quality long-term care and it is incumbent
2 on Congress and the President to ensure that Medi-
3 care and Medicaid patients are protected from
4 abuse, neglect, and mistreatment.

5 (2) Although the majority of long-term care fa-
6 cilities do an excellent job in caring for elderly and
7 disabled patients, incidents of abuse and neglect and
8 mistreatment do occur at an unacceptable rate and
9 are not limited to nursing homes alone.

10 (3) Current Federal and State safeguards are
11 inadequate because there is little or no information
12 sharing between States about known abusers and no
13 common State procedures for tracking abusers from
14 State to State and facility to facility.

15 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
16 Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional to-
17 tals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume
18 that a national registry of abusive long-term care workers
19 should be established by building upon existing infrastruc-
20 tures at the Federal and State levels that would enable
21 long-term care providers who participate in the Medicare
22 and Medicaid programs (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.; 1396 et
23 seq.) to conduct background checks on prospective employ-
24 ees.

1 **SEC. 334. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EXPANDING MEDI-**
2 **CARE BENEFITS.**

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

4 (1) In the 1997 Balanced Budget Agreement,
5 changes were made to Medicare that extended the
6 solvency of the Trust Fund for 10 years.

7 (2) The Medicare Commission, also established
8 in the Balanced Budget Agreement, has just started
9 the task of examining the Medicare program in an
10 effort to make sound policy recommendations to
11 Congress and the Administration about what needs
12 to be done to ensure that Medicare is financially pre-
13 pared to handle the added burden when the baby
14 boomers begin retiring.

15 (3) The problems facing Medicare are not about
16 more revenues. The program needs to do more to
17 improve the health care status of retirees and give
18 them more choices and better information to make
19 wise consumer decisions when purchasing health
20 care services.

21 (4) Improving the health care status of senior
22 citizens would ensure additional savings for Medi-
23 care. Helping seniors stay healthier should be a pri-
24 ority of any legislation aimed at protecting Medicare.

25 (5) In order to keep seniors healthier, Medicare
26 has to become more prevention based. Currently,

1 Medicare offers prevention benefits, and the Bal-
2 anced Budget Act of 1997 made a substantial in-
3 vestment in prevention benefits, providing
4 \$8,500,000,000 over 10 years.

5 (6) Preventing illnesses or long hospital stays
6 or repeated hospital stays will save Medicare dollars.

7 (7) Medicare cannot be saved without structural
8 changes and reforms.

9 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
10 Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution
11 assume that the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 directed
12 the National Bipartisan Commission on the future of
13 Medicare to examine Medicare’s benefit structure, includ-
14 ing prevention benefits, and make recommendations to the
15 Congress on such benefits in the context of an overall plan
16 to extend the solvency of the program.

17 **SEC. 335. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON BATTLEFIELD PRES-**
18 **ERVATION.**

19 It is the sense of the Senate that the budget levels
20 in this resolution assume that—

21 (1) preserving Revolutionary War, War of
22 1812, and Civil War battlefields is an integral part
23 of preserving our Nation’s history;

24 (2) the Secretary of the Interior should give
25 special priority to the preservation of Revolutionary

1 War and War of 1812 battlefields, by making funds
 2 available for the conduct of the Revolutionary War
 3 and War of 1812 Historic Preservation Study as au-
 4 thorized by section 603 of Public Law 104–333 (16
 5 U.S.C. 1a–5 note); and

6 (3) the Secretary of the Interior should give
 7 special priority to the preservation of Revolutionary
 8 War, War of 1812, and Civil War battlefields by al-
 9 locating funds in the Land and Water Conservation
 10 Fund for the purchase of battlefield sites the integ-
 11 rity of which is threatened by urban or suburban de-
 12 velopment.

13 **SEC. 336. A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE SENATE’S SUP-**
 14 **PORT FOR FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL LAW**
 15 **ENFORCEMENT.**

16 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

17 (1) our Federal, State and local law enforce-
 18 ment officers provide essential services that preserve
 19 and protect our freedom and safety, and with the
 20 support of Federal assistance, State and local law
 21 enforcement officers have succeeded in reducing the
 22 national scourge of violent crime, illustrated by a
 23 murder rate in 1996 which is projected to be the
 24 lowest since 1971 and a violent crime total in 1996
 25 which is the lowest since 1990;

1 (2) through a comprehensive effort to attack vi-
2 olence against women mounted by State and local
3 law enforcement, and dedicated volunteers and pro-
4 fessionals who provide victim services, shelter, coun-
5 seling and advocacy to battered women and their
6 children, important strides have been made against
7 the national scourge of violence against women, il-
8 lustrated by the decline in the murder rate for wives,
9 ex-wives and girlfriends at the hands of their “inti-
10 mates” fell to a 19-year low in 1995;

11 (3) recent gains by Federal, State and local law
12 enforcement in the fight against violent crime and
13 violence against women are fragile, and continued fi-
14 nancial commitment from the Federal Government
15 for funding and financial assistance is required to
16 sustain and build upon these gains; and

17 (4) the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund as
18 adopted by the Violent Crime Control and Law En-
19 forcement Act of 1994 funds the Violent Crime Con-
20 trol and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, the Violence
21 Against Women Act of 1994, and the Antiterrorism
22 and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 without
23 adding to the Federal budget deficit.

24 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
25 Senate that the provisions and the functional totals under-

1 lying this resolution assume the Federal Government's
2 commitment to fund Federal law enforcement programs
3 and programs to assist State and local efforts to combat
4 violent crime, including violence against women, shall be
5 maintained and funding for the Violent Crime Reduction
6 Trust Fund shall continue to at least fiscal year 2003.

7 **SEC. 337. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ANALYSIS OF CIVILIAN**
8 **SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS IN**
9 **THE FEDERAL BUDGET.**

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

11 (1) The National Academy of Sciences, Na-
12 tional Academy of Engineering, and Institute of
13 Medicine have recommended, in their 1995 report,
14 entitled “Allocating Federal Funds for Science and
15 Technology”, that the Federal science and tech-
16 nology budget “be presented as a comprehensive
17 whole in the President’s budget and similarly consid-
18 ered as a whole at the beginning of the congressional
19 budget process before the total Federal budget is
20 disaggregated and sent to the appropriations com-
21 mittees and subcommittees”.

22 (2) Civilian Federal agencies are supporting
23 more than \$35,000,000,000 of research and develop-
24 ment in fiscal year 1998, but it is difficult for the
25 Congress and the public to track or understand this

1 support because it is dispersed among 12 different
2 budget functions.

3 (3) A meaningful examination of the overall
4 Federal budget for science and technology, consist-
5 ent with the recommendation of the National Acad-
6 emies, as well as an examination of science and tech-
7 nology budgets in individual civilian agencies, would
8 be facilitated if the President's budget request clear-
9 ly displayed the amounts requested for science and
10 technology programs across all civilian agencies and
11 classified these amounts in Budget Function 250.

12 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
13 Senate that the congressional budget for the United States
14 for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 should
15 consolidate the spending for all Federal civilian science
16 and technology programs in Budget Function 250, and
17 that the President should accordingly transmit to the Con-
18 gress a budget request for fiscal year 2000 that classifies
19 these programs, across all Federal civilian departments
20 and agencies, in Budget Function 250.

21 **SEC. 338. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CIVILIAN SCIENCE**
22 **AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS IN THE FED-**
23 **ERAL BUDGET.**

24 It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions
25 underlying the function totals in this budget resolution as-

1 sume that expenditures for civilian science and technology
2 programs in the Federal budget will double over the period
3 from fiscal year 1998 to fiscal year 2008.

4 **SEC. 339. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LONG-TERM BUDGET-**
5 **ING AND REPAYMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT.**

6 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

7 (1) today, there are 34,000,000 Americans over
8 the age of 65, and by the year 2030, that number
9 will grow to nearly 70,000,000;

10 (2) in 1963, mandatory spending represented
11 30 percent of the Federal budget, while discretionary
12 spending made up 70 percent, and by 1998, those
13 proportions have almost completely reversed, in that
14 mandatory spending now accounts for 68 percent of
15 the Federal budget, while discretionary spending
16 represents 32 percent;

17 (3) according to the 1997 Annual Report of the
18 Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Sur-
19 vivors Insurance and Disability Insurance (OASDI)
20 Trust Fund—

21 (A) the difference between the income and
22 benefits for the OASDI program is a deficit of
23 2.23 percent of taxable payroll;

1 (B) the assets in the Trust Fund are ex-
2 pected to be depleted under present law in the
3 year 2029;

4 (C) by the time the assets in the Trust
5 Fund are depleted, annual tax revenues will be
6 sufficient to cover only three-fourths of the an-
7 nual expenditures;

8 (D) intermediate estimates are that
9 OASDI will absorb nearly 17.5 percent of na-
10 tional payroll by the year 2030; and

11 (E) the cost of the OASDI program is esti-
12 mated to rise from its current level of 4.7 per-
13 cent of Gross Domestic Product to 6.7 percent
14 by the end of the 75-year projection period;

15 (4) according to reports by the Congressional
16 Budget Office, the Economic and Budget Outlook:
17 Fiscal Years 1999-2008 (January 1998) and Reduc-
18 ing the Deficit: Spending and Revenue Options
19 (March 1997)—

20 (A) the Medicare Part A Trust Fund will
21 be exhausted early in fiscal year 2010;

22 (B) enrollment in Medicare will increase
23 dramatically as the baby boomers reach age 65;

24 (C) between the years 2010 and 2030, en-
25 rollment in Medicare is projected to grow by 2.4

1 percent per year, up from the 1.4 percent aver-
2 age annual growth projected through 2007;

3 (D) by the year 2030, Medicare enrollment
4 will have doubled, to 75,000,000 people; and

5 (E) the increase in Medicare enrollment
6 caused by the aging of the population will be
7 accompanied by a tapering of the growth rate
8 of the working age population, and the number
9 of workers will drop from 3.8 for every Medi-
10 care beneficiary in 1997 to 2.02 per beneficiary
11 by 2030;

12 (5) the demographic shift that is currently tak-
13 ing place, and will continue for the next 30 years,
14 will put a tremendous burden on workers as the cost
15 of programs such as Social Security and Medicare
16 are borne by proportionately fewer workers;

17 (6) the current Budget Resolution, which
18 projects revenues and spending only for the next 10
19 years, does not give Congress a clear picture of the
20 budget problems that confront the United States
21 shortly after the turn of the century;

22 (7) currently, 14 percent of the Federal budget
23 is spent on interest payments on the national debt;
24 and

1 (8) if projected surpluses are used entirely for
2 debt reduction and current tax and spending policies
3 remain unchanged, the share of Federal income
4 needed to pay interest would drop below 5 percent
5 within 12 years, and in 1997, that 10 percentage-
6 point reduction would have amounted to
7 \$158,000,000,000 available for other priorities.

8 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
9 Senate that the functional totals in this concurrent resolu-
10 tion assume that future budget resolutions and future
11 budgets submitted by the President should include—

12 (1) an analysis for the period of 30 fiscal years
13 beginning with such fiscal year, of the estimated lev-
14 els of total budget outlays and total new budget au-
15 thority, the estimated revenues to be received, the
16 estimated surplus or deficit, if any, for each major
17 Federal entitlement program for each fiscal year in
18 such period; and

19 (2) a specific accounting of payments, if any,
20 made to reduce the public debt, or unfunded liabil-
21 ities associated with each major Federal entitlement
22 program.

1 **SEC. 340. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PRESIDENT'S**
2 **BUDGET.**

3 It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels
4 in this resolution assume that the President should sub-
5 mit, as part of the budget request of the President that
6 is submitted to Congress, a study of the impact of the
7 provisions of the budget on each generation of Americans
8 and its long-term effects on each generation.

9 **SEC. 341. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE VALUE**
10 **OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM FOR FU-**
11 **TURE RETIREES.**

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

14 (1) The Social Security system has allowed a
15 generation of Americans to retire with dignity.
16 Today, 13 percent of the population is 65 or older
17 and by 2030, 20 percent of the population will be 65
18 or older. More than $\frac{1}{2}$ of the elderly do not receive
19 private pensions and more than $\frac{1}{3}$ have no income
20 from assets.

21 (2) For 60 percent of all senior citizens, Social
22 Security benefits provide almost 80 percent of their
23 retirement income. For 80 percent of all senior citi-
24 zens, Social Security benefits provide over 50 per-
25 cent of their retirement income.

1 (3) Poverty rates among the elderly are at the
2 lowest level since the United States began to keep
3 poverty statistics, due in large part to the Social Se-
4 curity system.

5 (4) 78 percent of Americans pay more in pay-
6 roll taxes than they do in income taxes.

7 (5) According to the 1997 report of the Manag-
8 ing Trustee for the Social Security trust funds, the
9 accumulated balance in the Federal Old-Age and
10 Survivors Insurance Trust Fund is estimated to fall
11 to zero by 2029, and the estimated payroll tax at
12 that time will be sufficient to cover only 75 percent
13 of the benefits owed to retirees at that time.

14 (6) The average American retiring in the year
15 2015 will pay \$250,000 in payroll taxes over the
16 course of a working career.

17 (7) Future generations of Americans must be
18 guaranteed the same value from the Social Security
19 system as past covered recipients.

20 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
21 Senate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume
22 that no change in the Social Security system should be
23 made that would reduce the value of the Social Security
24 system for future generations of retirees.

1 **SEC. 342. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE LAND AND WATER**
2 **CONSERVATION FUND.**

3 It is the sense of the Senate that the budget levels
4 in this resolution assume that programs funded from the
5 Land and Water Conservation Fund should be funded in
6 the full amount authorized by law.

7 **SEC. 343. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EDUCATION GOALS.**

8 It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals
9 underlying this resolution assume that the Federal Gov-
10 ernment should work hand-in-hand with States, school dis-
11 tricts, and local leaders—

12 (1) to accomplish the following goals by the
13 year 2005:

14 (A) establish achievement levels and as-
15 sessments in every grade for the core academic
16 curriculum; measure each regular student's per-
17 formance; and prohibit the practice of social
18 promotion of students (promoting students rou-
19 tinely from one grade to the next without re-
20 gard to their academic achievement);

21 (B) provide remedial programs for stu-
22 dents whose achievement levels indicate they
23 should not be promoted to the next grade;

24 (C) create smaller schools to enable stu-
25 dents to have closer interaction with teachers;

1 (D) require at least 180 days per year of
2 instruction in core curriculum subjects;

3 (E) recruit new teachers who are ade-
4 quately trained and credentialed in the subject
5 or subjects they teach and encourage excellent,
6 experienced teachers to remain in the classroom
7 by providing adequate salaries; require all
8 teachers to be credentialed and limit emergency
9 or temporary teaching credentials to a limited
10 period of time; hold teachers and principals ac-
11 countable to high educational standards; and

12 (F) require all regular students to pass an
13 examination in basic core curriculum subjects in
14 order to receive a high school diploma; and

15 (2) to reaffirm the importance of public school-
16 ing and commit to guaranteeing excellence and ac-
17 countability in the public schools of this Nation.

18 **SEC. 344. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF THE SENATE.**

19 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

20 (1) while it is important to study the effects of
21 class size on learning and study the need to hire
22 more teachers, each type of study must be carried
23 out in conjunction with an effort to ensure that
24 there will be quality teachers in every classroom;

25 (2) all children deserve well-educated teachers;

1 (3) there is a teacher quality crisis in the
2 United States;

3 (4) individuals entering a classroom as teachers
4 should have a sound grasp on the subject the indi-
5 viduals intend to teach, and the individuals should
6 know how to teach;

7 (5) less than 40 percent of the individuals
8 teaching core subjects (consisting of English, mathe-
9 matics, science, social studies, and foreign lan-
10 guages) majored or minored in the core subjects;

11 (6) the quality of teachers impacts student
12 achievement;

13 (7) the measure of a good teacher is how much
14 and how well the teacher's students learn;

15 (8) teachers should have the opportunity to
16 learn new technology and teaching methods through
17 the establishment of teacher training facilities so
18 that teachers can share their new knowledge and ex-
19 periences with children in the classroom;

20 (9) school officials should have the flexibility
21 the officials need to have teachers in their schools
22 adequately trained to meet strenuous teacher stand-
23 ards;

24 (10) knowledgeable and eager individuals of
25 sound character and various professional back-

1 grounds should be encouraged to enter kindergarten
2 through grade 12 classrooms as teachers; and

3 (11) States should have maximum flexibility
4 and incentives to create alternative teacher certifi-
5 cation and licensure programs in order to recruit
6 well-educated people into the teaching profession.

7 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
8 Senate that the functional totals in this concurrent resolu-
9 tion on the budget assume—

10 (1) the enactment of legislation to provide as-
11 sistance for programs that—

12 (A) focus on teacher training delivered
13 through local partnerships, with private and
14 public partners, to ensure that current and fu-
15 ture teachers possess necessary teaching skills
16 and knowledge of subject areas; and

17 (B) focus on alternative certification to re-
18 cruit knowledgeable and eager individuals of
19 sound character to enter kindergarten through
20 grade 12 classrooms as teachers;

21 (2) that the quality of teachers can be strength-
22 ened by improving the academic knowledge of teach-
23 ers in the subject areas in which the teachers teach;

24 (3) that institutions of higher education should
25 be held accountable to prepare teachers who are

1 highly competent in the subject areas in which the
2 teachers teach, including preparing teachers by pro-
3 viding training in the effective uses of technologies
4 in classrooms; and

5 (4) that there should be recruitment into teach-
6 ing of high quality individuals, including individuals
7 from other occupations.

8 **SEC. 345. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INS CIRCUIT RIDERS**
9 **IN THE FORMER SOVIET UNION.**

10 It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of
11 this resolution assume that included in the funding for the
12 Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) is
13 \$2,000,000 for the establishment of INS circuit riders in
14 the former Soviet Union for the purpose of processing ref-
15 ugees and conducting medical examinations of refugees
16 who will enter the United States under the Refugee Act
17 of 1980.

18 **SEC. 346. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FUNDING**
19 **FOR THE AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.**

20 It is the sense of the Senate that the congressional
21 budget for the United States Government as provided for
22 in this resolution should assure that—

23 (1) the contract authority level for the Airport
24 Improvement Program (provided for in part B of
25 subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code) not be

1 reduced below the current level of \$2,347,000,000;
2 and

3 (2) the critical infrastructure development,
4 maintenance, and repair of airports not be jeopard-
5 ized.

6 **SEC. 347. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE ONE HUNDRED**
7 **FIFTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION SHOULD**
8 **REAUTHORIZE FUNDS FOR THE FARMLAND**
9 **PROTECTION PROGRAM.**

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

12 (1) eighteen States and dozens of localities have
13 spent nearly \$1,000,000,000 to protect over 600,000
14 acres of important farmland;

15 (2) the Farmland Protection Program has pro-
16 vided cost-sharing for 18 States and dozens of local-
17 ities to protect over 82,000 acres on 230 farms since
18 1996;

19 (3) the Farmland Protection Program has gen-
20 erated new interest in saving farmland in commu-
21 nities around the country;

22 (4) the Farmland Protection Program rep-
23 resents an innovative and voluntary partnership, re-
24 wards local ingenuity, and supports local priorities;

1 fee-for-service, point of service, and Health Maintenance
2 Organizations, 7 were denied accreditation.

3 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
4 Senate that the assumptions underlying this resolution
5 provide for the enactment of legislation requiring all
6 health plans participating in the Federal Employees
7 Health Benefits Program to be accredited by a nationally
8 recognized accreditation organization representative of a
9 spectrum of health care interests including purchasers,
10 consumers, providers and health plans.

11 **SEC. 349. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING WASTEFUL**
12 **SPENDING IN DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ACQUI-**
13 **SITION PRACTICES.**

14 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

15 (1) according to the Defense Department’s In-
16 spector General, despite efforts to streamline Gov-
17 ernment purchases, the military, in some cases, paid
18 more than “fair value” for many items;

19 (2) efficient purchasing policies, in the context
20 of decreasing defense budgets, are more important
21 than ever to ensure Defense Department spending
22 contributes to military readiness.

23 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
24 Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that
25 the Defense Department should continue efforts to elimi-

1 nate wasteful spending such that defense spending allo-
2 cated in the fiscal year 1999 budget, and all subsequent
3 budgets, is spent in the manner most efficient to maintain
4 and promote military readiness for United States Armed
5 Forces around the globe.

6 **SEC. 350. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE UNITED**
7 **STATES RESPONSE TO THE CHANGING NA-**
8 **TURE OF TERRORISM.**

9 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

10 (1) the threat of terrorism to American citizens
11 and interests remains high, with Americans suffer-
12 ing one-third of the total terrorist attacks in the
13 world in 1997;

14 (2) the terrorist threat is changing—while past
15 acts were generally limited to the use of conventional
16 explosives and weapons, terrorists today are exploit-
17 ing technological advances and increasingly lethal
18 tools and strategies to pursue their agenda;

19 (3) on a worldwide basis, terrorists are focusing
20 on afflicting mass casualties on civilian targets
21 through the acquisition of chemical, biological and
22 nuclear weapons of mass destruction;

23 (4) chemical and biological weapons in the
24 hands of terrorists or rogue nations constitute a
25 threat to the United States;

1 (5) the multifaceted nature of the terrorist
2 threat encompasses not only foreign terrorists tar-
3 geting American citizens and interests abroad, but
4 foreign terrorists operating within the United States
5 itself, as well as domestic terrorists;

6 (6) terrorists groups are becoming increasingly
7 multinational, more associated with criminal activity,
8 and less responsive to external influences;

9 (7) terrorists exploit America's free and open
10 society to illegally enter the country, raise funds, re-
11 cruit new members, spread propaganda, and plan fu-
12 ture activities;

13 (8) terrorists are also making use of computer
14 technology to communicate, solicit money and sup-
15 port, and store information essential to their oper-
16 ations;

17 (9) State sponsors of terrorism and other for-
18 eign countries are known to be developing computer
19 intrusion and manipulation capabilities which could
20 pose a threat to essential public and private infor-
21 mation systems in the United States;

22 (10) the infrastructures deemed critical to the
23 United States are the telecommunications networks,
24 the electric power grid, oil and gas distribution,
25 water distribution facilities, transportation systems,

1 financial networks, emergency services, and the con-
2 tinuity of Government services, the disruption of
3 which could result in significant losses to the United
4 States economic well-being, public welfare, or na-
5 tional security;

6 (11) a national strategy of infrastructure pro-
7 tection, as required by the Defense Appropriations
8 Act of 1996, and subsequent amendments, has yet
9 to be issued; and

10 (12) we as a Nation remain fundamentally un-
11 prepared to respond in a coordinated and effective
12 manner to these growing terrorist threats.

13 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
14 Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume
15 that—

16 (1) the Federal Government must take the lead
17 in establishing effective coordination between intel-
18 ligence-gathering and law enforcement agencies,
19 among Federal, State, and local levels of Govern-
20 ment, and with the private sector, for the purpose of
21 assessing, warning, and protecting against terrorist
22 attacks;

23 (2) technical preparedness for the detection and
24 analysis of chemical and biological weapons, and for
25 swift and adequate emergency response to their use

1 by terrorists, must be a near-term continuing prior-
2 ity;

3 (3) the United States must seek full inter-
4 national cooperation in securing the capture and
5 conviction of terrorists who attack or pose a threat
6 to American citizens and interests;

7 (4) the United States should fully enforce its
8 laws intended to deny foreign terrorist organizations
9 the ability to raise money in the United States, pre-
10 vent the evasion of our immigration laws and fur-
11 thering of criminal activities, and curtail the use of
12 our country as a base of operations; and

13 (5) a national strategy, adequate to addressing
14 the complexity of protecting our critical infrastruc-
15 tures, and as required by the Defense Appropria-
16 tions Act of 1996 and subsequent amendments,
17 must be completed and implemented immediately.

18 **SEC. 351. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ECONOMIC GROWTH,**
19 **SOCIAL SECURITY, AND GOVERNMENT EFFI-**
20 **CIENCY.**

21 It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals
22 underlying this resolution assume that—

23 (1) the elimination of a discretionary spending
24 program may be used for either tax cuts or to re-
25 form the Social Security system;

1 (2) the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the
2 Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control
3 Act of 1985, and other appropriate budget rules and
4 laws should be amended to implement the policy
5 stated in paragraph (1).

6 **SEC. 352. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING A SUPER-**
7 **MAJORITY REQUIREMENT FOR RAISING**
8 **TAXES.**

9 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

10 (1) the Nation’s current tax system is indefensi-
11 ble, being overly complex, burdensome, and severely
12 limiting to economic opportunity for all Americans;

13 (2) fundamental tax reform should be under-
14 taken as soon as practicable to produce a tax system
15 that—

16 (A) applies a low tax rate, through easily
17 understood laws, to all Americans;

18 (B) provides tax relief for working Ameri-
19 cans;

20 (C) protects the rights of taxpayers and re-
21 duces tax collection abuses;

22 (D) eliminates the bias against savings and
23 investment;

24 (E) promotes economic growth and job cre-
25 ation;

1 (F) does not penalize marriage or families;
2 and

3 (G) provides for a taxpayer-friendly collec-
4 tions process to replace the Internal Revenue
5 Service; and

6 (3) the stability and longevity of any new tax
7 system designed to achieve these goals should be
8 guaranteed with a supermajority vote requirement so
9 that Congress cannot easily raise tax rates, impose
10 new taxes, or otherwise increase the amount of a
11 taxpayer's income that is subject to tax.

12 (b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of Senate
13 that the assumptions underlying the functional totals of
14 this resolution assume fundamental tax reform that is ac-
15 companied by a proposal to amend the Constitution of the
16 United States to require a supermajority vote in each
17 House of Congress to approve tax increases.

18 **SEC. 353. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON HEALTH CARE QUAL-**
19 **ITY.**

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

22 (1) Rapid changes in the health care market-
23 place have compromised confidence in the our Na-
24 tion's health system.

1 (2) American consumers want more conven-
2 ience, fewer hassles, more choices, and better service
3 from their health insurance plans.

4 (3) All Americans deserve quality-driven health
5 care supported by sound science and evidence-based
6 medicine.

7 (4) The Federal Government, through the Na-
8 tional Institutes of Health, supports research that
9 improves the quality of medical care that Americans
10 receive.

11 (5) This resolution assumes increased funding
12 for the National Institutes of Health for 1999 of
13 \$15,100,000,000, an 11-percent increase over cur-
14 rent funding levels, which are 7 percent higher than
15 in 1997.

16 (6) As the largest purchaser of health care serv-
17 ices, the Federal Government has a responsibility to
18 utilize its purchasing power to demand high quality
19 health plans and providers for its health programs
20 and to protect its beneficiaries from inferior medical
21 care.

22 (7) The Federal Government must adopt the
23 posture of private sector purchasers and insist on
24 high quality care for the 67,000,000 Medicare and

1 Medicaid beneficiaries and the 9,000,000 Federal
2 employees, retirees, and their dependents.

3 (8) The private sector has proven to be more
4 capable of keeping pace with the rapid changes in
5 health care delivery and medical practice that affect
6 quality of care considerations than the Federal Gov-
7 ernment.

8 (9) As Congress considers health care legisla-
9 tion, it must first commit to “do no harm” to health
10 care quality, consumers, and the evolving market
11 place. Rushing to legislate or regulate based on an-
12 ecdotal information and micro-managing health
13 plans on politically popular issues will not solve the
14 problems of consumer confidence and the quality of
15 our health care system.

16 (10) When health insurance premiums rise,
17 Americans lose health coverage. Studies indicate
18 that a 1 percent increase in private health insurance
19 premiums will be associated with an increase in the
20 number of persons without insurance of about
21 400,000 persons.

22 (11) Health care costs have begun to rise sig-
23 nificantly in the past year. The Congressional Budg-
24 et Office (referred to as “CBO”) projects that the
25 growth in health premiums will be 5.5 percent in

1 1998 up from 3.8 percent in 1997. CBO continues
2 to project that premiums will grow about 1 percent-
3 age point faster than the Gross Domestic Product in
4 the longer run. CBO also warns that new Federal
5 mandates on health insurance could exacerbate this
6 increase in premiums.

7 (12) The President's Advisory Commission on
8 Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health
9 Care Industry developed the Consumer Bill of
10 Rights and Responsibilities. This includes informa-
11 tion disclosure, confidentiality of health information,
12 and choice of providers.

13 (13) The President's Commission further deter-
14 mined that private sector organizations have the ca-
15 pacity to act in a timely manner needed to keep pace
16 with the swiftly evolving health system.

17 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
18 Senate that the assumptions underlying this resolution as-
19 sume that the Senate will not pass any health care legisla-
20 tion that will—

21 (1) make health insurance unaffordable for
22 working families and increase the number of unin-
23 sured Americans;

1 (2) divert limited health care resources away
2 from serving patients to paying lawyers and hiring
3 new bureaucrats; or

4 (3) impose political considerations on clinical
5 decisions, instead of allowing such decisions to be
6 made on the basis of sound science and the best in-
7 terests of patients.

8 **SEC. 354. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE USE OF BUDGET**
9 **SURPLUS FOR TAX RELIEF OR DEBT REDUC-**
10 **TION.**

11 It is the sense of the Senate that this resolution as-
12 sumes that any budget surplus should be dedicated to debt
13 reduction or direct tax relief for hard-working American
14 families.

15 **SEC. 355. USE OF BUDGET SURPLUS TO REFORM SOCIAL**
16 **SECURITY.**

17 It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions
18 underlying the functional totals included in the resolution
19 assume:

20 (1) The Congress and the President should use
21 any budget surplus to reduce the Social Security
22 payroll tax and to establish personal retirement ac-
23 counts with the tax reduction for hard-working
24 Americans.

1 (6) once Colombian heroin is in the stream of
2 commerce it is nearly impossible to interdict because
3 it is concealed and trafficked in very small quan-
4 tities;

5 (7) the best and most cost efficient method of
6 preventing Colombian heroin from entering the
7 United States is to destroy the opium poppies in the
8 high Andes mountains where Colombian heroin is
9 produced;

10 (8) the elite anti-narcotics unit of the Colom-
11 bian National Police has the responsibility to eradi-
12 cate both coca and opium in Colombia, including the
13 reduction and elimination of cocaine and heroin pro-
14 duction, and they have done a remarkably effective
15 job with the limited and outdated equipment at their
16 disposal;

17 (9) more than 40 percent of the anti-narcotics
18 operations of the Colombian National Police involve
19 hostile ground fire from narco-terrorists and 90 per-
20 cent of such operations involve the use of heli-
21 copters;

22 (10) the need for better high performance heli-
23 copters by the Colombian National Police, especially
24 for use in the high Andes mountains, is essential for
25 more effective eradication of opium in Colombia;

1 (11) on December 23, 1997, one of the anti-
2 quated Vietnam-era UH-1H Huey helicopters used
3 by the Colombian National Police in an opium eradi-
4 cation mission crashed in the high Andes mountains
5 due to high winds and because it was flying above
6 the safety level recommended by the original manu-
7 facturer;

8 (12) in the Foreign Operations, Export Financ-
9 ing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act,
10 1998 (Public Law 105-118), amounts were appro-
11 priated for the procurement by the United States for
12 the Colombian National Police of three UH-60L
13 Blackhawk utility helicopters that can operate safely
14 and more effectively at the high altitudes of the
15 Andes mountains where Colombian opium grows at
16 altitudes as high as 12,000 feet;

17 (13) the Blackhawk helicopter is a high per-
18 formance utility helicopter, with greater lift capacity,
19 that can perform at the high altitudes of the Andes
20 mountains, as well as survive crashes and sustain
21 ground fire, much better than any other utility heli-
22 copter now available to the Colombian National Po-
23 lice in the war on drugs;

24 (14) because the Vietnam-era Huey helicopters
25 that the United States has provided the Colombian

1 National Police are outdated and have been develop-
2 ing numerous stress cracks, a sufficient number
3 should be upgraded to Huey II's and the remainder
4 should be phased-out as soon as possible;

5 (15) these Huey helicopters are much older
6 than most of the pilots who fly them, do not have
7 the range due to limited fuel capacity to reach many
8 of the expanding locations of the coca fields or co-
9 caine labs in southern Colombia, nor do they have
10 the lift capacity to carry enough armed officers to
11 reach and secure the opium fields in the high Andes
12 mountains prior to eradication;

13 (16) the elite anti-narcotics unit of the Colom-
14 bian National Police has a stellar record in respect-
15 ing for human rights and has received the com-
16 mendation of a leading international human rights
17 group in their operations to reduce and eradicate il-
18 licit drugs in Colombia;

19 (17) the narco-terrorists of Colombia have an-
20 nounced that they will now target United States citi-
21 zens, particularly those United States citizens work-
22 ing with their Colombian counterparts in the fight
23 against illicit drugs in Colombia;

24 (18) a leading commander of the Revolutionary
25 Armed Forces of Colombia ("FARC") announced re-

1 cently that the objective of these narco-terrorists, in
2 light of recent successes, will be “to defeat the
3 Americans”;

4 (19) United States Government personnel in
5 Colombia who fly in these helicopters accompanying
6 the Colombian National Police on missions are now
7 at even greater risk from these narco-terrorists and
8 their drug trafficking allies;

9 (20) in the last six months four anti-narcotics
10 helicopters of the Colombian National Police have
11 been downed in operations;

12 (21) Congress intends to provide the necessary
13 support and assistance to wage an effective war on
14 illicit drugs in Colombia and provide the equipment
15 and assistance needed to protect all of the men and
16 women of the Colombian National Police as well as
17 those Americans who work side by side with the Co-
18 lombian National Police in this common struggle
19 against illicit drugs;

20 (22) the new Government of Bolivia has made
21 a commitment to eradicate coca and cocaine produc-
22 tion in that country within 5 years;

23 (23) the United States should support any
24 country that is interested in removing the scourge of
25 drugs from its citizens; and

1 (24) Bolivia has succeeded, in large measure
2 due to United States assistance, in reducing acreage
3 used to produce coca, which is the basis for cocaine
4 production.

5 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
6 Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution
7 assume that—

8 (1) the President should, with funds made
9 available under Public Law 105–118, expeditiously
10 procure and provide to the Colombian National Po-
11 lice three UH–60L Blackhawk utility helicopters
12 solely for the purpose of assisting the Colombian
13 National Police to perform their responsibilities to
14 reduce and eliminate the production of illicit drugs
15 in Colombia and the trafficking of such illicit drugs,
16 including the trafficking of drugs such as heroin and
17 cocaine to the United States;

18 (2) if the President determines that the pro-
19 curement and transfer to the Colombian National
20 Police of three UH–60L Blackhawk utility heli-
21 copters is not an adequate number of such heli-
22 copters to maintain operational feasibility and effec-
23 tiveness of the Colombian National Police, then the
24 President should promptly inform Congress as to the
25 appropriate number of additional UH–60L

1 Blackhawk utility helicopters for the Colombian Na-
2 tional Police so that amounts can be authorized for
3 the procurement and transfer of such additional heli-
4 copters; and

5 (3) assistance for Bolivia should be maintained
6 at least at the level assumed in the fiscal year 1998
7 budget submission of the President and the Admin-
8 istration should act accordingly.

9 **SEC. 357. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR MEDI-**
10 **CAL CARE FOR VETERANS.**

11 It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals
12 underlying this resolution assume that \$40,274,000 in ad-
13 ditional amounts above the President's budget levels will
14 be made available for veterans health care for fiscal year
15 1999.

16 **SEC. 358. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON OBJECTION TO THE**
17 **USE OF THE SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS TO**
18 **FUND CERTAIN PROGRAMS.**

19 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that the Budget
20 Committee Report accompanying this resolution assumes
21 that the landowner incentive program of the Endangered
22 Species Recovery Act would be funded “from the gross
23 receipts realized in the sales of excess BLM land: *Pro-*
24 *vided*, That BLM has sufficient administrative funds to
25 conduct such sales”.

1 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
2 Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution
3 assume that—

4 (1) the landowner incentive program included in
5 the Endangered Species Recovery Act should be fi-
6 nanced from a dedicated source of funding; and

7 (2) public lands should not be sold to fund the
8 landowner incentive program of the Endangered
9 Species Recovery Act through their proceeds alone,
10 if subsequent legislation provides an alternative or
11 mixed, dedicated source of mandatory funding.

12 **SEC. 359. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING A MULTI-**
13 **NATIONAL ALLIANCE AGAINST DRUG TRAF-**
14 **FICKING.**

15 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

16 (1) the traffic in illegal drugs greatly threatens
17 democracy, security and stability in the Western
18 Hemisphere due to the violence and corruption asso-
19 ciated with drug trafficking organizations;

20 (2) drug trafficking organizations operate with-
21 out respect for borders or national sovereignty;

22 (3) the production, transport, sale, and use of
23 illicit drugs endangers the people and legitimate in-
24 stitutions of all countries in the hemisphere;

1 should also examine the condition of the Internal
2 Revenue Code of 1986.

3 (2) According to the Congressional Research
4 Service, the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1997
5 added 1,000,000 words and 315 pages to the Inter-
6 nal Revenue Code.

7 (3) The Internal Revenue Code continues to
8 grow more complex and difficult for the average tax-
9 payer to understand, and the average tax return has
10 become more time-consuming to prepare.

11 (4) The average taxpayer will spend 9 hours
12 and 54 minutes preparing Form 1040 for the 1997
13 tax year.

14 (5) The average taxpayer spends between 21
15 and 28 hours each year on tax matters.

16 (6) In 1995, 58,965,000 of the 118,218,327 tax
17 returns that were filed, almost 50 percent, were filed
18 by taxpayers who utilized the help of a paid tax pre-
19 parer.

20 (7) The average taxpayer spends \$72 each year
21 for tax preparation.

22 (8) The total burden on all taxpayers of main-
23 taining records, and preparing and filing tax returns
24 is estimated to be in excess of 1,600,000 hours per
25 year.

1 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
2 Senate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume
3 that the Senate should give priority to tax proposals that
4 simplify the tax code and reject proposals that add greater
5 complexity in the tax code and increased compliance costs
6 for the taxpayer.

7 **SEC. 361. GENERAL PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF MARI-**
8 **JUANA FOR MEDICINAL PURPOSES.**

9 It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of
10 this resolution assume that no funds appropriated by Con-
11 gress should be used to provide, procure, furnish, fund or
12 support, or to compel any individual, institution or govern-
13 ment entity to provide, procure, furnish, fund or support,
14 any item, good, benefit, program or service, for the pur-
15 pose of the use of marijuana for medicinal purposes, ex-
16 cept that this section shall not apply to medical research
17 and investigational new drug programs under the jurisdic-
18 tion of the Food and Drug Administration.

19 **SEC. 362. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING AMTRAK**
20 **FUNDING.**

21 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

22 (1) on November 13, 1997 the Senate unani-
23 mously passed the Amtrak Reform and Accountabil-
24 ity Act of 1997, Public Law 105–134, authorizing
25 appropriations of \$1,058,000,000 for fiscal year

1 1999; \$1,023,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;
2 \$989,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and
3 \$955,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, totaling
4 \$4,025,000,000 for fiscal years 1999–2002;

5 (2) in Public Law 105–134 the Congress de-
6 clared that “intercity rail passenger service is an es-
7 sential component of a national intermodal pas-
8 senger transportation system”;

9 (3) section 201 of the Amtrak Reform and Ac-
10 countability Act of 1997 has now statutorily formal-
11 ized prior Congressional directives to Amtrak to
12 reach operating self-sufficiency by fiscal year 2002;

13 (4) the Congress and the President, through en-
14 actment of this legislation, have effectively agreed
15 that Congress will provide adequate funding to per-
16 mit Amtrak to achieve the goal of operating self-suf-
17 ficiency;

18 (5) capital investment is critical to reducing op-
19 erating costs and increasing the quality of Amtrak
20 service;

21 (6) capital investment is essential to improving
22 Amtrak’s long-term financial health;

23 (7) the \$2,200,000,000 provided to Amtrak
24 through the Taxpayer Relief Act is for the sole pur-
25 pose of capital expenditures and other qualified ex-

1 penses and is intended to supplement, not supplant,
2 annual appropriations.

3 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
4 Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional to-
5 tals in this budget resolution assume that Congress and
6 the Administration will fulfill the intent of the Amtrak Re-
7 form and Accountability Act of 1997 and appropriate suf-
8 ficient funds in each of the next 5 fiscal years for Amtrak
9 to implement its fiscal years 1998–2003 Strategic Busi-
10 ness Plan, while preserving the integrity of the
11 \$2,200,000,000 provided under the Taxpayer Relief Act
12 for the statutory purpose of capital investment.

13 **SEC. 363. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MARKET AC-**
14 **CESS PROGRAM.**

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

16 (1) The Market Access Program (MAP) contin-
17 ues to be a vital and important part of United
18 States trade policy aimed at maintaining and ex-
19 panding United States agricultural exports, counter-
20 ing subsidized foreign competition, strengthening
21 farm income and protecting American jobs. Further,
22 the Senate finds that:

23 (A) The Market Access Program is specifi-
24 cally targeted towards small business, farmer
25 cooperatives and trade associations.

1 (B) The Market Access Program is admin-
2 istered on a cost-share basis. Participants, in-
3 cluding farmers and ranchers, are required to
4 contribute up to 50 percent or more toward the
5 cost of the program.

6 (2) The Market Access Program has been a tre-
7 mendous success by any measure. Since the program
8 was established, United States agricultural exports
9 have doubled. In fiscal year 1997, United States ag-
10 ricultural exports amounted to \$57,300,000,000, re-
11 sulting in a positive agricultural trade surplus of ap-
12 proximately \$22,000,000,000, and contributing bil-
13 lions of dollars more in increased economic activity
14 and additional tax revenues.

15 (3) The Market Access Program has also
16 helped maintain and create needed jobs throughout
17 the Nation's economy. More than one million Ameri-
18 cans now have jobs that depend on United States
19 agricultural exports. Further, every billion dollars in
20 additional United States agricultural exports helps
21 create as many as 17,000 or more new jobs.

22 (4) United States agriculture, including farm
23 income and related jobs, is more dependent than
24 ever on maintaining and expanding United States

1 agricultural exports as Federal farm programs are
2 gradually reduced under the FAIR Act of 1996.

3 (5) In addition to the Asian economic situation
4 and exchange rate fluctuations, United States agri-
5 cultural exports continue to be adversely impacted
6 by continued subsidized foreign competition, artifi-
7 cial trade barriers and other unfair foreign trade
8 practices.

9 (6) The European Union (EU) and other for-
10 eign competitors continue to heavily outspend the
11 United States by more than 10 to 1 with regard to
12 export subsidies.

13 (A) In 1997, the EU budgeted
14 \$7,200,000,000 for export subsidies aimed at
15 capturing a larger share of the world market at
16 the expense of United States agriculture.

17 (B) EU and other foreign competitors also
18 spend nearly \$500,000,000 on market pro-
19 motion activities. The EU spends more on wine
20 promotion than the United States currently
21 spends on all commodities and related agricul-
22 tural products.

23 (C) The EU has announced a major new
24 initiative aimed at increasing their exports to

1 Japan—historically, the largest single market
2 for United States agriculture exports.

3 (7) United States agriculture is the most com-
4 petitive industry in the world, but it cannot and
5 should not be expected to compete alone against the
6 treasuries of foreign governments.

7 (8) Reducing or eliminating funding for the
8 Market Access Program would adversely affect
9 United States agriculture's ability to remain com-
10 petitive in today's global marketplace. A reduction in
11 United States agricultural exports would translate
12 into lower farm income, a worsening trade deficit,
13 slower economic growth, fewer export-related jobs,
14 and a declining tax base.

15 (9) United States success in upcoming trade
16 negotiations on agriculture scheduled to begin in
17 1999 depends on maintaining an aggressive trade
18 strategy and related policies and programs. Reduc-
19 ing or eliminating the Market Access Program would
20 represent a form of unilateral disarmament and
21 weaken the United States negotiating position.

22 (10) The Market Access Program is one of the
23 few programs specifically allowed under the current
24 Uruguay Round Agreement.

1 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
2 Senate that funding for the Market Access Program
3 (MAP) should be fully maintained as authorized and ag-
4 gressively utilized by the United States Department of Ag-
5 riculture to encourage United States agricultural exports,
6 strengthen farm income, counter subsidized foreign com-
7 petition, and protect American jobs.

8 **SEC. 364. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NA-**
9 **TIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.**

10 (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

11 (1) heart disease was the leading cause of death
12 for both men and women in every year from 1970
13 to 1993;

14 (2) mortality rates for individuals suffering
15 from prostate cancer, skin cancer, and kidney cancer
16 continue to rise;

17 (3) the mortality rate for African American
18 women suffering from diabetes is 134 percent higher
19 than the mortality rate of Caucasian women suffer-
20 ing from diabetes;

21 (4) asthma rates for children increased 58 per-
22 cent from 1982 to 1992;

23 (5) nearly half of all American women between
24 the ages of 65 and 75 reported having arthritis;

1 (6) AIDS is the leading cause of death for
2 Americans between the ages of 24 and 44;

3 (7) the Institute of Medicine has described
4 United States clinical research to be “in a state of
5 crisis” and the National Academy of Sciences con-
6 cluded in 1994 that “the present cohort of clinical
7 investigators is not adequate”;

8 (8) biomedical research has been shown to be
9 effective in saving lives and reducing health care ex-
10 penditures;

11 (9) research sponsored by the National Insti-
12 tutes of Health has contributed significantly to the
13 first overall reduction in cancer death rates since
14 recordkeeping was instituted;

15 (10) research sponsored by the National Insti-
16 tutes of health has resulted in the identification of
17 genetic mutations for osteoporosis; Lou Gehrig’s
18 Disease, cystic fibrosis, and Huntington’s Disease;
19 breast, skin and prostate cancer; and a variety of
20 other illnesses;

21 (11) research sponsored by the National Insti-
22 tutes of Health has been key to the development of
23 Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) and Positron
24 Emission Tomography (PET) scanning technologies;

1 (12) research sponsored by the National Insti-
2 tutes of Health has developed effective treatments
3 for Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia (ALL). Today,
4 80 percent of children diagnosed with Acute
5 Lymphoblastic Leukemia are alive and free of the
6 disease after 5 years; and

7 (13) research sponsored by the National Insti-
8 tutes of Health contributed to the development of a
9 new, cost-saving cure for peptic ulcers.

10 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
11 Senate that the function totals in this budget resolution
12 assume that—

13 (1) appropriations for the National Institutes of
14 Health should be increased by 100 percent over the
15 next 5 fiscal years;

16 (2) appropriations for the National Institutes of
17 Health should be increased by \$2,000,000,000 in
18 year 1999 over the amount appropriated in fiscal
19 year 1998;

20 (3) the budget resolution takes a major step to-
21 ward meeting this goal; and

22 (4) at a minimum, appropriations for the Na-
23 tional Institutes of Health should match the rec-
24 ommendations provided in the budget resolution.

1 **SEC. 365. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING DISPLAY OF**
2 **TEN COMMANDMENTS.**

3 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

4 (1) the Ten Commandments have had a signifi-
5 cant impact on the development of the fundamental
6 legal principles of Western Civilization; and

7 (2) the Ten Commandments set forth a code of
8 moral conduct, observance of which is acknowledged
9 to promote respect for our system of laws and the
10 good of society.

11 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the
12 Senate that the functional totals in this concurrent resolu-
13 tion on the budget assume that—

14 (1) the Ten Commandments are a declaration
15 of fundamental principles that are the cornerstones
16 of a fair and just society; and

17 (2) the public display, including display in the
18 Supreme Court, the Capitol building, the White
19 House, and other government offices and court-
20 houses across the nation, of the Ten Commandments
21 should be permitted, as long as it is consistent with

1 the establishment clause of the first amendment of
2 the United States Constitution.

Passed the Senate April 2, 1998.

Attest:

Secretary.

105TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

S. CON. RES. 86

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 and revising the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

SCON 86 ES1S—2
SCON 86 ES1S—3
SCON 86 ES1S—4
SCON 86 ES1S—5
SCON 86 ES1S—6
SCON 86 ES1S—7
SCON 86 ES1S—8
SCON 86 ES1S—9
SCON 86 ES1S—10