THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, SENATE SUPPORING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS SEPTEMBER 8, 1995—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution	20,937	2,031	.....
Over budget resolution	.....	.....	518

[1] In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include $7,716 million in budget authority and $7,958 million in outlays in funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress, and $741 million in budget authority and $852 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.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 11, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report, my first for fiscal year 1996, shows the effects of Congressional action on the 1996 budget and is current through September 8, 1995. The estimates of budget authority, outlays and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 1996 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 67). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. BLUM,
(For June E. O'Neill, Director).

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, FISCAL YEAR 1996, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS SEPTEMBER 8, 1995

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 67)	Current level [1]	Current level over/under resolution
ON-BUDGET			
Budget authority	1,285.5	815.1	−470.4
Outlays	1,288.1	1,005.0	−283.1
Revenues:			
1996	1,042.5	1,042.5	(2)
1996–2000	5,691.5	5,690.8	−0.7
Deficit	245.6	−37.5	−283.1
Debt subject to limit	5,210.7	4,846.5	−364.2
OFF-BUDGET			
Social Security outlays:			
1996	299.4	299.4	0.0
1996–2000	1,626.5	1,626.5	0.0
Social Security revenues:			
1996	374.7	374.7	0.0
1996–2000	2,061.0	2,061.0	0.0

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

[2] 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 1996, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS SEPTEMBER 8, 1995

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
Revenues	.....	.....	1,042,557
Permanents and other spending legislation	830,272	798.924	.....
Appropriation legislation	0	242,052	.....
Offseting receipts	−200,017	−200,017	.....
Total previously enacted	630,254	840,958	1,042,557

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 104TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS SEPTEMBER 8, 1995—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
1995 Rescissions and Department of Defense Emergency Supplementals Act (P.L. 104–6)	−100	−885	.....
Self-Employed Health Insurance Act (P.L. 104–7)	−18	−18	−101
1995 Rescissions and Emergency Supplemental for Disaster Assistance Act (P.L. 104–19)	22	−3,149	.....
Total enacted this session	−96	−4,053	−101
ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements other mandatory programs not yet enacted	184,908	168,049	.....
Total current Level [1]	815,066	1,004,954	1,042,456
Total budget resolution	1,285,500	1,288,100	1,042,500
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution	470,434	283,146	44
Over budget resolution	.....	.....	.....

[1] In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include $3,275 million in budget authority and $1,504 million in outlays for funding for emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress.●

THE IMPORTANCE OF AN INDEPENDENT U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

● Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I firmly support the continuation of a strong, independent U.S. Information Agency. The USIA serves a vital purpose in telling America's story to the rest of the world. It serves the critical function of advancing public diplomacy, broadcasting through its radios and Worldnet, enabling educational and cultural exchange programs, distributing information, and promoting a sense of shared cultural values. These programs not only serve our national security interests. They also provide direct economic benefits and foster a climate where American businesses can develop overseas markets, producing jobs, and providing wages for American workers.

We must remember the important distinctions between the official type of diplomacy conducted by our State Department and what is known as public diplomacy. The State Department conducts a quiet, often secret, dialog between countries with an emphasis placed on accommodation, negotiation, and compromise. These are all important, since they nurture relationships between countries to achieve broader goals. Public diplomacy such as that conducted by USIA seeks to foster direct economic relationships, engages in democratic institution-building, and encourages mutual understanding and a shared sense of values.

A classic illustration of the parallel nature of the two types of diplomacy occurred during the period when martial law was declared in Poland. At a time when private organizations, including the AFL–CIO, were engaged in a massive effort to assist the Polish trade union Solidarnosc, the Reagan administration was taking steps to ease economic sanctions that had been imposed on the Jaruzelski government. Because of the arms-length distance between the government and the private sector, both could pursue their goals. This was true also in Russia, South Africa, the Philippines, and Chile. If this bill passes without the Lieberman amendment, such distance will disappear, and this type of dual diplomacy will prove impossible. If USIA is folded into the State Department, its public diplomacy functions will be severely diminished, particularly in areas where democracy needs them the most in order to survive.

Another major reason for my support of a continued independent USIA stems from its programs of exchanges for emerging foreign and American political leaders. Over the years, these programs have brought young local and Federal officials to America for a first-hand look at our Government and how it works. More than 30 current heads of state had their first exposure to the people and institutions of the United States through the USIA Exchange Program. Hundreds of cabinet ministers, mayors, governors, and Members of Parliament around the world formed their first opinions of America by coming here and meeting people where they work and live.

Hundreds of other leading political figures both here and abroad have gained valuable international experience through USIA's support for programs like that of the American Council of Young Political Leaders. Twenty-five Members of Congress and countless State and local officials around the Nation are alumni of these programs. All will testify to the positive impact of these programs.

The USIA's rule of law program is an example of its efforts in assisting developing democracies worldwide. This particular program has been actively engaged in the area of judicial reform in Romania, perhaps once the most oppressive of the former Communist regimes. Through the posting of American judges at the Ministry of Justice for long-term projects, programs to strengthen the Magistrates' Training Institute, and ongoing support for the newly founded Magistrates' Training Association, USIA has established itself as a leader in assisting Romania in its attempts to establish an independent judiciary. American judges and academics have traveled to Romania under the auspices of USIA's Fulbright Program and have been posted to law schools throughout the country to teach and develop curricula and to work with the judiciary on numerous issues of importance. Romanian judges have also visited the United States under the Agency's International Visitor Program for 30-day observation and consultation trips to witness first hand the American judiciary and to gather information to assist in their judicial reform efforts.

The USIA also supports such projects as the American People Ambassador Program, a program of people to people international. This program arranges face-to-face professional, scientific, technical, and community exchanges between Americans and their counterparts around the world. Each one explores a different topic, but all share the personal exchange of information, ideas, goals, and experiences with leading public and provide sector citizens of foreign countries.

One such program in my State is the torch of Birmingham Award Program, which seeks to honor Russian companies and those in the Newly Independent States who are succeeding despite difficult economic conditions. In September, over 400 Russian business and government leaders will be coming to Birmingham to participate in this event. They will represent every imaginable segment of the Russian economy, and will network with leading Alabama business, political, and community leaders. The USIA and its resources are essential to organizations like the American People Ambassador Program which operate exchanges around the world.

All of us are keenly aware of the budgetary constraints we face. But we must not be short sighted by eliminating investments in our Nation's future and security. Who can say whether or not educational and cultural exchange programs will be maintained if they are placed in a department with a significantly different mission, set of priorities, and official purpose?

The world remains just as dangerous as it has ever been. new threats have replaced some of those which ended with the cold war. But they are just as real and threatening to international peace and stability. The world looks to us for leadership—leadership with a strong voice. I applaud Senator LIEBERMAN's efforts to ensure that America continues to have that strong voice through an independent USIA, and look forward to working with him on this issue when the State Department reauthorization bill is again brought before the Senate.●

THE INCREASING AND IMPORTANT ROLE OF PRIVATE TRAINING FACILITIES IN WORK FORCE TRAINING

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, today I bring to the attention of my colleagues an industry that is growing almost unnoticed in this country, an industry that demonstrates the ability of the private sector to meet the challenges posed by our expanding and technologically advanced economy. I am speaking of the hundreds of private professional firms across the Nation that provide job training to American workers. Since the early 1980's, a new breed of high-quality private sector training providers have proliferated in response to the need of business and industry for highly skilled workers. This is especially true of providers who train people who train people in the information-technology sector of the American economy.

Each year, American employers wisely spend billions of dollars to train and educate their employees. This training enhances the skills of those workers and often enables them to assume new, more challenging positions. The training market in information technology alone—which is one of the fastest growing and most promising sectors of our economy—totaled $2 billion in 1994, and almost all of this need was met with private sector resources. Private professional firms have developed extensive programs and nationwide networks to serve the huge and growing needs of large and small businesses in this field. Many of these firms, although often small enterprises, work in partnerships with large employers who demand that they provide only the highest quality training and who require that they teach skills that conform to industry-based benchmarks and standards.

Today, training providers, which include both public education institutions and private training companies, are using skill standards as benchmarks to develop their courses and to prepare professional workers for exams that will certify them as qualified to perform certain high-skill jobs. Skill standards in this context are not rigid definitions of ''jobs,'' but rather a large comprehensive set of well articulated, competency-based skill statements that are industry driven and nationally recognized. By reflecting the true and detailed needs of the workplace, and by being used in the hiring, promotion, and training of the work force, these become de facto standards at the national level, and they transcend national borders as do businesses in today's global economy. In short, private sector training providers in the information-technology field reflect developments in the marketplace and prepare individuals to handle the jobs of the future.

According to Training magazine, U.S. organizations with 100 employees or more spent $48 billion on training in 1993, and it is likely that the total increased in 1994 and will again in 1995. Employers are recognizing the need to train the individuals they hire in order to keep pace with rapidly evolving technology and to remain competitive in the global economy. Nowhere is training more important than in the information-technology industries, where technological innovations and product upgrades that require new or enhanced skills are coming to market everyday.

Within the information-technology industry it is clear that private sector training providers are one of the main resources to turn to for training. for example, most of the large American software companies use what is known as a leveraged training mode, wherein independent training providers develop courses that teach individuals how to operate the application or systems of a given software company. In turn, the software company will denote the training provider as one that is authorized to award certification in the operation or maintenance of that company's products. This is just one of many examples of how corporations and smaller businesses are using the resources of private training providers.

Whether individuals are updating their skills to improve performance on the job or are unemployed and seeking new skills, by completing training and receiving an industry recognized credential they are improving their own career prospects as well as keeping the American work force competitive.

These training centers must meet the demands of industry and of the market that will eventually employ their students; therefore they must provide only the highest quality training. And while the information-technology market demands quality, it also demands more and more qualified individuals each year. For example, the software and computing industry grew at an annual rate of over 28 percent between 1980 and 1992, while the GDP for that time averaged 2.4-percent growth. Not only is the number of jobs in this field increasing, but those jobs pay wages that are significantly higher than wages in many other industries. In addition, given that the information-technology companies have no geographic-specific resource requirements, they contribute to the economy of virtually every State in the country.

Mr. President, it is quite apparent that the individuals with high-technology skills are in great demand throughout the Nation, and it is apparent that the demand will only increase. Private training providers have been rising to this challenge, and they have done so with entrepreneurial vigor and a commitment to quality. As the number of people in need of training increases, and as the number of people that organizations intend to train outstrips their capability to train them in house, private sector providers of training services will become an ever more important part of the American economy.

It has been my pleasure today to recognize and share with my colleagues the merits of this growing American industry.●

UNLV'S WOMEN'S SOFTBALL TEAM

● Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the achievements of the women's softball team at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas. This outstanding group of women and their coaching staff have set a standard of excellence in 1995 which is worthy of merit.

The team results for the 1995 season are the best in the history of the university. UNLV softball finished their season ranked fourth in the Nation by both a USA Today poll and the NCAA.