Calendar No. 64

106TH CONGRESS
1ST 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

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

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.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.

(a) DECLARATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolu-

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

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

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for 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 diplomatic 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 families.
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.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 2000 through 2009:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,401,979,000,000.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2004: $1,584,969,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: $1,648,259,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $1,681,438,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $1,735,646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $1,805,517,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $1,868,515,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.

Fiscal year 2001: $−7,433,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $−53,118,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: $−32,303,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: $−49,180,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: $−62,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $−109,275,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $−135,754,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $−150,692,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $−177,195,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000: $1,426,931,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $1,456,294,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $1,487,477,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: $1,560,513,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: $1,612,278,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: $1,665,843,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $1,697,402,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $1,752,567,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $1,813,739,000,000.

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

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2000: $−6,313,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $0.

Fiscal year 2002: $0.

Fiscal year 2003: $0.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 2000 through 2009 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $288,812,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $303,616,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

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

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

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $14,494,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,133,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $14,651,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,807,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $14,834,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,513,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $14,929,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,352,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $14,998,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,181,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $14,962,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,054,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $17,955,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,214,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $17,946,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,907,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,880,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,784,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,772,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $17,912,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,768,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $49,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$650,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$1,435,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$3,136,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $−163,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$1,138,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, −$84,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$1,243,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, −$319,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$1,381,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, −$447,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$1,452,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, −$452,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$1,453,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, −$506,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$1,431,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, −$208,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$1,137,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, −$76,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$1,067,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $21,520,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $21,183,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $20,747,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $22,479,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $22,492,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $22,536,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,429,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $22,566,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,466,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $22,667,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,425,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $22,658,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,361,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $23,041,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,738,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $14,831,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,660,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $13,519,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,279,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $11,288,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,536,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $11,955,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,252,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $12,072,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,526,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $10,553,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,882,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $10,609,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,083,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $10,711,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,145,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $10,763,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,162,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $10,853,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,223,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $9,864,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,470,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $10,620,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $5,754,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $14,450,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,188,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $14,529,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,875,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $13,859,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,439,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $12,660,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,437,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $12,635,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,130,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $12,666,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,879,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $12,642,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $13,415,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,824,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $51,325,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $45,333,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $51,128,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $47,711,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $51,546,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $47,765,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $52,477,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $46,720,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $52,580,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $46,207,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $52,609,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $46,022,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $52,640,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $45,990,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $52,673,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $45,990,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $52,707,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $46,007,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $52,742,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $46,033,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $5,343,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,273,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $2,021,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $795,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $2,019,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $724,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $2,013,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $688,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $67,373,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $63,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $66,549,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $65,355,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $67,295,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $66,037,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $73,334,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $68,531,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $76,648,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $72,454,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $77,464,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $75,891,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $78,229,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $77,189,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $79,133,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $78,119,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $80,144,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $79,109,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $80,051,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $79,059,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $156,181,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $152,986,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $164,089,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $162,357,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $173,330,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $173,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $184,679,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $185,330,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $197,893,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $198,499,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $212,821,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $212,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $228,379,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $228,323,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $246,348,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $245,472,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $265,160,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $264,420,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $285,541,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $284,941,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $208,652,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $208,698,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $222,104,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $222,252,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $230,593,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $230,222,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $250,743,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $250,871,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $268,558,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $268,738,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $295,574,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $295,188,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $306,772,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $306,929,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $337,566,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $337,761,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $365,642,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $365,225,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $394,078,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $394,249,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $244,390,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $248,088,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $250,873,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $257,033,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $263,620,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $266,577,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $333,562,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $335,104,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $14,239,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,348,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $13,768,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,750,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $15,573,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,555,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $16,299,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,281,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $17,087,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,069,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $17,961,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,943,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $18,895,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,877,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $19,907,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $19,889,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $21,033,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $21,015,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $22,233,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,215,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $44,724,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $45,064,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $44,255,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $44,980,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $44,728,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $45,117,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $45,536,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $46,024,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $45,862,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $46,327,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $48,341,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $48,844,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $46,827,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $47,373,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $47,377,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $45,803,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $47,959,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $48,505,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $48,578,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $49,150,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $23,434,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $25,349,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $24,656,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $25,117,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $24,657,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $24,932,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $23,833,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $23,720,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $12,339,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,476,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $11,916,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,605,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $12,080,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,282,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $12,083,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,150,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $12,099,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,186,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $12,112,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,906,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $12,134,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,839,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $12,150,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,873,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $12,169,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,064,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $12,178,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,931,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $275,682,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $275,682,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

Fiscal year 2004:

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

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

Fiscal year 2005:

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

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

Fiscal year 2006:

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

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

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $257,618,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $257,618,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $255,177,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $255,177,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $253,001,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $253,001,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$8,033,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$8,094,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$8,480,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$12,874,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$6,437,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$19,976,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, −$4,394,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$4,835,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, −$4,481,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$5,002,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, −$4,515,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$5,067,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, −$4,619,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$5,192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, −$5,210,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$5,780,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, −$5,279,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$5,851,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, −$5,316,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$5,889,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$34,260,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$34,260,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$36,876,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$36,876,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$43,626,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$43,626,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, −$37,464,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$37,464,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, −$37,559,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$37,559,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, −$38,497,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$38,497,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, −$39,178,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$39,178,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, −$40,426,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$40,426,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, −$41,237,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$41,237,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, −$42,084,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$42,084,000,000.

SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN THE SENATE.

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

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

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

SEC. 105. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

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

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

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

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR A FISCAL YEAR 2000 SURPLUS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(d) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised aggregates and other levels under subsection (c) shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as aggregates and other levels contained in this resolution.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry that provides risk management and income assistance for agriculture producers, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of budget authority and outlays to that Committee by an amount that does not exceed—

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

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

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

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

(1) fiscal year 2000;

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

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

(c) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised allocations under subsection (a) shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations contained in this resolution.

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

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may reduce the spending and revenue aggregates and may revise committee allocations for legislation that reduces revenues if such legislation will not increase the deficit for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

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

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

(b) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised allocations and aggregates under subsection (a) shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

SEC. 204. CLARIFICATION ON THE APPLICATION OF SECTION 202 OF H. CON. RES. 67.

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

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''the deficit'' and inserting ''the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit''; and

(2) in paragraph (6), by—

(A) striking ''increases the deficit'' and inserting ''increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit''; and

(B) striking ''increase the deficit'' and inserting ''increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit''.

SEC. 205. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION POINT OF ORDER.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, a point of order may be made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure and if the Presiding Officer sustains that point of order, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—A provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

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

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

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

SEC. 206. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.

In the event there is no joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000, and in conformance with section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives and of the Senate shall submit for printing in the Congressional Record allocations consistent with the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000, as passed by the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

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

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation that would use proceeds from Outer Continental Shelf leasing and production to fund historic preservation, recreation and land, water, fish, and wildlife conservation ef-

forts and to support coastal needs and activities, provided that, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of that legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

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

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

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate submits an adjustment under this section for legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment to that legislation that would necessitate such submission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committees shall report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

SEC. 208. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MANAGED CARE PLANS THAT AGREE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SERVICES TO THE ELDERLY.

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

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

(1) fiscal year 2000;

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

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

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional level and spending aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and spending aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of

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

(2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate submits an adjustment under this section for legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment to that legislation that would necessitate such submission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and spending aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(d) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committees shall report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

SEC. 209. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

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

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

(1) fiscal year 2000;

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

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

(b) PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT.—The adjustments made pursuant to subsection (a) may be made to address the cost of the prescription drug benefit.

(c) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—The revision of allocations and aggregates made under this section shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

SEC. 210. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, or of that House

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

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

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE CONGRESS AND THE SENATE

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

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

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

(2) according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), 42 percent of married couples incurred ''marriage penalties'' under the tax code in 1996, averaging nearly $1,400;

(3) measured as a percent of income, marriage penalties are largest for low-income families, as couples with incomes below $20,000 who incurred a

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

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

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

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

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

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

quirement to improve security for United States diplomatic missions and personnel abroad, which should be met without compromising existing budgets for International Affairs (Function 150).

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

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) medicare home health services provide a vitally important option enabling homebound individuals to stay in their own homes and communities rather than go into institutionalized care; and

(2) implementation of the Interim Payment System and other changes to the medicare home health benefit have exacerbated inequalities in payments for home health services between regions, limiting access to these services in many areas and penalizing efficient, low-cost providers.

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

SEC. 304. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE DEDUCTIBILITY OF HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS OF THE SELF-EMPLOYED.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

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

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

(4) it will not be until 2004 that the self-employed will be able to take a full 100-percent deduction for their health insurance premiums for the tax year 2003;

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

(6) the increased cost coupled with the less favorable tax treatment makes health insurance less affordable for the self-employed;

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

of uninsured is 53.1 percent, for self-employed living at 100 through 199 percent of poverty the rate of uninsured is 47 percent, and for self-employed living at 200 percent of poverty and above the rate of uninsured is 17.8 percent;

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

(9) this lack of full deductibility is also adversely affecting the growing number of women who own small businesses.

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

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

It is the sense of the Senate that this concurrent resolution on the budget assumes any reductions in taxes should be structured to benefit working families by providing family tax relief and incentives to stimulate savings, investment, job creation, and economic growth.

SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

(2) these employees perform vital day-to-day functions, ranging from equipment maintenance to leadership and staff roles, that allow the drill weekends and annual active duty training of the traditional Guardsmen to be dedicated to preparation for the National Guard's warfighting and peacetime missions;

(3) when the ability to provide sufficient Active Guard/Reserves and Technicians end strength is reduced, unit readiness, as well as quality of life for soldiers and families is degraded;

(4) the Army National Guard, with agreement from the Department of Defense, requires a minimum essential requirement of 23,500 Active Guard/Reserves and 25,500 Technicians; and

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

22,500 Technicians, end strength shortfalls of 3,000 and 1,693, respectively.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in the budget resolution assume that the Department of Defense will give priority to providing adequate resources to sufficiently fund the Active Guard/Reserves and Military Technicians at minimum required levels.

SEC. 307. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EFFECTS OF SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM ON WOMEN.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Social Security benefit structure is of particular importance to low-earning wives and widows, with 63 percent of women beneficiaries aged 62 or older receiving wife's or widow's benefits;

(2) three-quarters of unmarried and widowed elderly women rely on Social Security for more than half of their income;

(3) without Social Security benefits, the elderly poverty rate among women would have been 52.2 percent, and among widows would have been 60.6 percent;

(4) women tend to live longer and tend to have lower lifetime earnings than men do;

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

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

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

(1) women face unique obstacles in ensuring retirement security and survivor and disability stability;

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

(3) the Congress and the President should take these factors into account when considering proposals to reform the Social Security system.

SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the National Institutes of Health is the Nation's foremost research center;

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

(3) continued biomedical research funding must be ensured so that medical doctors and scientists have the security to commit to conducting long-term research studies;

(4) funding for the National Institutes of Health should continue to increase in order to prevent the cessation of biomedical research studies and the loss of medical doctors and research scientists to private research organizations; and

(5) the National Institutes of Health conducts research protocols without proprietary interests, thereby ensuring that the best health care is researched and made available to the Nation.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that there shall be a continuation of the pattern of budgetary increases for biomedical research.

SEC. 309. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FUNDING FOR KYOTO PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION PRIOR TO SENATE RATIFICATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The agreement signed by the Administration on November 12, 1998, regarding legally binding commitments on greenhouse gas reductions is in-

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

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

(3) The Administration has not submitted the Kyoto Protocol to the Senate for ratification and has indicated it has no intention to do so in the foreseeable future.

(4) The Administration has pledged to Congress that it would not implement any portion of the Kyoto Protocol prior to its ratification in the Senate.

(5) Congress agrees that Federal expenditures are required and appropriate for activities which both improve the environment and reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Those activities include programs to promote energy efficient technologies, encourage technology development that reduces or sequesters greenhouse gases, encourage the development and use of alternative and renewable fuel technologies,

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

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the levels in this resolution assume that funds should not be provided to put into effect the Kyoto Protocol prior to its Senate ratification in compliance with the requirements of the Byrd-Hagel Resolution and consistent with previous Administration assurances to Congress.

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

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

(1) A dozen internationally, prestigious economic studies have shown that technological progress has historically been the single most important factor in economic growth, having more than twice the impact of labor or capital.

(2) The link between economic growth and technology is evident: our dominant high technology industries are currently responsible for 80 percent of the value of today's stock market, ⅓ of our economic output, and half of our economic growth. Furthermore, the link between Federal funding of research and development (R&D) and market products is conclusive: 70 percent of all patent applications

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

(3) The revolutionary high technology applications of today were spawned from scientific advances that occurred in the 1960's, when the government intensively funded R&D. In the 3 decades since then, our investment in R&D as a fraction of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has dropped to half its former value. As a fraction of the Federal budget, the investment in civilian R&D has dropped to only ⅓ its value in 1965.

(4) Compared to other foreign nation's investment in science and technology, American competitiveness is slipping: an Organization for Economic Co-opertion and Development report notes that 14 countries now invest more in basic and fundamental research as a fraction of GDP than the United States.

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

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

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

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

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

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

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

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals included in this resolution assume the following:

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

(2) Front line drug fighting agencies are dedicating more resources for intentional efforts to continue restoring a balanced drug control strategy. Congress should carefully examine the reauthorization of the United States Customs service and ensure they have adequate resources and authority not only to facilitate the movement of internationally traded goods but to ensure they can aggressively pursue their law enforcement activities.

(3) By pursuing a balanced effort which requires investment in 3 key areas: demand reduction (such as education and treatment); domestic law enforcement; and international supply reduction, Congress believes we can reduce the number of children who are exposed to and addicted to illegal drugs.

SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TRIBAL COLLEGES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

(2) while annual appropriations for tribal colleges have increased modestly in recent years, core operation funding levels are still about ½ of the $6,000 per Indian student level authorized by the Tribally Controlled College or University Act;

(3) although tribal colleges received a $1,400,000 increase in funding in fiscal year 1999, because of rising student populations, these institutions faced an actual per-student decrease in funding over fiscal year 1998; and

(4) per student funding for tribal colleges is only about 63 percent of the amount given to mainstream community colleges ($2,964 per student at tribal colleges versus $4,743 per student at mainstream community colleges).

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

(1) this resolution recognizes the funding difficulties faced by tribal colleges and assumes that priority consideration will be provided to them

through funding for the Tribally Controlled College and University Act, the 1994 Land Grant Institutions, and title III of the Higher Education Act; and

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

SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) January 1999 ''Economic and Budget Outlook,'' the Social Security Trust Fund is projected to incur annual surpluses of $126,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, $137,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000, $144,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2001, $153,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, $161,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2003, and $171,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2004;

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

ment of statutory legislation that would enforce this assumption;

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

(4) using CBO's re-estimate of his budget proposal, the President would spend approximately $40,000,000,000 of the Social Security surplus in fiscal year 2000 on non-Social Security programs; $41,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2001; $24,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002; $34,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2003; and $20,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2004; and

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

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

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

SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SALE OF GOVERNORS ISLAND.

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

SEC. 315. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PELL GRANT FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

(2) higher education promotes economic opportunity for individuals, as recipients of bachelor's degrees earn an average of 75 percent per year more than those with high school diplomas and experience half as much unemployment as high school graduates;

(3) higher education promotes social opportunity, as increased education is correlated with reduced criminal activity, lessened reliance on public assistance, and increased civic participation;

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

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

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

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

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

(8) grant aid as a portion of all students financial aid has fallen significantly over the past 5 years;

(9) the nation's neediest students are now borrowing approximately as much as its wealthiest students to finance higher education; and

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

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

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

posed $125 increase in the Pell Grant maximum award;

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

(3) within the discretionary allocation provided to the Appropriations Committee, the maximum grant award should be raised, to the maximum extent practicable and funding for the Pell Grant program should be higher than the level requested by the President.