

Since my last report, dated June 16, 1995, there has been no action to change the current level of budget authority, outlays or revenues.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,  
Director.

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, FISCAL YEAR 1995, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JUNE 16, 1995

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) <sup>1</sup>	Current level <sup>2</sup>	Current level over/under resolution
<b>ON-BUDGET</b>			
Budget Authority .....	1,238.7	1,233.1	-5.6
Outlays .....	1,217.6	1,216.2	-1.4
Revenues:			
1995 .....	977.7	978.2	0.5
1995-99 .....	5,415.2	5,405.7	-9.5
Deficit .....	241.0	238.0	-3.1
Debt Subject to Limit .....	4,965.1	4,843.4	-121.7
<b>OFF-BUDGET</b>			
Social Security Outlays:			
1995 .....	287.6	287.5	-0.1
1995-99 .....	1,562.6	1,562.6	(?)
Social Security Revenues:			
1995 .....	360.5	360.3	-0.2
1995-99 .....	1,998.4	1,998.2	-0.2

<sup>1</sup> Reflects revised allocation under section 9(g) of H. Con. Res. 64 for the Deficit-Neutral reserve fund.

<sup>2</sup> Current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

<sup>3</sup> Less than \$50 million.

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JUNE 30, 1995

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
<b>ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS</b>			
Revenues .....			978,466
Permanents and other spending .....			
Legislation .....	750,307	706,236	
Appropriation legislation .....	738,096	757,783	
Offsetting receipts .....	-250,027	-250,027	
Total previously enacted .....	1,238,376	1,213,992	978,466
<b>ENACTED THIS SESSION</b>			
1995 Emergency Supplementals and Rescissions Act (P.L. 104-6) .....	-3,386	-1,008	
Self-Employed Health Insurance Act (P.L. 104-7) .....			-248
Total enacted this session .....	-3,386	-1,008	-248
<b>ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES</b>			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted .....	-1,887	3,189	
Total current level <sup>1</sup> .....	1,233,103	1,216,173	978,218
Total budget resolution .....	1,238,744	1,217,605	977,700
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution .....	5,641	1,432	
Over budget resolution .....			518

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include \$3,905 million in budget authority and \$7,442 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress, and \$841 million in budget authority and \$917 million in outlays for emergencies that would be available only upon an official budget request from the President designating the entire amount requested as an emergency requirement.

CONTINUE FUNDING FOR THE OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

• Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of continuing the funding for the Office of Technology

Assessment [OTA] of the U.S. Congress. I believe that if more of my distinguished colleagues, as well as the public, knew what the elimination of the OTA would mean to our deliberative processes, they, too, would support this invaluable congressional resource.

Mr. President, there is considerable dedication among my colleagues to reduce the Federal budget deficit and to streamline Federal agencies. This Congress deserves to be commended for bringing the budget deficit, and its burden on future generations, to the attention of the American people more dramatically than ever before. I, too, support the reduction of Federal spending, but only where it makes good sense to do so.

However, I ask, what positive affect will the elimination of the OTA—a 143-person, \$20 million-a-year agency that performs a great service to the Congress and that potentially saves billions of dollars—have on reducing the budget deficit?

Mr. President, many of my colleagues know that the OTA does valuable work and that it is well-managed. However, some argue that the OTA is a luxury that the Congress and the country can no longer afford. Mr. President, I submit that the OTA is not an indulgence, but rather a necessity for the Congress and the Nation.

I have frequently turned to the OTA for analysis and information. For example, in 1986, the OTA provided an invaluable service to the Congress and the American Indian community by taking an unprecedented in-depth look at native American health and health care. We learned an enormous amount about both the inadequacies of information technology and the health care delivery systems in the Federal agencies that are charged with implementing our nation-to-nation treaty agreements. As a result of the OTA's study, the Congress will now enjoy a much higher degree of accuracy in reports on the status of Indian health.

Let me give you another example of how the OTA has responded to my requests to deliver impartial information. I was one of the first primary requesters of Adolescent Health—OTA, 1991—the first extensive national examination of the scientific evidence on the efficacy of prevention and treatment interventions directed toward improving the health of our Nation's adolescent population. The OTA clearly gave the authorizing and appropriating committees the message that we should not trick ourselves into thinking that by simply labeling Federal initiatives as "prevention" of adolescent substance abuse, delinquency, AIDS, or pregnancy, the programs were effective. In fact, many of us on both sides of the aisle were disturbed when the OTA concluded that there was very little evidence of success from the prevention efforts that we had promoted. However, the requesters soon came to realize how valuable it was to receive an open-minded and impartial review

from the OTA. And, as the OTA was charged to do, its report went well beyond just giving us the bad news. Because its role is to provide useful information to the Congress, the OTA provided sufficient analysis for us to see where our federally funded prevention efforts were going wrong, and provided guidance to the executive branch on how to better target Federal dollars for adolescent health.

I can give you numerous other examples of the OTA's rigorous approach in winnowing through cloudy data in order to provide us with information that is both accurate and useful. For example, since the late 1970's, the OTA has been an often lonely voice in the health care wilderness, carefully assessing whether the country is investing sufficiently in evidence-gathering on health care treatments. Valid information about what works and what doesn't work is critical to the public and private sectors of the health care industry, which represents one-seventh of the Nation's gross domestic product. Senators and staffers need this information as they consider budget requests from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, including the upcoming reauthorization for the National Institutes of Health, and proposed reforms to Medicaid, Medicare, and the private insurance market. For example, policymakers need to know the extent to which consumers have sufficient information to choose insurance plans, health facilities and individual treatments. Just recently, the OTA, re-examined how we know what works by looking at new health assessment technologies—OTA, Identifying Health Technologies That Work: Searching for Evidence, September 1994. I recommend that report to all of my colleagues and to their constituents in the health care business.

As another example, a health technology study by the OTA in December 1988, Nurse Practitioners, Physician Assistants, and Certified Nurse Midwives: A Policy Analysis, concluded that nonphysician providers were "especially valuable in improving access to primary and supplemental care in rural areas and \* \* \* for the poor, minorities and people without insurance." This information was very helpful in developing health care systems enhanced by the utilization of nonphysician care providers for our underserved populations.

Similar, hard-hitting, tell-it-like-it-is analyses have been done by the OTA on subjects ranging from ground water to space. These include classic assessments of polygraph testing, DNA analysis, police body armor, seismic verification of nuclear test ban treaties and other work on weapons of mass destruction, and on risk assessment methods, all of which were greeted with accolades from Members. Right now, the OTA has work under way in areas as important and diverse as

earthquake damage prevention, advanced automotive technologies, renewable energy, wireless communications, and Arctic impacts of Soviet nuclear contamination.

Some of my colleagues have suggested that we don't need an OTA—that is, our own group of experts in the legislative branch capable of providing us with these highly technical analyses needed for developing legislation. How many of us are able to fully grasp and synthesize highly scientific information and identify the relevant questions that need to be addressed?

The OTA was created to provide the Congress with its own source of information on highly technical matters. Who else but a scientifically oriented agency, composed of technical experts, governed by a bipartisan board of congressional overseers, and seeking information directly under congressional auspices, and given the Congress and the country accurate and essential information on new technologies?

Can other congressional support agencies and staff provide the information we need? I am second to none in my high regard for these agencies, but each has its own distinct role. The U.S. General Accounting Office is in effective organization of auditors and accountants, not scientists. The Congressional Research Service is busy responding to the requests of members for information and research. The Congressional Budget Office provides the Congress with budget data and with analyses of alternative fiscal and budgetary impacts of legislation. Furthermore, each of these agencies is likely to have its budget reduced, or to be asked to take on more responsibilities, or both, and would find it extremely difficult to take on the kinds of specialized work that OTA has contributed.

I hope that the Congress does not become a body that ignores common sense. If it is to remain the world's greatest deliberative body—possible only because of access to the best and most accurate and impartial information and analysis—the Congress must retain the OTA.●

**ERRATA IN CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 67**

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, due to a printing error, the table in the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 67 setting forth the budget authority and outlay allocations for Senate committees incorrectly shows a budget authority allocation of \$1,400 million to the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee for 1996.

The 1996 budget authority allocation to the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee is actually \$1,440 million. Therefore, the Veterans' Affairs allocation for fiscal year 1996 is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Veterans' Affairs .....	1,440	1,423	19,235	17,686

**RECOGNIZING RECIPIENT OF THE GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND**

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, each year an elite group of young women rise above the ranks of their peers and confront the challenge of attaining the Girl Scouts of the United States of America's highest rank in scouting, the Girl Scout Gold Award.

It is with great pleasure that I recognize and applaud Kerri Marsteller of Monkton, MD, who is one of this year's recipients of this most prestigious and time honored award.

Kerri is to be commended on her extraordinary commitment and dedication to her family, friends, community, and to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America.

The qualities of character, perseverance, and leadership which enabled her to reach this goal will also help her to meet the challenges of the future. She is our inspiration for today and our promise for tomorrow.

I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kerri Marsteller. She is one of the best and the brightest and serves as an example of character and moral strength for us all to imitate and follow.

Finally, I wish to salute the families and Scout leaders who have provided Kerri and other young women with continued support and encouragement.

It is with great pride that I congratulate Kerri Marsteller on this achievement.●

**RESTORATION OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH VIETNAM**

● Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I support the President's decision today to restore full diplomatic relations with Vietnam. This would not be an easy decision for any President to make. President Clinton has shown courage and honor in his resolve to do so.

President Clinton, like Presidents Bush and Reagan before him, took very seriously his pledge to the American people that the first priority in our relationship with Vietnam would be the accounting for Americans missing in action in Vietnam.

Given the importance of that commitment, President Clinton insisted that Vietnam cooperate with our accounting efforts to such an extent that normalization was clearly justified and that tangible progress toward the fullest possible accounting be clear enough to assure us that the prospects for continued cooperation were excellent.

Vietnam has shown that level of cooperation. The President has kept his commitment. Normalizing relations with our former enemy is the right thing to do.

In 1991, President Bush proposed a roadmap for improving our relations with Vietnam. Under its provisions, Vietnam was required to take unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral steps to help us account for our missing. Vietnam's cooperation has been excellent for some time now, and has increased since the President lifted our trade embargo against Vietnam in 1994.

That view is shared by virtually every American official, military and civilian, involved in the accounting process, from the commander in chief of U.S. Forces in the Pacific to the enlisted man excavating crash sites in remote Vietnamese jungles. It is also shared by Gen. John Vessey who served three Presidents as Special Emissary to Vietnam for POW/MIA Affairs, as capable and honorable a man as has ever worn the uniform of the United States.

It is mostly my faith in the service of these good men and women that has convinced me that Vietnam's cooperation warrants the normalization of our relations under the terms of the roadmap. It would be injurious to the credibility of the United States and beneath the dignity of a great nation to evade commitments which we freely undertook.

I should also note that Adm. Jeremiah Denton, my acting senior ranking officer at the Hanoi Hilton and a courageous resister, as well as my dear friend Ev Alvarez, the longest held POW in Vietnam, join me and many other former POW's in supporting the restoration of diplomatic relations.

Other factors make the case for full diplomatic relations even stronger. Increasingly, the United States and Vietnam have a shared strategic concern that can be better addressed by an improvement in our relations.

I am not advocating the containment of China. Nor do I think such an ambitious and complex strategic goal could be achieved simply by normalizing relations with Vietnam. But Vietnam, which will become a full member of ASEAN later this month, is an increasingly responsible player in Southeast Asian affairs. An economically viable Vietnam, acting in concert with its neighbors, will help the region resist dominance by any one power. That is a development which is clearly in the best interests of the United States.

Human rights progress in Vietnam should also be better served by restoring relations with that country. The Vietnamese have already developed complex relations with the rest of the free world. Instead of vainly trying to isolate Vietnam, the United States should test the proposition that greater exposure to Americans will render Vietnam more susceptible to the influence of our values.

Vietnam's human rights record needs substantial improvement. We should