

Calendar No. 64

106<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> Session

**S. CON. RES. 20**

[Report No. 106-27]

---

**CONCURRENT RESOLUTION**

Setting forth the congressional budget for the  
United States Government for fiscal years 2000  
through 2009.

---

MARCH 19, 1999

Placed on the calendar

## Calendar No. 64

106TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION**S. CON. RES. 20****[Report No. 106-27]**

Setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government  
for fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 19, 1999

Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, reported the following  
original concurrent resolution; which was read twice and placed on the  
calendar

---

**CONCURRENT RESOLUTION**

Setting forth the congressional budget for the United States  
Government for fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

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

3       **SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET**

4                       **FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.**

5               (a) DECLARATION.—

6                       (1) IN GENERAL.—Congress determines and de-  
7       clares that this resolution is the concurrent resolu-

1       tion on the budget for fiscal year 2000 including the  
 2       appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2001  
 3       through 2009 as authorized by section 301 of the  
 4       Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

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

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000.

#### TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

- Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
- Sec. 102. Social Security.
- Sec. 103. Major functional categories.
- Sec. 104. Reconciliation of revenue reductions in the Senate.
- Sec. 105. Reconciliation of revenue reductions in the House of Representatives.

#### TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

- Sec. 201. Reserve fund for fiscal year 2000 surplus.
- Sec. 202. Reserve fund for agriculture.
- Sec. 203. Tax reduction reserve fund in the Senate.
- Sec. 204. Clarification on the application of section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67.
- Sec. 205. Emergency designation point of order.
- Sec. 206. Authority to provide committee allocations.
- Sec. 207. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for use of OCS receipts.
- Sec. 208. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for managed care plans that agree to  
                                   provide additional services to the elderly.
- Sec. 209. Reserve fund for Medicare and prescription drugs.
- Sec. 210. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

#### TITLE III—SENSE OF THE CONGRESS AND THE SENATE

- Sec. 301. Sense of the Senate on marriage penalty.
- Sec. 302. Sense of the Senate on improving security for United States diplo-  
                                   matic missions.
- Sec. 303. Sense of the Senate on access to medicare home health services.
- Sec. 304. Sense of the Senate regarding the deductibility of health insurance  
                                   premiums of the self-employed.
- Sec. 305. Sense of the Senate that tax reductions should go to working fami-  
                                   lies.
- Sec. 306. Sense of the Senate on the National Guard.

- Sec. 307. Sense of the Senate on effects of social security reform on women.  
 Sec. 308. Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the national institutes of health.  
 Sec. 309. Sense of Congress on funding for Kyoto protocol implementation prior to Senate ratification.  
 Sec. 310. Sense of the Senate on Federal research and development investment.  
 Sec. 311. Sense of the Senate on counter-narcotics funding.  
 Sec. 312. Sense of the Senate regarding tribal colleges.  
 Sec. 313. Sense of the Senate on the social security surplus.  
 Sec. 314. Sense of the Senate on the sale of Governor's Island.  
 Sec. 315. Sense of the Senate on Pell Grant funding.

## 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 2000 through 2009:

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 2000: \$1,401,979,000,000.  
 10 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,435,214,000,000.  
 11 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,455,158,000,000.  
 12 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,531,015,000,000.  
 13 Fiscal year 2004: \$1,584,969,000,000.  
 14 Fiscal year 2005: \$1,648,259,000,000.  
 15 Fiscal year 2006: \$1,681,438,000,000.  
 16 Fiscal year 2007: \$1,735,646,000,000.  
 17 Fiscal year 2008: \$1,805,517,000,000.  
 18 Fiscal year 2009: \$1,868,515,000,000.

1 (B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels  
2 of Federal revenues should be changed are as fol-  
3 lows:

4 Fiscal year 2000: \$0.  
5 Fiscal year 2001: \$-7,433,000,000.  
6 Fiscal year 2002: \$-53,118,000,000.  
7 Fiscal year 2003: \$-32,303,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2004: \$-49,180,000,000.  
9 Fiscal year 2005: \$-62,637,000,000.  
10 Fiscal year 2006: \$-109,275,000,000.  
11 Fiscal year 2007: \$-135,754,000,000.  
12 Fiscal year 2008: \$-150,692,000,000.  
13 Fiscal year 2009: \$-177,195,000,000.

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

17 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,426,931,000,000.  
18 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,456,294,000,000.  
19 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,487,477,000,000.  
20 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,560,513,000,000.  
21 Fiscal year 2004: \$1,612,278,000,000.  
22 Fiscal year 2005: \$1,665,843,000,000.  
23 Fiscal year 2006: \$1,697,402,000,000.  
24 Fiscal year 2007: \$1,752,567,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2008: \$1,813,739,000,000.

1                   Fiscal year 2009: \$1,873,969,000,000.

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

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

6                   Fiscal year 2001: \$1,435,214,000,000.

7                   Fiscal year 2002: \$1,455,158,000,000.

8                   Fiscal year 2003: \$1,531,015,000,000.

9                   Fiscal year 2004: \$1,582,070,000,000.

10                  Fiscal year 2005: \$1,638,428,000,000.

11                  Fiscal year 2006: \$1,666,608,000,000.

12                  Fiscal year 2007: \$1,715,883,000,000.

13                  Fiscal year 2008: \$1,780,697,000,000.

14                  Fiscal year 2009: \$1,840,699,000,000.

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

18                  Fiscal year 2000: \$−6,313,000,000.

19                  Fiscal year 2001: \$0.

20                  Fiscal year 2002: \$0.

21                  Fiscal year 2003: \$0.

22                  Fiscal year 2004: \$2,899,000,000.

23                  Fiscal year 2005: \$9,831,000,000.

24                  Fiscal year 2006: \$14,830,000,000.

25                  Fiscal year 2007: \$19,763,000,000.

1 Fiscal year 2008: \$24,820,000,000.

2 Fiscal year 2009: \$27,816,000,000.

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

5 Fiscal year 2000: \$5,635,900,000,000.

6 Fiscal year 2001: \$5,716,100,000,000.

7 Fiscal year 2002: \$5,801,000,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2003: \$5,885,000,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2004: \$5,962,200,000,000.

10 Fiscal year 2005: \$6,029,400,000,000.

11 Fiscal year 2006: \$6,088,100,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2007: \$6,138,900,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2008: \$6,175,100,000,000.

14 Fiscal year 2009: \$6,203,500,000,000.

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

17 Fiscal year 2000: \$3,510,000,000,000.

18 Fiscal year 2001: \$3,377,700,000,000.

19 Fiscal year 2002: \$3,236,900,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2003: \$3,088,200,000,000.

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

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

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

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

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

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

2 **SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

19           (b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of  
20 Senate enforcement under sections 302, and 311 of the  
21 Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays  
22 of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust  
23 Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund  
24 are as follows:

25                   Fiscal year 2000: \$327,256,000,000.



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 **SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

11 Congress determines and declares that the appro-  
12 priate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new  
13 direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee  
14 commitments for fiscal years 2000 through 2009 for each  
15 major functional category are:

16 (1) National Defense (050):

17 Fiscal year 2000:

18 (A) New budget authority,

19 \$288,812,000,000.

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

21 Fiscal year 2001:

22 (A) New budget authority,

23 \$303,616,000,000.

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

25 Fiscal year 2002:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$308,175,000,000.

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

4 Fiscal year 2003:

5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$318,277,000,000.

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

8 Fiscal year 2004:

9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$327,166,000,000.

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

12 Fiscal year 2005:

13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$328,370,000,000.

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

16 Fiscal year 2006:

17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$329,600,000,000.

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

20 Fiscal year 2007:

21 (A) New budget authority,  
22 \$330,870,000,000.

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

24 Fiscal year 2008:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$332,176,000,000.

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

4 Fiscal year 2009:

5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$333,452,000,000.

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

8 (2) International Affairs (150):

9 Fiscal year 2000:

10 (A) New budget authority,  
11 \$12,511,000,000.

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

13 Fiscal year 2001:

14 (A) New budget authority,  
15 \$12,716,000,000.

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

17 Fiscal year 2002:

18 (A) New budget authority,  
19 \$11,985,000,000.

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

21 Fiscal year 2003:

22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 \$13,590,000,000.

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

25 Fiscal year 2004:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$14,494,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$14,133,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2005:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$14,651,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$13,807,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2006:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$14,834,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$13,513,000,000.  
12 Fiscal year 2007:  
13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$14,929,000,000.  
15 (B) Outlays, \$13,352,000,000.  
16 Fiscal year 2008:  
17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$14,998,000,000.  
19 (B) Outlays, \$13,181,000,000.  
20 Fiscal year 2009:  
21 (A) New budget authority,  
22 \$14,962,000,000.  
23 (B) Outlays, \$13,054,000,000.  
24 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):  
25 Fiscal year 2000:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$17,955,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$18,214,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2001:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$17,946,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$17,907,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2002:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$17,912,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$17,880,000,000.  
12 Fiscal year 2003:  
13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$17,912,000,000.  
15 (B) Outlays, \$17,784,000,000.  
16 Fiscal year 2004:  
17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$17,912,000,000.  
19 (B) Outlays, \$17,772,000,000.  
20 Fiscal year 2005:  
21 (A) New budget authority,  
22 \$17,912,000,000.  
23 (B) Outlays, \$17,768,000,000.  
24 Fiscal year 2006:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$17,912,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$17,768,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2007:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$17,912,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$17,768,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2008:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$17,912,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$17,768,000,000.  
12 Fiscal year 2009:  
13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$17,912,000,000.  
15 (B) Outlays, \$17,768,000,000.  
16 (4) Energy (270):  
17 Fiscal year 2000:  
18 (A) New budget authority, \$49,000,000.  
19 (B) Outlays, -\$650,000,000.  
20 Fiscal year 2001:  
21 (A) New budget authority,  
22 -\$1,435,000,000.  
23 (B) Outlays, -\$3,136,000,000.  
24 Fiscal year 2002:

1 (A) New budget authority,

2 \$ - 163,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, - \$1,138,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2003:

5 (A) New budget authority, - \$84,000,000.

6 (B) Outlays, - \$1,243,000,000.

7 Fiscal year 2004:

8 (A) New budget authority,

9 - \$319,000,000.

10 (B) Outlays, - \$1,381,000,000.

11 Fiscal year 2005:

12 (A) New budget authority,

13 - \$447,000,000.

14 (B) Outlays, - \$1,452,000,000.

15 Fiscal year 2006:

16 (A) New budget authority,

17 - \$452,000,000.

18 (B) Outlays, - \$1,453,000,000.

19 Fiscal year 2007:

20 (A) New budget authority,

21 - \$506,000,000.

22 (B) Outlays, - \$1,431,000,000.

23 Fiscal year 2008:

24 (A) New budget authority,

25 - \$208,000,000.

1 (B) Outlays, – \$1,137,000,000.

2 Fiscal year 2009:

3 (A) New budget authority, – \$76,000,000.

4 (B) Outlays, – \$1,067,000,000.

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

6 Fiscal year 2000:

7 (A) New budget authority,

8 \$21,520,000,000.

9 (B) Outlays, \$22,244,000,000.

10 Fiscal year 2001:

11 (A) New budget authority,

12 \$21,183,000,000.

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

14 Fiscal year 2002:

15 (A) New budget authority,

16 \$20,747,000,000.

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

18 Fiscal year 2003:

19 (A) New budget authority,

20 \$22,479,000,000.

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

22 Fiscal year 2004:

23 (A) New budget authority,

24 \$22,492,000,000.

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



1 Fiscal year 2005:  
2 (A) New budget authority,  
3 \$22,536,000,000.  
4 (B) Outlays, \$22,429,000,000.  
5 Fiscal year 2006:  
6 (A) New budget authority,  
7 \$22,566,000,000.  
8 (B) Outlays, \$22,466,000,000.  
9 Fiscal year 2007:  
10 (A) New budget authority,  
11 \$22,667,000,000.  
12 (B) Outlays, \$22,425,000,000.  
13 Fiscal year 2008:  
14 (A) New budget authority,  
15 \$22,658,000,000.  
16 (B) Outlays, \$22,361,000,000.  
17 Fiscal year 2009:  
18 (A) New budget authority,  
19 \$23,041,000,000.  
20 (B) Outlays, \$22,738,000,000.  
21 (6) Agriculture (350):  
22 Fiscal year 2000:  
23 (A) New budget authority,  
24 \$14,831,000,000.  
25 (B) Outlays, \$13,660,000,000.

1 Fiscal year 2001:  
2 (A) New budget authority,  
3 \$13,519,000,000.  
4 (B) Outlays, \$11,279,000,000.  
5 Fiscal year 2002:  
6 (A) New budget authority,  
7 \$11,288,000,000.  
8 (B) Outlays, \$9,536,000,000.  
9 Fiscal year 2003:  
10 (A) New budget authority,  
11 \$11,955,000,000.  
12 (B) Outlays, \$10,252,000,000.  
13 Fiscal year 2004:  
14 (A) New budget authority,  
15 \$12,072,000,000.  
16 (B) Outlays, \$10,526,000,000.  
17 Fiscal year 2005:  
18 (A) New budget authority,  
19 \$10,553,000,000.  
20 (B) Outlays, \$9,882,000,000.  
21 Fiscal year 2006:  
22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 \$10,609,000,000.  
24 (B) Outlays, \$9,083,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2007:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$10,711,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$9,145,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2008:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$10,763,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$9,162,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2009:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$10,853,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$9,223,000,000.  
12 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
13 Fiscal year 2000:  
14 (A) New budget authority,  
15 \$9,864,000,000.  
16 (B) Outlays, \$4,470,000,000.  
17 Fiscal year 2001:  
18 (A) New budget authority,  
19 \$10,620,000,000.  
20 (B) Outlays, \$5,754,000,000.  
21 Fiscal year 2002:  
22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 \$14,450,000,000.  
24 (B) Outlays, \$10,188,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2003:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$14,529,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$10,875,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2004:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$13,859,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$10,439,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2005:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$12,660,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$9,437,000,000.  
12 Fiscal year 2006:  
13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$12,635,000,000.  
15 (B) Outlays, \$9,130,000,000.  
16 Fiscal year 2007:  
17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$12,666,000,000.  
19 (B) Outlays, \$8,879,000,000.  
20 Fiscal year 2008:  
21 (A) New budget authority,  
22 \$12,642,000,000.  
23 (B) Outlays, \$8,450,000,000.  
24 Fiscal year 2009:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$13,415,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$8,824,000,000.  
4 (8) Transportation (400):  
5 Fiscal year 2000:  
6 (A) New budget authority,  
7 \$51,325,000,000.  
8 (B) Outlays, \$45,333,000,000.  
9 Fiscal year 2001:  
10 (A) New budget authority,  
11 \$51,128,000,000.  
12 (B) Outlays, \$47,711,000,000.  
13 Fiscal year 2002:  
14 (A) New budget authority,  
15 \$51,546,000,000.  
16 (B) Outlays, \$47,765,000,000.  
17 Fiscal year 2003:  
18 (A) New budget authority,  
19 \$52,477,000,000.  
20 (B) Outlays, \$46,720,000,000.  
21 Fiscal year 2004:  
22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 \$52,580,000,000.  
24 (B) Outlays, \$46,207,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2005:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$52,609,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$46,022,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2006:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$52,640,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$45,990,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2007:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$52,673,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$45,990,000,000.  
12 Fiscal year 2008:  
13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$52,707,000,000.  
15 (B) Outlays, \$46,007,000,000.  
16 Fiscal year 2009:  
17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$52,742,000,000.  
19 (B) Outlays, \$46,033,000,000.  
20 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
21 Fiscal year 2000:  
22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 \$5,343,000,000.  
24 (B) Outlays, \$10,273,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

4 Fiscal year 2002:

5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$1,889,000,000.

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

8 Fiscal year 2003:

9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$2,042,000,000.

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

12 Fiscal year 2004:

13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$2,037,000,000.

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

16 Fiscal year 2005:

17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$2,030,000,000.

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

20 Fiscal year 2006:

21 (A) New budget authority,  
22 \$2,027,000,000.

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

24 Fiscal year 2007:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$2,021,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$795,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2008:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$2,019,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$724,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2009:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$2,013,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$688,000,000.  
12 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social  
13 Services (500):  
14 Fiscal year 2000:  
15 (A) New budget authority,  
16 \$67,373,000,000.  
17 (B) Outlays, \$63,994,000,000.  
18 Fiscal year 2001:  
19 (A) New budget authority,  
20 \$66,549,000,000.  
21 (B) Outlays, \$65,355,000,000.  
22 Fiscal year 2002:  
23 (A) New budget authority,  
24 \$67,295,000,000.  
25 (B) Outlays, \$66,037,000,000.



1 Fiscal year 2003:  
2 (A) New budget authority,  
3 \$73,334,000,000.  
4 (B) Outlays, \$68,531,000,000.  
5 Fiscal year 2004:  
6 (A) New budget authority,  
7 \$76,648,000,000.  
8 (B) Outlays, \$72,454,000,000.  
9 Fiscal year 2005:  
10 (A) New budget authority,  
11 \$77,464,000,000.  
12 (B) Outlays, \$75,891,000,000.  
13 Fiscal year 2006:  
14 (A) New budget authority,  
15 \$78,229,000,000.  
16 (B) Outlays, \$77,189,000,000.  
17 Fiscal year 2007:  
18 (A) New budget authority,  
19 \$79,133,000,000.  
20 (B) Outlays, \$78,119,000,000.  
21 Fiscal year 2008:  
22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 \$80,144,000,000.  
24 (B) Outlays, \$79,109,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2009:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$80,051,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$79,059,000,000.  
4 (11) Health (550):  
5 Fiscal year 2000:  
6 (A) New budget authority,  
7 \$156,181,000,000.  
8 (B) Outlays, \$152,986,000,000.  
9 Fiscal year 2001:  
10 (A) New budget authority,  
11 \$164,089,000,000.  
12 (B) Outlays, \$162,357,000,000.  
13 Fiscal year 2002:  
14 (A) New budget authority,  
15 \$173,330,000,000.  
16 (B) Outlays, \$173,767,000,000.  
17 Fiscal year 2003:  
18 (A) New budget authority,  
19 \$184,679,000,000.  
20 (B) Outlays, \$185,330,000,000.  
21 Fiscal year 2004:  
22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 \$197,893,000,000.  
24 (B) Outlays, \$198,499,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2005:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$212,821,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$212,637,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2006:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$228,379,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$228,323,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2007:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$246,348,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$245,472,000,000.  
12 Fiscal year 2008:  
13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$265,160,000,000.  
15 (B) Outlays, \$264,420,000,000.  
16 Fiscal year 2009:  
17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$285,541,000,000.  
19 (B) Outlays, \$284,941,000,000.  
20 (12) Medicare (570):  
21 Fiscal year 2000:  
22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 \$208,652,000,000.  
24 (B) Outlays, \$208,698,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2001:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$222,104,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$222,252,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2002:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$230,593,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$230,222,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2003:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$250,743,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$250,871,000,000.  
12 Fiscal year 2004:  
13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$268,558,000,000.  
15 (B) Outlays, \$268,738,000,000.  
16 Fiscal year 2005:  
17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$295,574,000,000.  
19 (B) Outlays, \$295,188,000,000.  
20 Fiscal year 2006:  
21 (A) New budget authority,  
22 \$306,772,000,000.  
23 (B) Outlays, \$306,929,000,000.  
24 Fiscal year 2007:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$337,566,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$337,761,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2008:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$365,642,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$365,225,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2009:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$394,078,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$394,249,000,000.  
12 (13) Income Security (600):  
13 Fiscal year 2000:  
14 (A) New budget authority,  
15 \$244,390,000,000.  
16 (B) Outlays, \$248,088,000,000.  
17 Fiscal year 2001:  
18 (A) New budget authority,  
19 \$250,873,000,000.  
20 (B) Outlays, \$257,033,000,000.  
21 Fiscal year 2002:  
22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 \$263,620,000,000.  
24 (B) Outlays, \$266,577,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2003:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$276,386,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, \$276,176,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2004:

5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$285,576,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, \$285,388,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2005:

9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$297,942,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, \$298,128,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2006:

13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$304,155,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, \$304,593,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2007:

17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$310,047,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, \$310,948,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2008:

21 (A) New budget authority,  
22 \$323,315,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, \$324,766,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2009:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$333,562,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$335,104,000,000.  
4 (14) Social Security (650):  
5 Fiscal year 2000:  
6 (A) New budget authority,  
7 \$14,239,000,000.  
8 (B) Outlays, \$14,348,000,000.  
9 Fiscal year 2001:  
10 (A) New budget authority,  
11 \$13,768,000,000.  
12 (B) Outlays, \$13,750,000,000.  
13 Fiscal year 2002:  
14 (A) New budget authority,  
15 \$15,573,000,000.  
16 (B) Outlays, \$15,555,000,000.  
17 Fiscal year 2003:  
18 (A) New budget authority,  
19 \$16,299,000,000.  
20 (B) Outlays, \$16,281,000,000.  
21 Fiscal year 2004:  
22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 \$17,087,000,000.  
24 (B) Outlays, \$17,069,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2005:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$17,961,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$17,943,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2006:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$18,895,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$18,877,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2007:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$19,907,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$19,889,000,000.  
12 Fiscal year 2008:  
13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$21,033,000,000.  
15 (B) Outlays, \$21,015,000,000.  
16 Fiscal year 2009:  
17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$22,233,000,000.  
19 (B) Outlays, \$22,215,000,000.  
20 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
21 Fiscal year 2000:  
22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 \$44,724,000,000.  
24 (B) Outlays, \$45,064,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2001:



1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$44,255,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$44,980,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2002:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$44,728,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$45,117,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2003:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$45,536,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$46,024,000,000.  
12 Fiscal year 2004:  
13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$45,862,000,000.  
15 (B) Outlays, \$46,327,000,000.  
16 Fiscal year 2005:  
17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$48,341,000,000.  
19 (B) Outlays, \$48,844,000,000.  
20 Fiscal year 2006:  
21 (A) New budget authority,  
22 \$46,827,000,000.  
23 (B) Outlays, \$47,373,000,000.  
24 Fiscal year 2007:

1           (A)       New       budget       authority,  
2           \$47,377,000,000.  
3           (B) Outlays, \$45,803,000,000.  
4           Fiscal year 2008:  
5           (A)       New       budget       authority,  
6           \$47,959,000,000.  
7           (B) Outlays, \$48,505,000,000.  
8           Fiscal year 2009:  
9           (A)       New       budget       authority,  
10          \$48,578,000,000.  
11          (B) Outlays, \$49,150,000,000.  
12          (16) Administration of Justice (750):  
13          Fiscal year 2000:  
14          (A)       New       budget       authority,  
15          \$23,434,000,000.  
16          (B) Outlays, \$25,349,000,000.  
17          Fiscal year 2001:  
18          (A)       New       budget       authority,  
19          \$24,656,000,000.  
20          (B) Outlays, \$25,117,000,000.  
21          Fiscal year 2002:  
22          (A)       New       budget       authority,  
23          \$24,657,000,000.  
24          (B) Outlays, \$24,932,000,000.  
25          Fiscal year 2003:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$24,561,000,000.

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

4 Fiscal year 2004:

5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$24,467,000,000.

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

8 Fiscal year 2005:

9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$24,355,000,000.

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

12 Fiscal year 2006:

13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$24,242,000,000.

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

16 Fiscal year 2007:

17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$24,114,000,000.

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

20 Fiscal year 2008:

21 (A) New budget authority,  
22 \$23,989,000,000.

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

24 Fiscal year 2009:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$23,833,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$23,720,000,000.  
4 (17) General Government (800):  
5 Fiscal year 2000:  
6 (A) New budget authority,  
7 \$12,339,000,000.  
8 (B) Outlays, \$13,476,000,000.  
9 Fiscal year 2001:  
10 (A) New budget authority,  
11 \$11,916,000,000.  
12 (B) Outlays, \$12,605,000,000.  
13 Fiscal year 2002:  
14 (A) New budget authority,  
15 \$12,080,000,000.  
16 (B) Outlays, \$12,282,000,000.  
17 Fiscal year 2003:  
18 (A) New budget authority,  
19 \$12,083,000,000.  
20 (B) Outlays, \$12,150,000,000.  
21 Fiscal year 2004:  
22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 \$12,099,000,000.  
24 (B) Outlays, \$12,186,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2005:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$12,112,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$11,906,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2006:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$12,134,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$11,839,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2007:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$12,150,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$11,873,000,000.  
12 Fiscal year 2008:  
13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$12,169,000,000.  
15 (B) Outlays, \$12,064,000,000.  
16 Fiscal year 2009:  
17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$12,178,000,000.  
19 (B) Outlays, \$11,931,000,000.  
20 (18) Net Interest (900):  
21 Fiscal year 2000:  
22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 \$275,682,000,000.  
24 (B) Outlays, \$275,682,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2001:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$271,443,000,000.

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

4 Fiscal year 2002:

5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$267,855,000,000.

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

8 Fiscal year 2003:

9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$265,573,000,000.

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

12 Fiscal year 2004:

13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 \$263,835,000,000.

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

16 Fiscal year 2005:

17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 \$261,411,000,000.

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

20 Fiscal year 2006:

21 (A) New budget authority,  
22 \$259,195,000,000.

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

24 Fiscal year 2007:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 \$257,618,000,000.  
3 (B) Outlays, \$257,618,000,000.  
4 Fiscal year 2008:  
5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 \$255,177,000,000.  
7 (B) Outlays, \$255,177,000,000.  
8 Fiscal year 2009:  
9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 \$253,001,000,000.  
11 (B) Outlays, \$253,001,000,000.  
12 (19) Allowances (920):  
13 Fiscal year 2000:  
14 (A) New budget authority,  
15 – \$8,033,000,000.  
16 (B) Outlays, – \$8,094,000,000.  
17 Fiscal year 2001:  
18 (A) New budget authority,  
19 – \$8,480,000,000.  
20 (B) Outlays, – \$12,874,000,000.  
21 Fiscal year 2002:  
22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 – \$6,437,000,000.  
24 (B) Outlays, – \$19,976,000,000.  
25 Fiscal year 2003:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 – \$4,394,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, – \$4,835,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2004:

5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 – \$4,481,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, – \$5,002,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2005:

9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 – \$4,515,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, – \$5,067,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2006:

13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 – \$4,619,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, – \$5,192,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2007:

17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 – \$5,210,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, – \$5,780,000,000.

20 Fiscal year 2008:

21 (A) New budget authority,  
22 – \$5,279,000,000.

23 (B) Outlays, – \$5,851,000,000.

24 Fiscal year 2009:



1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 – \$5,316,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, – \$5,889,000,000.

4 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

5 Fiscal year 2000:

6 (A) New budget authority,  
7 – \$34,260,000,000.

8 (B) Outlays, – \$34,260,000,000.

9 Fiscal year 2001:

10 (A) New budget authority,  
11 – \$36,876,000,000.

12 (B) Outlays, – \$36,876,000,000.

13 Fiscal year 2002:

14 (A) New budget authority,  
15 – \$43,626,000,000.

16 (B) Outlays, – \$43,626,000,000.

17 Fiscal year 2003:

18 (A) New budget authority,  
19 – \$37,464,000,000.

20 (B) Outlays, – \$37,464,000,000.

21 Fiscal year 2004:

22 (A) New budget authority,  
23 – \$37,559,000,000.

24 (B) Outlays, – \$37,559,000,000.

25 Fiscal year 2005:

1 (A) New budget authority,  
2 — \$38,497,000,000.

3 (B) Outlays, — \$38,497,000,000.

4 Fiscal year 2006:

5 (A) New budget authority,  
6 — \$39,178,000,000.

7 (B) Outlays, — \$39,178,000,000.

8 Fiscal year 2007:

9 (A) New budget authority,  
10 — \$40,426,000,000.

11 (B) Outlays, — \$40,426,000,000.

12 Fiscal year 2008:

13 (A) New budget authority,  
14 — \$41,237,000,000.

15 (B) Outlays, — \$41,237,000,000.

16 Fiscal year 2009:

17 (A) New budget authority,  
18 — \$42,084,000,000.

19 (B) Outlays, — \$42,084,000,000.

20 **SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN**  
21 **THE SENATE.**

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

1           (1) to reduce revenues by not more than \$0 in  
2           fiscal year 2000, \$142,034,000,000 for the period of  
3           fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and  
4           \$777,587,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000  
5           through 2009; and

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

9   **SEC. 105. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN**  
10                                   **THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**

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

15           (1) to reduce revenues by not more than \$0 in  
16           fiscal year 2000, \$142,034,000,000 for the period of  
17           fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and  
18           \$777,587,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000  
19           through 2009; and

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

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

3                   **SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR A FISCAL YEAR 2000 SUR-**  
 4                                           **PLUS.**

5                   (a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED  
 6 BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—Pursuant  
 7 to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of  
 8 1974, the Congressional Budget Office shall update its  
 9 economic and budget forecast for fiscal year 2000 by July  
 10 15, 1999.

11                   (b) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the report provided  
 12 pursuant to subsection (a) estimates an on-budget surplus  
 13 for fiscal year 2000, the Chairman of the Committee on  
 14 the Budget shall make the adjustments as provided in sub-  
 15 section (c).

16                   (c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Com-  
 17 mittee on the Budget shall take the amount of the on-  
 18 budget surplus for fiscal year 2000 estimated in the report  
 19 submitted pursuant to subsection (a) and—

20                                   (1) reduce the on-budget revenue aggregate by  
 21 that amount for fiscal year 2000;

22                                   (2) provide for or increase the on-budget sur-  
 23 plus levels used for determining compliance with the  
 24 pay-as-you-go requirements of section 202 of H.

1 Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) by that amount for  
2 fiscal year 2000; and

3 (3) adjust the instruction in sections 104(1)  
4 and 105(1) of this resolution to—

5 (A) reduce revenues by that amount for  
6 fiscal year 2000; and

7 (B) increase the reduction in revenues for  
8 the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004  
9 and for the period of fiscal years 2000 through  
10 2009 by that amount.

11 (d) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised aggre-  
12 gates and other levels under subsection (c) shall be consid-  
13 ered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of  
14 1974 as aggregates and other levels contained in this reso-  
15 lution.

16 **SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.**

17 (a) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is reported by the  
18 Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry  
19 that provides risk management and income assistance for  
20 agriculture producers, the Chairman of the Senate Com-  
21 mittee on the Budget may increase the allocation of budg-  
22 et authority and outlays to that Committee by an amount  
23 that does not exceed—

24 (1) \$500,000,000 in budget authority and in  
25 outlays for fiscal year 2000; and

1           (2) \$6,000,000,000 in budget authority and  
2           \$5,165,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal  
3           years 2000 through 2004; and

4           (3) \$6,000,000,000 in budget authority and in  
5           outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through  
6           2009.

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

11           (1) fiscal year 2000;

12           (2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through  
13          2004; or

14           (3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through  
15          2009.

16          (c) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised alloca-  
17          tions under subsection (a) shall be considered for the pur-  
18          poses of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as alloca-  
19          tions contained in this resolution.

20          **SEC. 203. TAX REDUCTION RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.**

21          (a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, the Chairman of  
22          the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce  
23          the spending and revenue aggregates and may revise com-  
24          mittee allocations for legislation that reduces revenues if  
25          such legislation will not increase the deficit for—

1 (1) fiscal year 2000;

2 (2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through  
3 2004; or

4 (3) the period of fiscal years 2000 through  
5 2009.

6 (b) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised alloca-  
7 tions and aggregates under subsection (a) shall be consid-  
8 ered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of  
9 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this reso-  
10 lution.

11 **SEC. 204. CLARIFICATION ON THE APPLICATION OF SEC-**  
12 **TION 202 OF H. CON. RES. 67.**

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

15 (1) in paragraph (1), by striking “the deficit”  
16 and inserting “the on-budget deficit or cause an on-  
17 budget deficit”; and

18 (2) in paragraph (6), by—

19 (A) striking “increases the deficit” and in-  
20 serting “increases the on-budget deficit or  
21 causes an on-budget deficit”; and

22 (B) striking “increase the deficit” and in-  
23 serting “increase the on-budget deficit or cause  
24 an on-budget deficit”.

1 **SEC. 205. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION POINT OF ORDER.**

2 (a) POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is consid-  
3 ering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference  
4 report, a point of order may be made by a Senator against  
5 an emergency designation in that measure and if the Pre-  
6 siding Officer sustains that point of order, that provision  
7 making such a designation shall be stricken from the  
8 measure and may not be offered as an amendment from  
9 the floor.

10 (b) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY REQUIRE-  
11 MENT.—A provision shall be considered an emergency des-  
12 igation if it designates any item an emergency require-  
13 ment pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the  
14 Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of  
15 1985.

16 (c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be  
17 waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative  
18 vote of three-fifths of the members, duly chosen and  
19 sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members  
20 of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required  
21 in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the  
22 Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

23 (d) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of  
24 order under this section may be raised by a Senator as  
25 provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget  
26 Act of 1974.



1 (e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is  
2 sustained under this section against a conference report  
3 the report shall be disposed of as provided in section  
4 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, except  
5 that there shall be no limit on debate.

6 **SEC. 206. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE COMMITTEE ALLOCA-**  
7 **TIONS.**

8 In the event there is no joint explanatory statement  
9 accompanying a conference report on the concurrent reso-  
10 lution on the budget for fiscal year 2000, and in conform-  
11 ance with section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act  
12 of 1974, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget  
13 of the House of Representatives and of the Senate shall  
14 submit for printing in the Congressional Record alloca-  
15 tions consistent with the concurrent resolution on the  
16 budget for fiscal year 2000, as passed by the House of  
17 Representatives and of the Senate.

18 **SEC. 207. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR USE OF**  
19 **OCS RECEIPTS.**

20 (a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, spending aggre-  
21 gates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits  
22 may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legisla-  
23 tion that would use proceeds from Outer Continental Shelf  
24 leasing and production to fund historic preservation, recre-  
25 ation and land, water, fish, and wildlife conservation ef-

1 forts and to support coastal needs and activities, provided  
2 that, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the  
3 budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the  
4 enactment of that legislation will not increase (by virtue  
5 of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit re-  
6 duction) the deficit in this resolution for—

7 (1) fiscal year 2000;

8 (2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through  
9 2004; or

10 (3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through  
11 2009.

12 (b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

13 (1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—Upon  
14 the consideration of legislation pursuant to sub-  
15 section (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the  
16 Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate ap-  
17 propriately revised allocations under section 302(a)  
18 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised  
19 functional levels and aggregates to carry out this  
20 section. These revised allocations, functional levels,  
21 and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes  
22 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as alloca-  
23 tions, functional levels, and aggregates contained in  
24 this resolution.

1           (2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the  
2           Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the  
3           Senate submits an adjustment under this section for  
4           legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in  
5           subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment  
6           to that legislation that would necessitate such sub-  
7           mission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate  
8           appropriately revised allocations under section  
9           302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and  
10          revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out  
11          this section. These revised allocations, functional lev-  
12          els, and aggregates shall be considered for the pur-  
13          poses of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as  
14          allocations, functional levels, and aggregates con-  
15          tained in this resolution.

16          (c) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The ap-  
17          propriate committees shall report appropriately revised al-  
18          locations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional  
19          Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

20   **SEC. 208. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MAN-**  
21                           **AGED CARE PLANS THAT AGREE TO PROVIDE**  
22                           **ADDITIONAL SERVICES TO THE ELDERLY.**

23          (a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, spending aggre-  
24          gates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits  
25          may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legisla-

1 tion to provide: additional funds for medicare managed  
2 care plans agreeing to serve elderly patients for at least  
3 2 years and whose reimbursement was reduced because  
4 of the risk adjustment regulations, provided that to the  
5 extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does  
6 not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of  
7 that legislation will not increase (by virtue of either con-  
8 temporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the  
9 deficit in this resolution for—

10 (1) fiscal year 2000;

11 (2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through  
12 2004; or

13 (3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through  
14 2009.

15 (b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

16 (1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—Upon  
17 the consideration of legislation pursuant to sub-  
18 section (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the  
19 Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate ap-  
20 propriately revised allocations under section 302(a)  
21 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised  
22 functional level and spending aggregates to carry out  
23 this section. These revised allocations, functional lev-  
24 els, and spending aggregates shall be considered for  
25 the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of

1 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates  
2 contained in this resolution.

3 (2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the  
4 Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the  
5 Senate submits an adjustment under this section for  
6 legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in  
7 subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment  
8 to that legislation that would necessitate such sub-  
9 mission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate  
10 appropriately revised allocations under section  
11 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and  
12 revised functional levels and spending aggregates to  
13 carry out this section. These revised allocations,  
14 functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered  
15 for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of  
16 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates  
17 contained in this resolution.

18 (d) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The ap-  
19 propriate committees shall report appropriately revised al-  
20 locations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional  
21 Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

22 **SEC. 209. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE AND PRESCRIP-**  
23 **TION DRUGS.**

24 (a) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is reported by the  
25 Senate Committee on Finance that significantly extends

1 the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust  
2 Fund without the use of transfers of new subsidies from  
3 the general fund, the Chairman of the Committee on the  
4 Budget may change committee allocations and spending  
5 aggregates if such legislation will not cause an on-budget  
6 deficit for—

7 (1) fiscal year 2000;

8 (2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through  
9 2004; or

10 (3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through  
11 2009.

12 (b) **PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT.**—The adjust-  
13 ments made pursuant to subsection (a) may be made to  
14 address the cost of the prescription drug benefit.

15 (c) **BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.**—The revision of al-  
16 locations and aggregates made under this section shall be  
17 considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget  
18 Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in  
19 this resolution.

20 **SEC. 210. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

21 Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

22 (1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of  
23 the Senate and the House of Representatives, re-  
24 spectively, and as such they shall be considered as  
25 part of the rules of each House, or of that House

1 to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall  
2 supersede other rules only to the extent that they  
3 are inconsistent therewith; and

4 (2) with full recognition of the constitutional  
5 right of either House to change those rules (so far  
6 as they relate to that House) at any time, in the  
7 same manner, and to the same extent as in the case  
8 of any other rule of that House.

9 **TITLE III—SENSE OF THE**  
10 **CONGRESS AND THE SENATE**

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

12 (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

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

18 (2) according to the Congressional Budget Of-  
19 fice (CBO), 42 percent of married couples incurred  
20 “marriage penalties” under the tax code in 1996,  
21 averaging nearly \$1,400;

22 (3) measured as a percent of income, marriage  
23 penalties are largest for low-income families, as cou-  
24 ples with incomes below \$20,000 who incurred a

1 marriage penalty in 1996 were forced to pay nearly  
2 8 percent more of their income in taxes than if they  
3 had been able to file individual returns;

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

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

15 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the  
16 Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation en-  
17 acted pursuant to this resolution assume that significantly  
18 reducing or eliminating the marriage penalty should be a  
19 component of any tax cut package reported by the Finance  
20 Committee and passed by Congress during the fiscal year  
21 2000 budget reconciliation process.

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

24 It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this  
25 resolution assume that there is an urgent and ongoing re-



1 quirement to improve security for United States diplo-  
 2 matic missions and personnel abroad, which should be met  
 3 without compromising existing budgets for International  
 4 Affairs (Function 150).

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

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

8 (1) medicare home health services provide a vi-  
 9 tally important option enabling homebound individ-  
 10 uals to stay in their own homes and communities  
 11 rather than go into institutionalized care; and

12 (2) implementation of the Interim Payment  
 13 System and other changes to the medicare home  
 14 health benefit have exacerbated inequalities in pay-  
 15 ments for home health services between regions, lim-  
 16 iting access to these services in many areas and pe-  
 17 nalizing efficient, low-cost providers.

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

22 **SEC. 304. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE DEDUCT-**  
 23 **IBILITY OF HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS**  
 24 **OF THE SELF-EMPLOYED.**

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

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

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

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

11          (4) it will not be until 2004 that the self-em-  
12          ployed will be able to take a full 100-percent deduc-  
13          tion for their health insurance premiums for the tax  
14          year 2003;

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

18          (6) the increased cost coupled with the less fa-  
19          vorable tax treatment makes health insurance less  
20          affordable for the self-employed;

21          (7) these disadvantages are reflected in the  
22          higher rate of uninsured among the self-employed  
23          which stands at 24.1 percent compared with 18.2  
24          percent for all wage and salaried workers, for self-  
25          employed living at or below the poverty level the rate

1 of uninsured is 53.1 percent, for self-employed living  
2 at 100 through 199 percent of poverty the rate of  
3 uninsured is 47 percent, and for self-employed living  
4 at 200 percent of poverty and above the rate of un-  
5 insured is 17.8 percent;

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

10 (9) this lack of full deductibility is also ad-  
11 versely affecting the growing number of women who  
12 own small businesses.

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

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

20 It is the sense of the Senate that this concurrent reso-  
21 lution on the budget assumes any reductions in taxes  
22 should be structured to benefit working families by pro-  
23 viding family tax relief and incentives to stimulate savings,  
24 investment, job creation, and economic growth.

1 **SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE NATIONAL**  
2 **GUARD.**

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

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

8 (2) these employees perform vital day-to-day  
9 functions, ranging from equipment maintenance to  
10 leadership and staff roles, that allow the drill week-  
11 ends and annual active duty training of the tradi-  
12 tional Guardsmen to be dedicated to preparation for  
13 the National Guard's warfighting and peacetime  
14 missions;

15 (3) when the ability to provide sufficient Active  
16 Guard/Reserves and Technicians end strength is re-  
17 duced, unit readiness, as well as quality of life for  
18 soldiers and families is degraded;

19 (4) the Army National Guard, with agreement  
20 from the Department of Defense, requires a min-  
21 imum essential requirement of 23,500 Active Guard/  
22 Reserves and 25,500 Technicians; and

23 (5) the fiscal year 2000 budget request for the  
24 Army National Guard provides resources sufficient  
25 for approximately 21,807 Active Guard/Reserves and



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

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

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

9           (1) women face unique obstacles in ensuring re-  
10 tirement security and survivor and disability sta-  
11 bility;

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

15           (3) the Congress and the President should take  
16 these factors into account when considering pro-  
17 posals to reform the Social Security system.

18 **SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING**

19 **FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.**

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

21           (1) the National Institutes of Health is the Na-  
22 tion's foremost research center;

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



1 consistent with the provisions of S. Res. 98, the  
2 Byrd-Hagel Resolution, which passed the Senate  
3 unanimously.

4 (2) The Administration has agreed to allowing  
5 at least 2 additional years for negotiations on the  
6 Buenos Aires Action Plan to determine the provi-  
7 sions of several vital aspects of the Treaty for the  
8 United States, including emissions trading schemes,  
9 carbon sinks, a clean development mechanism, and  
10 developing Nation participation.

11 (3) The Administration has not submitted the  
12 Kyoto Protocol to the Senate for ratification and has  
13 indicated it has no intention to do so in the foresee-  
14 able future.

15 (4) 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 (5) Congress agrees that Federal expenditures  
19 are required and appropriate for activities which  
20 both improve the environment and reduce carbon di-  
21 oxide emissions. Those activities include programs to  
22 promote energy efficient technologies, encourage  
23 technology development that reduces or sequesters  
24 greenhouse gases, encourage the development and  
25 use of alternative and renewable fuel technologies,



1 and other programs justifiable independent of the  
2 goals of the Kyoto Protocol.

3 (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con-  
4 gress that the levels in this resolution assume that funds  
5 should not be provided to put into effect the Kyoto Pro-  
6 tocol prior to its Senate ratification in compliance with  
7 the requirements of the Byrd-Hagel Resolution and con-  
8 sistent with previous Administration assurances to Con-  
9 gress.

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

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

13 (1) A dozen internationally, prestigious eco-  
14 nomic studies have shown that technological  
15 progress has historically been the single most impor-  
16 tant factor in economic growth, having more than  
17 twice the impact of labor or capital.

18 (2) The link between economic growth and  
19 technology is evident: our dominant high technology  
20 industries are currently responsible for 80 percent of  
21 the value of today's stock market,  $\frac{1}{3}$  of our eco-  
22 nomic output, and half of our economic growth. Fur-  
23 thermore, the link between Federal funding of re-  
24 search and development (R&D) and market products  
25 is conclusive: 70 percent of all patent applications

1 cite nonprofit or federally-funded research as a core  
2 component to the innovation being patented.

3 (3) The revolutionary high technology applica-  
4 tions of today were spawned from scientific advances  
5 that occurred in the 1960's, when the government  
6 intensively funded R&D. In the 3 decades since then,  
7 our investment in R&D as a fraction of Gross Do-  
8 mestic Product (GDP) has dropped to half its  
9 former value. As a fraction of the Federal budget,  
10 the investment in civilian R&D has dropped to only  
11  $\frac{1}{3}$  its value in 1965.

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

19 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the  
20 Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the  
21 Federal investment in R&D should be preserved and in-  
22 creased in order to ensure long-term United States eco-  
23 nomic strength. Funding for Federal agencies performing  
24 basic scientific, medical, and precompetitive engineering  
25 research pursuant to the Balanced Budget Agreement Act

1 of 1997 should be a priority for the Senate Budget and  
2 Appropriations Committees this year, within the Budget  
3 as established by this Committee, in order to achieve a  
4 goal of doubling the Federal investment in R&D over an  
5 11 year period.

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

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

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

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

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

19 (4) the percentage change in drug use since  
20 1992, among graduating high school students who  
21 used drugs in the past 12 months, has substantially  
22 increased—marijuana use is up 80 percent, cocaine  
23 use is up 80 percent, and heroin use is up 100 per-  
24 cent.

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

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

7 (2) Front line drug fighting agencies are dedi-  
8 cating more resources for intentional efforts to con-  
9 tinue restoring a balanced drug control strategy.  
10 Congress should carefully examine the reauthoriza-  
11 tion of the United States Customs service and en-  
12 sure they have adequate resources and authority not  
13 only to facilitate the movement of internationally  
14 traded goods but to ensure they can aggressively  
15 pursue their law enforcement activities.

16 (3) By pursuing a balanced effort which re-  
17 quires investment in 3 key areas: demand reduction  
18 (such as education and treatment); domestic law en-  
19 forcement; and international supply reduction, Con-  
20 gress believes we can reduce the number of children  
21 who are exposed to and addicted to illegal drugs.

22 **SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TRIBAL COL-**  
23 **LEGES.**

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

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

6           (2) while annual appropriations for tribal col-  
7 leges have increased modestly in recent years, core  
8 operation funding levels are still about  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the  
9 \$6,000 per Indian student level authorized by the  
10 Tribally Controlled College or University Act;

11          (3) although tribal colleges received a  
12 \$1,400,000 increase in funding in fiscal year 1999,  
13 because of rising student populations, these institu-  
14 tions faced an actual per-student decrease in fund-  
15 ing over fiscal year 1998; and

16          (4) per student funding for tribal colleges is  
17 only about 63 percent of the amount given to main-  
18 stream community colleges (\$2,964 per student at  
19 tribal colleges versus \$4,743 per student at main-  
20 stream community colleges).

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

23           (1) this resolution recognizes the funding dif-  
24 ficulties faced by tribal colleges and assumes that  
25 priority consideration will be provided to them

1 through funding for the Tribally Controlled College  
 2 and University Act, the 1994 Land Grant Institu-  
 3 tions, and title III of the Higher Education Act; and

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

8 **SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE SOCIAL SECURITY**  
 9 **SURPLUS.**

10 (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

11 (1) according to the Congressional Budget Of-  
 12 fice (CBO) January 1999 “Economic and Budget  
 13 Outlook,” the Social Security Trust Fund is pro-  
 14 jected to incur annual surpluses of  
 15 \$126,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1999,  
 16 \$137,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000,  
 17 \$144,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2001,  
 18 \$153,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002,  
 19 \$161,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2003, and  
 20 \$171,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2004;

21 (2) the fiscal year 2000 budget resolution craft-  
 22 ed by Chairman Domenici assumes that Trust Fund  
 23 surpluses will be used to reduce publicly-held debt  
 24 and for no other purposes, and calls for the enact-

1       ment of statutory legislation that would enforce this  
2       assumption;

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

9           (4) using CBO's re-estimate of his budget pro-  
10      posal, the President would spend approximately  
11      \$40,000,000,000 of the Social Security surplus in  
12      fiscal year 2000 on non-Social Security programs;  
13      \$41,000,000,000     in     fiscal     year     2001;  
14      \$24,000,000,000     in     fiscal     year     2002;  
15      \$34,000,000,000     in     fiscal     year     2003; and  
16      \$20,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2004; and

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

21           (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the  
22      Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation en-  
23      acted pursuant to this resolution assume that Congress  
24      shall reject any budget that would spend any portion of

1 the Social Security surpluses generated in any fiscal year  
2 for any Federal program other than Social Security.

3 **SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SALE OF GOVERNORS**  
4 **ISLAND.**

5 It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this  
6 resolution assume that the sale of Governors Island should  
7 be completed prior to the end of fiscal year 2000.

8 **SEC. 315. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PELL GRANT FUND-**  
9 **ING.**

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

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

13 (2) higher education promotes economic oppor-  
14 tunity for individuals, as recipients of bachelor's de-  
15 grees earn an average of 75 percent per year more  
16 than those with high school diplomas and experience  
17 half as much unemployment as high school grad-  
18 uates;

19 (3) higher education promotes social oppor-  
20 tunity, as increased education is correlated with re-  
21 duced criminal activity, lessened reliance on public  
22 assistance, and increased civic participation;

23 (4) a more educated workforce will be essential  
24 for continued economic competitiveness in an age  
25 where the amount of information available to society



1 will double in a matter of days rather than months  
2 or years;

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

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

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

14 (8) grant aid as a portion of all students finan-  
15 cial aid has fallen significantly over the past 5 years;

16 (9) the nation's neediest students are now bor-  
17 rowing approximately as much as its wealthiest stu-  
18 dents to finance higher education; and

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

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

24 (1) the President's proposed reductions in the  
25 Pell Grant program are incompatible with his pro-

1 posed \$125 increase in the Pell Grant maximum  
2 award;

3 (2) the President's proposed reductions should  
4 be rejected; and

5 (3) within the discretionary allocation provided  
6 to the Appropriations Committee, the maximum  
7 grant award should be raised, to the maximum ex-  
8 tent practicable and funding for the Pell Grant pro-  
9 gram should be higher than the level requested by  
10 the President.