

BOXER), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2175 proposed to S.Con.Res. 86, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 and revising the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

AMENDMENT NO. 2178

At the request of Mr. BURNS the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), and the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2178 proposed to S.Con.Res. 86, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 and revising the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

AMENDMENT NO. 2193

At the request of Mrs. BOXER her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2193 proposed to S.Con.Res. 86, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 and revising the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

AMENDMENT NO. 2195

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2195 proposed to S.Con.Res. 86, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 and revising the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

AMENDMENT NO. 2202

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2202 intended to be proposed to S.Con.Res. 86, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 and revising the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

AMENDMENT NO. 2205

At the request of Mr. DURBIN the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2205 proposed to

S.Con.Res. 86, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 and revising the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

AMENDMENT NO. 2209

At the request of Mr. THURMOND his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2209 proposed to S.Con.Res. 86, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 and revising the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

At the request of Mr. ROTH the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2209 proposed to S.Con.Res. 86, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 2210

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2210 proposed to S.Con.Res. 86, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 and revising the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

AMENDMENT NO. 2211

At the request of Mr. ENZI his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2211 proposed to S.Con.Res. 86, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 and revising the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

TORRICELLI (AND JEFFORDS)
AMENDMENT NO. 2212

Mr. LAUTENBERG. (for Mr. TORRICELLI, for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 86) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 and revising the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998; as follows:

On page 53, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 3 . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON BATTLEFIELD PRESERVATION.

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

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

(2) the Secretary of the Interior should give special priority to the preservation of Revolutionary War and War of 1812 battle-

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

(3) the Secretary of the Interior should give special priority to the preservation of Revolutionary War, War of 1812, and Civil War battlefields by allocating funds in the Land and Water Conservation Fund for the purchase of battlefield sites the integrity of which is threatened by urban or suburban development.

BOND (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT
NO. 2213

Mr. BOND (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. D'AMATO, and Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

"SEC. 317. SENSE OF THE SENATE TO MAINTAIN FULL FUNDING FOR THE SECTION 202 ELDERLY HOUSING PROGRAM.

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

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

"(2) Since 1959, the Section 202 Elderly Housing program has funded some 5,400 elderly housing projects with over 330,000 housing units, with the current average tenant in Section 202 housing being a frail, older woman in her seventies, living alone with an income of less than \$10,000 per year.

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

"(4) There are over 1.4 million elderly Americans currently identified as having "worst case housing needs" and in need of affordable housing.

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

"(6) The President's Budget Request for fiscal year 1999 proposes reducing funding for the Section 202 Elderly Housing program from the fiscal year 1998 level of \$645,000,000 to \$109,000,000 in fiscal year 1999. This represents a reduction of over 83 percent in funding, which will result in reducing the construction of Section 202 housing units from some 6,000 units in fiscal year 1998 to only 1,500 units in fiscal year 1999.

"(7) The full funding of the Section 202 Elderly Housing program as an independent federal housing program is an investment in our elderly citizens as well as our Nation.

"(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Section 202 Elderly Housing program, as provided under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, shall be funded in fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 at not less than the fiscal year 1998 funding level of \$645,000,000."

KERREY AMENDMENTS NOS. 2214—
2215

Mr. KERREY proposed two amendments to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 12214

At the appropriate place, add the following:

sec. . Sense of the Senate supporting long-term entitlement reforms.

(a) The Senate finds that the resolution assumes the following—

(1) entitlement spending has risen dramatically over the last thirty-five years.

(2) in 1963, mandatory spending (i.e. entitlement spending and interest on the debt) made up 30 percent of the budget, this figure rose to 45 percent by 1973, to 56 percent by 1983 and to 61 percent by 1993.

(3) mandatory spending is expected to make up 68 percent of the federal budget in 1998.

(4) absent changes, that spending is expected to take up over 70 percent of the federal budget shortly after the year 2000 and 74 percent of the budget by the year 2008.

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

(6) this mandatory spending will continue to crowd out spending for the traditional "discretionary" functions of government like clean air and water, a strong national defense, parks and recreation, education, our transportation system, law enforcement, research and development and other infrastructure spending.

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

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

(1) Congress and the President should work to enact structural reforms in entitlement spending in 1998 and beyond which sufficiently restrain the growth of mandatory spending in order to keep the budget in balance over the long term, extend the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds, avoid crowding out funding for basic government functions and that every effort should be made to hold mandatory spending to no more than seventy percent of the budget.

AMENDMENT NO. 2215

At the end of Title III, insert the following:
SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PASSAGE OF THE IRS RESTRUCTURING AND REFORM ACT.

(2) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) The House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed IRS Reform Legislation (H.R. 2676), on November 5, 1997.

(2) The IRS Restructuring and Reform Act has the potential to benefit 120 million Americans by simplifying the tax process and making the IRS more responsive to taxpayer concerns:

(3) The President has announced that he would sign H.R. 2676;

(4) The Senate plans to recess without considering legislation to reform the IRS.

(5) The American people are busy preparing their taxes to meet the April 15th deadline. They do not get to recess before filing their returns; and

(5) Senators should keep their commitment to take up and pass IRS reform legislation before they recess.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this budget resolution assume that the Senate shall not recess until it has considered and voted on H.R. 2676, the IRS Restructuring and Reform Act of 1997.

MURRAY AMENDMENTS NOS. 2216–2217

Mrs. MURRAY proposed two amendments to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2216

On page 16, line 9, increase the amount by \$2,088,000,000.

On page 16, line 10, increase the amount by \$81,000,000.

On page 16, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,776,000,000.

On page 16, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,487,000,000.

On page 16, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,437,000,000.

On page 16, line 18, increase the amount by \$1,686,000,000.

On page 16, line 21, increase the amount by \$593,000,000.

On page 16, line 22, increase the amount by \$1,301,000,000.

On page 25, line 8, strike “–\$300,000,000” and insert “–\$2,388,000,000.”

On page 25, line 9, strike “–\$1,900,000,000” and insert “–\$1,981,000,000.”

On page 25, line 12, strike “–\$1,200,000,000” and insert “–\$2,976,000,000.”

On page 25, line 13, strike “–\$4,600,000,000” and insert “–\$6,087,000,000.”

On page 25, line 16, strike “–\$2,700,000,000” and insert “–\$4,137,000,000.”

On page 25, line 17, strike “–\$3,000,000,000” and insert “–\$4,686,000,000.”

On page 25, line 20, strike “–\$3,800,000,000” and insert “–\$4,393,000,000.”

On page 25, line 21, strike “–\$7,000,000,000” and insert “–\$8,301,000,000.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2217

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EXPANDING MEDICARE BENEFITS.

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

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

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

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

(4) Improving the health care status of senior citizens would ensure additional savings for Medicare. Helping seniors stay healthier should be a priority of any legislation aimed at protecting Medicare.

(5) In order to keep seniors healthier, Medicare has to become more prevention based. Currently, Medicare offers very few prevention benefits. As a result, seniors are often sicker when they seek care or are hospitalized.

(6) If the objective is to use tobacco revenues to save Medicare, a portion of these new revenues must be allocated to expanding prevention benefits.

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

(8) Medicare cannot be saved without structural changes and reforms. Simply using a new Federal tax to prop up Medicare will not extend solvency much beyond a few

months and will do little to improve the health status of senior citizens and the disabled.

(9) Congress should use these new revenues to expand prevention benefits to ensure that seniors are healthier and stronger. This is how we can truly save Medicare.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume the allocation of a portion of the Federal share of tobacco revenues to expand prevention benefits for Medicare beneficiaries with an emphasis on improving the health status of Medicare beneficiaries and providing long term savings to the program.

DORGAN AMENDMENTS NOS. 2218–2219

Mr. DORGAN proposed two amendments to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2218

Strike page 33, line 3, through page 34, line 3, and insert the following:

SEC. 301. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE TAX TREATMENT OF HOME MORTGAGE INTEREST AND CHARITABLE GIVING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) current Federal income tax laws embrace a number of fundamental tax policies including longstanding encouragement for home ownership and charitable giving;

(2) the mortgage interest deduction is among the most important incentives in the income tax code and promotes the American Dream of home ownership—the single largest investment for most families, and preserving it is critical for the more than 20,000,000 families claiming it now and for millions more in the future;

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

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

(5) recklessly sunseting the entire income tax code threatens our Nation's future economic growth and unwisely eliminates existing tax incentives that are crucial for taxpayers who are often making the most important financial decisions of their lives.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the levels in this resolution assume that Congress supports the continued tax deductibility of home mortgage interest and charitable contributions.

At the appropriate place in the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . HEALTH RESEARCH RESERVE FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates may be adjusted and allocations may be adjusted for legislation that reserves 21 percent of the Federal share of receipts from tobacco legislation for the health research purposes provided in subsection (b), 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 1999;

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

(3) the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2009.

(b) ELIGIBLE HEALTH RESEARCH.—Of the receipts from tobacco legislation reserved pursuant to subsection (a), the following amounts may be used for the following purposes:

(1) 7.5 percent of such receipts to fund research into the prevention and cure of cancer;

(2) 7.5 percent of such receipts to fund research into the prevention and cure of heart disease, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases;

(3) 2 percent of such receipts, to be allocated at the discretion of the Director of the National Institutes of Health, to fund the responsibilities of his office and to fund construction and acquisition of equipment or facilities for the National Institutes of Health;

(4) 2 percent of such receipts for transfer to the National Center for Research Resources to carry out section 1502 of the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993;

(5) 1 percent of such receipts to fund prevention research programs at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

(6) 1 percent of such receipts to fund quality and health outcomes research at the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research; and

(7) the remainder of such receipts to fund other member institutes and centers, including the Office of AIDS Research, of the National Institutes of Health in the same proportion to such remainder, as the amount of annual appropriations under appropriations acts for each member institute and center for a fiscal year bears to the total amount of appropriations under appropriations acts for all member institutes and centers for that fiscal year.

(c) REVISED LEVELS, AGGREGATES AND 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.

(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 purposes described in subsection (b), upon the offering of an amendment 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.

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Revised allocations, functional levels and aggregates submitted or filed pursuant to this subsection 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.

(d) APPLICATION OF SECTION 202 OF H. CON. RES. 67.—Section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) shall not apply for purposes of this section.

BIDEN AMENDMENT NO. 2220

Mr. BIDEN proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

On page 28, line 5, before the period insert “and Veterans Administration health care”.

KYL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2221

Mr. KYL (for himself, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. HELMS, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Mr. HAGEL) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING A SUPERMAJORITY REQUIREMENT FOR RAISING TAXES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Nation's current tax system is indefensible, being overly complex, burdensome, and severely limiting to economic opportunity for all Americans;

(2) fundamental tax reform should be undertaken as soon as practicable to produce a tax system that—

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

(B) provides tax relief for working Americans;

(C) protects the rights of taxpayers and reduces tax collection abuses;

(D) eliminates the bias against savings and investment;

(E) promotes economic growth and job creation;

(F) does not penalize marriage or families; and

(G) provides for a taxpayer-friendly collections process to replace the Internal Revenue Service; and

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

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

GRAMS AMENDMENT NO. 2222

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. GRAMS) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the resolution, insert the following new section:

SEC. . USE OF BUDGET SURPLUS TO REFORM SOCIAL SECURITY.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals included in the resolution assume—

(a) the Congress and the President should use any budget surplus to reduce the Social Security payroll tax and to establish personal retirement accounts with the tax reduction for hard-working Americans.

(b) the Congress and the President should not use the Social Security surplus to finance general government programs and other spending, should begin to build real assets for the trust funds, and work to reform the Social Security system.

BINGAMAN (AND LIEBERMAN) AMENDMENT NO. 2223

Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

“SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CIVILIAN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.”

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation to fund civilian scientific and technological research and development, to increase research and development for the health sciences, or to increase research and development to improve the global environment, 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 1999;

“(2) the period of fiscal years 1999 through 2003; or

“(3) the period of fiscal years 2004 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.”.

FEINGOLD (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2224

Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. HARKIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. . DISABILITY RESERVE FUND FOR FISCAL YEARS 1999-2003.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If legislation generates revenue increases or direct spending reductions to finance disability programs designed to allow persons with a disability to become employed and remain independent and to the extent that such increases or reductions are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the appropriate budgetary levels, allocations, and limits may be adjusted (but by amounts not to exceed \$2,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1999 through 2003) if such adjustments do not cause an increase in the deficit in the resolution.

(b) ADJUSTMENT FOR BUDGET AUTHORITY.—After the reporting of legislation (the offering of an amendment thereto or conference

report thereon) that reduces nondisability direct spending or increases revenue for a fiscal year or years, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall submit appropriately revised allocations and aggregates by an amount that equals the amount such legislation reduces direct spending or increases revenues for a fiscal year or years.

(c) ESTABLISHING A RESERVE.—

(1) REVISIONS.—After the enactment of legislation described in subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall submit revisions to the appropriate allocations and aggregates by the amount that provisions in such legislation generates revenue increases or direct nondisability-related spending reductions.

(2) REVENUE INCREASES OR DIRECT SPENDING REDUCTIONS.—After the submission of revisions under paragraph (1), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall also submit the amount of revenue increases or nondisability related direct spending reductions such legislation generates and the maximum amount available each year for adjustments pursuant to subsection (d).

(d) EFFECT OF REVISED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates submitted under subsection (c) shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(e) REPORTING REVISED SUBDIVISIONS.—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised subdivisions of allocations pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

DEWINE AMENDMENT NO. 2225

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. DEWINE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, *supra*; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FINDINGS AND SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

(2) all children deserve well-educated teachers;

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

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

(5) less than 40 percent of the individuals teaching core subjects (consisting of English, mathematics, science, social studies, and foreign languages) majored or minored in the core subjects;

(6) the quality of teachers impacts student achievement;

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

(8) teachers should have the opportunity to learn new technology and teaching methods through the establishment of teacher training facilities so that teachers can share their new knowledge and experiences with children in the classroom;

(9) school officials should have the flexibility the officials need to have teachers in their schools adequately trained to meet strenuous teacher standards;

(10) knowledgeable and eager individuals of sound character and various professional backgrounds should be encouraged to enter kindergarten through grade 12 classrooms as teachers; and

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

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume—

(1) the enactment of legislation to provide assistance for programs that—

(A) focus on teacher training delivered through local partnerships, with private and public partners, to ensure that current and future teachers possess necessary teaching skills and knowledge of subject areas; and

(B) focus on alternative certification to recruit knowledgeable and eager individuals of sound character to enter kindergarten through grade 12 classrooms as teachers;

(2) that the quality of teachers can be strengthened by improving the academic knowledge of teachers in the subject areas in which the teachers teach;

(3) that institutions of higher education should be held accountable to prepare teachers who are highly competent in the subject areas in which the teachers teach, including preparing teachers by providing training in the effective uses of technologies in classrooms; and

(4) that there should be recruitment into teaching of high quality individuals, including individuals from other occupations.

ROCKEFELLER AMENDMENT NO. 2226

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, *supra*; as follows:

On page 14, line 7, strike “\$51,500,000,000.” and all that follows through line 24, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

“\$51,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

(B) Outlays, \$42,900,000,000.”

On page 25, line 8, strike “—\$300,000,000.” and all that follows through line 25, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

“\$200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$1,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$3,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$1,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$4,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, —\$1,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$1,000,000,000.

On page 31, line 24, strike subsection (6) in its entirety.

CONRAD AMENDMENT NO. 2227

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. CONRAD) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, *supra*; as follows:

On page 28, strike line 2 through line 17 and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation that reserves the Federal share of receipts from tobacco legislation for the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund or the Federal Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Trust Funds.

(b) REVISED AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS.—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.

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

BUMPERS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2228

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. BUMPERS, for himself, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. FEINGOLD) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, *supra*; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by \$39,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by \$66,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$67,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$69,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$71,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$39,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$66,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$67,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$69,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$71,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$39,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$66,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$67,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by \$69,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by \$71,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$39,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$66,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$67,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$69,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$71,000,000.

On page 16, line 9, increase the amount by \$39,000,000.

On page 16, line 10, increase the amount by \$39,000,000.

On page 16, line 13, increase the amount by \$66,000,000.

On page 16, line 14, increase the amount by \$66,000,000.

On page 16, line 17, increase the amount by \$67,000,000.

On page 16, line 18, increase the amount by \$67,000,000.

On page 16, line 21, increase the amount by \$69,000,000.

On page 16, line 22, increase the amount by \$69,000,000.

On page 16, line 25, increase the amount by \$71,000,000.

On page 17, line 1, increase the amount by \$71,000,000.

FEINSTEIN AMENDMENT NO. 2229

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:
SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EDUCATION GOALS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that the Federal Government should work hand-in-hand with States, school districts, and local leaders—

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

(A) establish achievement levels and assessments in every grade for the core academic curriculum; measure each regular student's performance; and prohibit the practice of social promotion of students (promoting students routinely from one grade to the next without regard to their academic achievement);

(B) provide remedial programs for students whose achievement levels indicate they should not be promoted to the next grade;

(C) create smaller schools to enable students to have closer interaction with teachers;

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

(E) recruit new teachers who are adequately trained and credentialed in the subject or subjects they teach and encourage excellent, experienced teachers to remain in the classroom by providing adequate salaries; require all teachers to be credentialed and limit emergency or temporary teaching credentials to a limited period of time; hold teachers and principals accountable to high educational standards; and

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

(2) to reaffirm the importance of public schooling and commit to guaranteeing excellence and accountability in the public schools of this nation.

KERRY AMENDMENT NO. 2230

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. KERRY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

On page 28, strike line 2 through line 17 and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates may be adjusted and allocations may be adjusted for legislation that reserves the Federal share of receipts from tobacco legislation for—

(1) (A) public health efforts to reduce the use of tobacco products by children, including youth tobacco control education and prevention programs, counter-advertising, research, and smoking cessation;

(B) transition assistance programs for tobacco farmers;

(C) increased funding for the Food and Drug Administration to protect children from the hazards of tobacco products;

(D) improving the availability, affordability and quality of child care;

(E) increased funding for education;

(F) increased funding for health research;

(G) reimbursements to States for tobacco-related health costs; or,

(H) expanding children's health insurance coverage; and,

“(2) savings for the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund or the Social Security Federal Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Trust Funds.

(b) REVISED AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS.—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.

(c) APPLICATION OF SECTION 202 OF H. CON. RES. 67.—For the purposes of enforcement of Section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) with respect to this resolution, the increase in the Federal share of receipts resulting from tobacco legislation and used to fund subsection (a)(2) shall not be taken into account.

WELLSTONE AMENDMENT NO. 2231

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. WELLSTONE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

On page 53, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 317. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR MEDICAL CARE FOR VETERANS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that \$159,116,000 in additional amounts above the President's budget levels will be made available for veterans health care for fiscal year 1999.

ROBB AMENDMENT NO. 2232

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. ROBB) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

On page 28, strike lines 1 through 17, and insert the following:

SEC. 202. TOBACCO RESERVE FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates may be increased and allocations may be increased for legislation which reserves the Federal share of receipts from tobacco legislation only for the Medical Hospital Insurance Trust Fund or for providing transition assistance to tobacco farmers.

(b) REVISED AGGREGATES.—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 increased aggregates to carry out this section. These aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) APPLICATION OF SECTION 202 OF H. CON. RES. 67.—For the purposes of enforcement of section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) with respect to this resolution, the increase in receipts resulting from tobacco legislation shall not be taken into account, except the portion dedicated to providing transition assistance to the tobacco farmers.

BIDEN AMENDMENT NO. 2233

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. BIDEN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

SEC. . A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE SENATE'S SUPPORT FOR FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) our Federal, State and local law enforcement officers provide essential services that preserve and protect our freedom and safety, and with the support of Federal assistance, state and local law enforcement officers have succeeded in reducing the national scourge of violent crime, illustrated by a murder rate in 1996 which is projected to be the lowest since 1971 and a violent crime total in 1990 which is the lowest since 1990;

(2) through a comprehensive effort to attack violence against women mounted by state and local law enforcement, and dedicated volunteers and professionals who provide victim services, shelter, counseling and advocacy to battered women and their children, important strides have been made against the national scourge of violence against women, illustrated by the decline in the murder rate for wives, ex-wives and girlfriends at the hands of their “intimates” fell to a 19-year low in 1995;

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

(4) the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund as adopted by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 funds the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 without adding to the Federal budget deficit.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions and the functional totals underlying this resolution assume the Federal Government's commitment to fund Federal law enforcement programs and programs to assist State and local efforts to combat violent crime, including violence against women, shall be maintained and funding for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund shall continue to at least fiscal year 2003.

BOXER (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2234

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mrs. BOXER, for herself, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. JOHNSON) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

On page 28, beginning on line 5, after “Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund,” strike all through the end of line 17, and insert the following:

“, or for health research, including funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

“(b) REVISED BUDGETARY LEVELS AND LIMITS.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust all appropriate budgetary levels and limits, including aggregates and allocations, to carry out this section. These budgetary levels and limits shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the budgetary levels and limits contained in this resolution.

“(c) APPLICATION OF SECTION 202 OF H. CON. RES. 67.—For the purposes of enforcement of

Section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) with respect to this resolution, the increase in receipts resulting from tobacco legislation shall not be taken into account, except the portion dedicated to health research, including the National Institutes of Health."

BINGAMAN (AND LIEBERMAN)
AMENDMENT NO. 2235

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. BINGAMAN for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ANALYSIS OF CIVILIAN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS IN THE FEDERAL BUDGET.

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

"(1) The National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine have recommended, in their 1995 report, entitled 'Allocating Federal Funds for Science and Technology,' that the Federal science and technology budget 'be presented as a comprehensive whole in the President's budget and similarly considered as a whole at the beginning of the congressional budget process before the total federal budget is disaggregate and sent to the appropriations committees and subcommittees.'"

"(2) Civilian federal agencies are supporting more than \$35 billion of research and development in fiscal year 1998, but it is difficult for the Congress and the public to track or understand this support because it is dispersed among 12 different budget functions.

"(3) A meaningful examination of the overall Federal budget for science and technology, consistent with the recommendation of the National Academies, as well as an examination of science and technology budgets in individual civilian agencies, would be facilitated if the President's budget request clearly displayed the amounts requested for science and technology programs across all civilian agencies and classified these amounts in Budget Function 250.

"(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Congressional budget for the United States for fiscal year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 should consolidated the spending for all federal civilian science and technology programs in Budget Function 250, and that the President should accordingly transmit to the Congress a budget request for fiscal year 2000 that classifies these programs, across all federal civilian departments and agencies, in Budget Function 250.'"

BINGAMAN (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 2236

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. BINGAMAN for himself, Mr. GRAMM and Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CIVILIAN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS IN THE FEDERAL BUDGET.

"It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the function totals in this budget resolution assume that expenditures for civilian science and technology programs in the Federal budget will double over the period from fiscal year 1998 to fiscal year 2008."

KERREY (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 2237

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. KERREY, for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. BREAUX, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KOHL, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. ROBB, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BENNETT) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LONG-TERM BUDGETING AND REPAYMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

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

(3) according to the 1997 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance (OASDI) Trust Fund—

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

(B) the assets in the Trust Fund are expected to be depleted under present law in the year 2029;

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

(D) intermediate estimates are that OASDI will absorb nearly 17.5 percent of national payroll by the year 2030; and

(E) the cost of the OASDI program is estimated to rise from its current level of 4.7 percent of Gross Domestic Product to 6.7 percent by the end of the 75-year projection period;

(4) according to reports by the Congressional Budget Office, the Economic and Budget Outlook: Fiscal Years 1999-2008 (January 1998) and Reducing the Deficit: Spending and Revenue Options (March 1997)—

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

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

(C) between the years 2010 and 2030, enrollment in Medicare is projected to grow by 2.4 percent per year, up from the 1.4 percent average annual growth projected through 2007;

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

(E) the increase in Medicare enrollment caused by the aging of the population will be accompanied by a tapering of the growth rate of the working age population, and the number of workers will drop from 3.8 for every Medicare beneficiary in 1997 to 2.02 per beneficiary by 2030;

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

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

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

(8) if projected surpluses are used entirely for debt reduction and current tax and

spending policies remain unchanged, the share of Federal income needed to pay interest would drop below 5 percent within 12 years, and in 1997, that 10 percentage-point reduction would have amounted to \$158,000,000,000 available for other priorities.

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

(1) an analysis for the period of 30 fiscal years beginning with such fiscal year, of the estimated levels of total budget outlays and total new budget authority, the estimated revenues to be received, the estimated surplus or deficit, if any, for each major Federal entitlement program for each fiscal year in such period; and

(2) a specific accounting of payments, if any, made to reduce the public debt, or unfunded liabilities associated with each major Federal entitlement program.

MOSELEY-BRAUN AMENDMENTS
NOS. 2238-2240

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN) proposed three amendments to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2238

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING LEGISLATION THAT INCREASES COMPLEXITY OF TAX RETURNS.

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

(1) As part of the consideration by the Senate of tax cuts for the families of America, the Senate should also examine the condition of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) According to the Congressional Research Service, the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1997 added 1,000,000 words and 315 pages to the Internal Revenue Code.

(3) The Internal Revenue Code continues to grow more complex and difficult for the average taxpayer to understand, and the average tax return has become more time-consuming to prepare.

(4) The average taxpayer will spend 9 hours and 54 minutes preparing Form 1040 for the 1997 tax year.

(5) The average taxpayer spends between 21 and 28 hours each year on tax matters.

(6) In 1995, 58,965,000 of the 118,218,327 tax returns that were filed, almost 50 percent, were filed by taxpayers who utilized the help of paid tax preparers.

(7) The average taxpayer spends \$72 each year for tax preparation.

(8) The total burden on all taxpayers of maintaining records, and preparing and filing tax returns is estimated to be in excess of 1,600,000 hours per year.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that the Senate should give priority to tax proposals that simplify the tax code and reject proposals that add greater complexity in the tax code and increase compliance costs for the taxpayer.

AMENDMENT NO. 2239

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2240

At the end of title III, insert the following:
SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE VALUE OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM FOR FUTURE RETIREES.

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

(1) The social security system has allowed a generation of Americans to retire with dignity. Today, 13 percent of the population is 65 or older and by 2030, 20 percent of the population will be 65 or older. More than ½ of the elderly do not receive private pensions and more than ⅓ have no income from assets.

(2) For 60 percent of all senior citizens, social security benefits provide almost 80 percent of their retirement income. For 80 percent of all senior citizens, social security benefits provide over 50 percent of their retirement income.

(3) Poverty rates among the elderly are at the lowest level since the United States began to keep poverty statistics, due in large part to the social security system.

(4) 78 percent of Americans pay more in payroll taxes than they do in income taxes.

(5) According to the 1997 report of the Managing Trustee for the social security trust funds, the accumulated balance in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund is estimated to fall to zero by 2029, and the estimated payroll tax at that time will be sufficient to cover only 75 percent of the benefits owed to retirees at that time.

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

(7) Future generations of Americans must be guaranteed the same value from the social security system as past covered recipients.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that no change in the social security system should be made that would reduce the value of the social security system for future generations of retirees.

**DURBIN (AND CHAFEE)
 AMENDMENT NO. 2241**

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. DURBIN, for himself and Mr. CHAFEE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:
SEC. ____ FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING AFFORDABLE, HIGH-QUALITY HEALTH CARE FOR SENIORS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

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

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

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

(4) Beneficiaries under the medicare program can pay out-of-pocket for health care services whenever they—

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

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

(5) Beneficiaries under the medicare program can use doctors who do not receive any reimbursement under such program.

(6) Close to 75 percent of seniors have annual incomes below \$25,000, including 4 per-

cent who have annual incomes below \$5,000, making any additional out-of-pocket costs for health care services extremely burdensome.

(7) Very few beneficiaries under the medicare program report having difficulty obtaining access to a physician who accepts reimbursement under such program.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that seniors have the right to affordable, high-quality health care, that they have the right to choose their physicians, and that no change should be made to the medicare program that could—

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

(2) compromise the efforts of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to screen inappropriate or fraudulent claims for reimbursement under such program; and

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

DORGAN AMENDMENT NO. 2242

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. DORGAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Social Security system provides benefits to 44,000,000 Americans, including 27,300,000 retirees, over 4,500,000 people with disabilities, 3,800,000 surviving children, and 8,400,000 surviving adults, and is essential to the dignity and security of the Nation's elderly and disabled.

(2) the Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds have reported to Congress that the "total income" of the Social Security system "is estimated to fall short of expenditures beginning in 2019 and in each year thereafter . . . until [trust fund] assets are exhausted in 2029";

(3) intergenerational fairness, honest accounting principles, prudent budgeting, and sound economic policy all require saving Social Security first, in order that the Nation may better afford the retirement of the baby boom generation beginning in 2010;

(4) in reforming Social Security in 1983, Congress intended that near-term Social Security trust fund surpluses be used to prefund the retirement of the baby boom generation;

(5) in his State of the Union message to the joint session of Congress on January 27, 1998, President Clinton called on Congress to "save Social Security first" and to "reserve one hundred percent of the surplus, that is any penny of any surplus, until we have taken all the necessary measures to strengthen the Social Security system for the twenty-first century";

(6) the nation will engage in a national dialogue during 1998 on the future of Social Security, which will include 4 regional conferences organized by the Concord Coalition and the American Association of Retired Persons, a White House summit on private retirement savings in July, and a White House Conference on Social Security in December; and

(7) saving Social Security first would work to expand national savings, reduce interest rates, enhance private investment, increase labor productivity, and boost economic growth.

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

(1) Congress should save Social Security first by reserving any unified budget surplus until legislation is enacted to make Social Security actuarially sound and capable of paying future retirees the benefits to which they are entitled;

(2) enactment of such legislation will require a broad base of public support that should be developed during 1998 through a national bipartisan discussion of alternative approaches to ensuring Social Security solvency; and

(3) since that discussion has just begun, Congress should not act now to foreclose policy options that could help ensure Social Security solvency.

**LAUTENBERG (AND OTHERS)
 AMENDMENT NO. 2243**

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. TORRICELLI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING AMTRAK FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) on November 13, 1997 the Senate unanimously passed the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997, P.L. 105-134, authorizing appropriations of \$1,058,000,000 for FY99; \$1,023,000,000 for FY00, \$989,000,000 for FY01; and \$955,000,000 for FY02, totaling \$4.025 billion FY99-02;

(2) in P.L. 105-134 the Congress declared that "intercity rail passenger service is an essential component of a national intermodal passenger transportation system";

(3) section 201 of the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 has now statutorily formalized prior Congressional directives to Amtrak to reach operating self-sufficiency by fiscal year 2002;

(4) the Congress and the President, through enactment of this legislation, have effectively agreed that Congress will provide adequate funding to permit Amtrak to achieve the goal of operating self-sufficiency;

(5) capital investment is critical to reducing operating costs and increasing the quality of Amtrak service;

(6) capital investment is essential to improving Amtrak's long-term financial health;

(7) the \$2.2 billion provided to Amtrak through the Taxpayer Relief Act is for the sole purpose of capital expenditures and other qualified expenses and is intended to supplement, not supplant, annual appropriations.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this budget resolution assume that Congress and the Administration will fulfill the intent of the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 and appropriate sufficient funds in each of the next five fiscal years for Amtrak to implement its FY 1998-FY 2003 Strategic Business Plan, while preserving the integrity of the \$2.2 billion provided under the Taxpayer Relief Act for the statutory purpose of capital investment.

DASCHLE AMENDMENT NO. 2244

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. DASCHLE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

(a) **DECLARATION.**—Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999 including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revising the budgetary levels for fiscal year 1998 set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 as authorized by section 304 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(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 1999.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Social security.

Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

Sec. 201. Deficit-neutral reserve fund in the Senate for President's initiatives.

SEC. 202. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS AND THE SENATE

SEC. 301. Sense of the Senate on saving Social Security first.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,312,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,341,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,386,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,449,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,505,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999: \$12,252,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$15,257,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$16,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$18,005,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$18,166,000,000.

(C) The amounts of Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

(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 1999: \$1,441,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,484,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,525,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,557,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,636,600,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,420,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$1,465,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,506,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,524,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,601,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999: \$108,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001: \$120,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$74,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$96,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999: \$5,667,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$5,870,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$6,067,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$6,224,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$6,400,900,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) **SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.**—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302, 602, 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 1999: \$438,200,000,000.

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

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

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

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

(b) **SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302, 602, 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 1999: \$212,600,000,000.

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

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

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

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

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 1999 through 2003 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 1999:

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,700,000,000.

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

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

Fiscal year 1999:

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

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, \$17,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, \$15,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,800,000,000.

(4) **Energy (270):**

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

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

(B) Outlays, —\$300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, \$22,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,500,000,000.

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

(6) **Agriculture (350):**

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

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

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001:

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

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

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

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

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

(8) **Transportation (400):**

Fiscal year 1999:

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

(B) Outlays, \$44,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$47,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$54,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,100,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,300,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,700,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$146,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$143,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$153,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$151,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$162,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$160,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$170,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$169,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$183,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$181,200,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$210,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$210,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$221,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$221,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$239,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$242,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$251,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$248,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$273,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$273,700,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$245,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$248,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$259,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$261,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$271,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$272,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$281,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$281,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$292,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$291,400,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,200,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,500,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,800,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,700,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$300,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$300,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, \$301,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$301,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$301,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$301,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$302,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$302,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$304,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$304,300,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (902):
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, —\$800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$1,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$1,200,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$36,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$36,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2000:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$36,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$36,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$37,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$37,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$44,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$44,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$35,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$35,700,000,000.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE FOR PRESIDENT'S INITIATIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation that generates revenues, in which the purpose of the increase in revenues is to reduce smoking by teenagers and children, and for legislation to fund the President's "Funds for America" initiatives, provided that the legislation which changes revenues or spending does not cause an increase in the deficit for—

- (1) fiscal year 1999;
- (2) the period of fiscal year 1999 through 2003; or
- (3) the period of fiscal years 2004–2009.

(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. 202. 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 CONGRESS AND THE SENATE

SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY FIRST.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Social Security program, created in 1935 to provide old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits, is one of the most successful and important social insurance programs in the United States, and has played an essential role in reducing poverty among seniors;

(2) the Social Security system will face significant pressures when the baby boom generation retires, which could threaten the long-term viability of the program;

(3) Congress needs to act promptly to ensure that Social Security benefits will be available when today's younger Americans retire;

(4) under current budget law, the Federal budget is still in deficit;

(5) to the extent that a budget surplus may someday materialize in the future, current budget law and rules that were established to ensure fiscal discipline, including caps on discretionary spending and the pay-as-you-go system (which requires that all new tax breaks and mandatory spending be fully offset) would prevent Congress from using any projected budget surplus; and

(6) President Clinton has called on Congress to save Social Security first by taking action to reform and strengthen the Social Security system, and by holding in reserve any projected budget surpluses that may materialize in the future rather than using them for new spending or tax breaks, while Congress and the Administration work toward a long-term solution for the challenges facing Social Security.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in this resolution assume that, to the extent that any budget surplus is realized in the future, that surplus should not be decreased for any purpose other than reducing the national debt, while Congress and the Administration work together to ensure that Social Security is financially sound over the long term and that it will be available for future generations.

**TORRICELLI AMENDMENTS NOS.
2245–2246**

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. TORRICELLI) proposed two amendments to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2245

On page 53, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 3 . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON BATTLEFIELD PRESERVATION.

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

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

(2) the Secretary of the Interior should give special priority to the preservation of Revolutionary War and War of 1812 battlefields, by making funds available for the conduct of the Revolutionary War and War of 1812 Historic Preservation Study as authorized by section 603 of Public Law 104-333 (16 U.S.C. 1a-5 note); and

(3) the Secretary of the Interior should give special priority to the preservation of Revolutionary War, War of 1812, and Civil War battlefields by allocating funds in the Land and Water Conservation Fund for the purchase of battlefield sites the integrity of which is threatened by urban or suburban development.

AMENDMENT NO. 2246

On page 53, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 3 . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

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

MOYNIHAN AMENDMENT NO. 2247

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. MOYNIHAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE OF THE FUTURE OF SOCIAL SOCIAL SECURITY.

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

(1) Public confidence in the long-term viability of the Social Security System is low, with opinion polls repeatedly indicating that a majority of non-retired young adults do not believe they will receive Social Security when they retire;

(2) In the year 2012, outlays for Old Age Survivors and Disability Insurance will exceed its tax revenues;

(3) Early action by the Congress is needed in order to strengthen public confidence in Social Security and address the long-run actuarial deficit of the program;

(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the Sense of the Senate that:

(1) the Committee on Finance should at the earliest possible date hold hearings on and begin consideration of legislation to preserve the Social Security program and ensure its long-run solvency; and that no policy options, affecting either revenues, outlays, or the manner of investment of funds, should be excluded from consideration.

BOND AMENDMENT NO. 2248

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. BOND) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert:

It is the Sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that included in the funding for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) is \$2 million dollars for the establishment of INS circuit rides in the former Soviet Union for the purpose of processing refugees and conducting medical examinations of refugees who will enter the United States under the Refugee Act of 1980.

ABRAHAM AMENDMENT NO. 2249

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. ABRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BUDGET ACT REFORMS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the provisions of this resolution assume that The Budget Control Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 should be amended to facilitate the use of future unified budget surpluses to strengthen and reform Social Security, reform the tax code, and reduce the tax burden on middle-class families, including:

(1) Eliminating Paygo rules with regard to revenue reductions while the unified budget is in surplus; and

(2) Striking points of order against reducing the Social Security payroll tax.

**THURMOND (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 2250**

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. THURMOND, for himself, Ms. SNOWE, and Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

On page 43, strike line 4 through line 17 and insert the following:

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

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

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

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

(1) this concurrent resolution on the budget assumes that the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare should, as part of its deliberations, describe long-term care needs and make all appropriate recommendations including private sector options that reflect the need for a continuum of care that spans from acute to long-term care. This is not a specific recommendation that any new program be added to Medicare;

(2) the Federal Government should take all appropriate steps to inform the public about the financial risks posed by long-term care costs and about the need for families to plan for their long-term care needs;

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

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

(5) the upcoming National Summit on Retirement Income Savings should ensure that planning for long-term care is an integral part of any discussion of retirement security.

**FAIRCLOTH (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 2251**

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. FAIRCLOTH, for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. KEMPTHORNE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ELIMINATION OF THE MARRIAGE PENALTY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that:

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

(2) The tax code should not penalize those who choose to marry;

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

(4) The Congressional Budget Office found that the average penalty amounts to \$1380 a year;

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

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

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions in this budget resolution assume that the Congress shall begin to phase out the marriage penalty this year.

SESSIONS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2252

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. SESSIONS, for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. HELMS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. THURMOND) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING DISPLAY OF TEN COMMANDMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Ten Commandments have had a significant impact on the development of the fundamental legal principles of Western Civilization; and

(2) the Ten Commandments set forth a code of moral conduct, observance of which is acknowledged to promote respect for our system of laws and the good of society.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that—

(1) the Ten Commandments are a declaration of fundamental principles that are the cornerstones of a fair and just society; and

(2) the public display, including display in the Supreme Court, the Capitol building, the White House, and other government offices and courthouses across the nation, of the Ten Commandments should be permitted.

STEVENS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2253

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. STEVENS, for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. INOUE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

In the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING OUTLAY ESTIMATES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BUDGET.

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

(1) The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 created a new era for federal spending and forced the Department of Defense to plan on limited spending over the five year period from fiscal year 1998 through 2002.

(2) The agreements forged under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 specifically defined the available amounts of budget authority and outlays, requiring the Department of Defense to properly plan its future activities in the new, constrained budget environment.

(3) The Department of Defense worked with the Office of Management and Budget to develop a fiscal year 1999 budget which complies with the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

(4) Based on Department of Defense program plans and policy changes, the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of Defense made detailed estimates of fiscal year 1999 Department of Defense outlay rates to ensure that the budget submitted would comply with the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

(5) The Congressional Budget Office outlay estimate of the fiscal year 1999 Department of Defense budget request exceeds both the outlay limit imposed by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and the Office of Management and Budget's outlay estimate, a disagreement which would force a total restructuring of the Department of Defense's fiscal year 1999 budget.

(6) The restructuring imposed on the Department of Defense would have a devastating impact on readiness, troop morale, military quality of life, and ongoing procurement and development programs.

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

(8) In a letter dated March 31, 1998, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget identified multiple differences between the Office of Management and Budget's estimated outlay rates and the Congressional Budget Office's estimated outlay rates.

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

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that not later than April 22, 1998, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall complete discussions and develop a common estimate of the projected fiscal year 1999 outlay rates for Department of Defense accounts.

SPECTER AMENDMENTS NOS. 2254–2256

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. SPECTER) proposed three amendments to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2254

On page 28, strike lines 1 through 17, and insert the following:

SEC. 202. TOBACCO RESERVE FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates may be increased and allocations may be increased for legislation that reserves the Federal share of receipts from tobacco legislation for—

(1) tobacco-related programs and activities, including extending the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund; and

(2) not less than \$2,000,000,000 for biomedical research in fiscal year 1999 and other public health research.

(b) REVISED AGGREGATES.—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 increased aggregates to carry out this section. These aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) APPLICATION OF SECTION 202 OF H. CON. RES. 67.—For the purposes of enforcement of section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) with respect to this resolution, the increase in receipts resulting from tobacco legislation used to reimburse the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund shall not be taken into account.

AMENDMENT NO. 2255

On page 28, line 17, after the material that appears on line 17, insert the following:

“(d) VETERANS.—

“(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to section (a), the Chairman of the Budget Committee may increase the appropriate budget authority and outlay aggregates and allocations by the amount such legislation increases spending for post-service smoking related Veterans compensation benefits.

“(2) The adjustments made pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed \$500,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and \$10,500,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

AMENDMENT NO. 2256

On page 28, line 17, after the material that appears on line 17, insert the following:

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, \$500,000,000 in receipts from tobacco legislation shall be reserved for purposes of section 204(a) in function 920, Allowances, as additional new budget authority for fiscal year 1999 and additional outlays for fiscal year 1999; and \$10,500,000,000 in receipts from tobacco legislation shall be reserved for purposes of section 204(a) in function 920, Allowances, as additional new budget authority for fiscal years 1999–2003, and additional outlays for fiscal years 1999–2003.

On page 31, line 24, strike subsection (6) in its entirety.

NICKLES AMENDMENT NO. 2257

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. NICKLES) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . PROHIBITION ON PRECATORY AMENDMENTS.

In setting forth the budget authority and outlay amounts in this resolution, the Senate assumes that the Senate of the United States instructs the Senate Parliamentarian to interpret Section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: “For purposes of the preceding sentence an amendment is not germane if it states precatory language.”; and that precatory includes, in the context of Senate consideration of any budget resolution, amendments which reference the budget resolution's assumptions regarding budgetary levels; federal revenues; Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance; budget authority; budget outlays; deficits; public debt; social security revenues, and outlays; loan obligations; loan guarantees; allowances; undistributed, and distributed, offsetting receipts; reconciliation; reserve funds; allocations; revenue, spending, and revised aggregates; offsets; appropriations; mandatory spending; entitlements; and any other term or definition employed, under the Budget Act, in a budget resolution.

FIRST AMENDMENT NO. 2258

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. FRIST) proposed an amendment to the concurrent

resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, *supra*; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:
SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FUNDING FOR THE AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

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

(1) the contract authority level for the Airport Improvement Program (provided for in part B of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code) not be reduced below the current level of \$2,347,000,000; and

(2) the critical infrastructure development, maintenance, and repair of airports not be jeopardized.

MCCONNELL AMENDMENT NO. 2259

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, *supra*; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:
SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PAYMENT OF COSTS OF LITIGATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the President's Task Force on National Health Care Reform, convened by President Clinton in 1993, was charged with calling together officials of the Federal Government and others to debate critical health issues of concern to the American public;

(2) the Task Force convened behind closed doors and inappropriately included individuals who were not employees of the Federal Government;

(3) United States District Judge Royce C. Lamberth ruled in Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., et al. versus Hillary Rodham Clinton, et al., that representatives of the administration engaged in "dishonest" and "reprehensible" conduct in characterizing the membership of the Task Force;

(4) Judge Royce C. Lamberth on the basis of such conduct ruled against the defendants and ordered them to pay \$285,864.78 in attorneys' fees, costs, and sanctions for the plaintiffs; and

(5) American taxpayers should not be held responsible for the inappropriate and dishonest conduct of Federal Government officials and lawyers involved with the Task Force.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that the award of \$285,864.78 in attorneys' fees, costs, and sanctions that Judge Royce C. Lamberth ordered the defendants to pay in Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., et al. versus Hillary Rodham Clinton, et al., should not be paid with taxpayer funds.

SESSIONS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2260

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. SESSIONS, for himself, Mr. ASHCROFT, and Mr. ENZI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, *supra*; as follows:

At the end of title III add the following:
SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING LIMITATIONS ON ATTORNEYS' FEES UNDER ANY NATIONAL TOBACCO SETTLEMENT.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that legislation providing for a national tobacco settlement should provide the following:

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State that receives funds under such legislation may not utilize those funds to

pay attorneys' fees, on behalf of attorneys for the State in connection with an action maintained by a State against one or more tobacco companies to recover tobacco-related Medicaid expenditures, or for other causes of action, in excess of the reasonable and customary fee for similarly skilled legal services for the specific locale. In no event should the rate exceed \$500 per hour.

(2) The limitation described in paragraph (1) shall not apply to any amounts provided for the attorneys' reasonable and customary expenses.

(3) No award of attorneys' fees shall be made under any national tobacco settlement until the attorneys involved have—

(A) provided State officials with a detailed time accounting with respect to the work performed in relation to any legal action which is the subject of the settlement or with regard to the settlement itself; and

(B) made public disclosure of the time accounting under subparagraph (A) and any fee agreements entered into, or fee arrangements made, with respect to any legal action that is the subject of the settlement.

CRAIG (AND DOMENICI) AMENDMENT NO. 2261

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. CRAIG, for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, *supra*; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:
SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE ON VA COMPENSATION AND POST-SERVICE SMOKING-RELATED ILLNESSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the President has twice included in his budgets not permitting the program expansion that the Veterans Administration (referred to as the "VA") is proposing to allow post-service smoking-related illness to be eligible for VA compensation;

(2) Congress has never acted on this program expansion;

(3) the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget have concluded that this change in VA policy would result in at least \$10,000,000,000 in additional costs to the VA;

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

(5) the programs expansion apparently runs counter to all existing VA policy, including a statement by former Secretary Brown that "It is inappropriate to compensate for death or disability resulting from veterans' personal choice to engage in conduct damaging to their health."

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

(1) The support of the President's proposal to not allow post-service smoking related illnesses to be eligible for VA compensation until the study and report required by paragraph (2) are completed.

(2) The Veterans Administration and the Office of Management and Budget are jointly required to—

(A) jointly study (referred to in this section as the "study") the VA General Counsel's determination (O.G.C. 2-93) and the resulting actions to change the compensation rules to include disability and death benefits for conditions related to the use of tobacco products during service; and

(B) deliver an opinion as to whether illnesses resulting from post-service smoking should be considered as a compensable disability.

(3) The study should include—

(A) the estimated numbers of those filing such claims, the cost resulting from such

benefits, the time necessary to review such claims, and how such a number of claims will affect the VA's ability to review its current claim load;

(B) an examination of how the proposed change corresponds to prior VA policy relating to post-service actions taken by an individual; and

(C) what Federal benefits, both VA and non-VA, former service members having smoking-related illnesses are eligible to receive.

(4) The study shall be completed no later than July 1, 1999.

(5) The Veterans Administration shall report its finding to the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate and the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Senate Budget and Veterans' Affairs Committees.

COVERDELL (AND SHELBY) AMENDMENT NO. 2262

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. COVERDELL, for himself and Mr. SHELBY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, *supra*; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:
SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE ON COLOMBIAN DRUG WAR HELICOPTERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Colombia is the leading illicit drug producing country in the Western Hemisphere;

(2) 80 percent of the world's cocaine originates in Colombia;

(3) based on the most recent data of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), more than 60 percent of the heroin seized in the United States originates in Colombia;

(4) in the last 10 years more than 4,000 officers of the Colombian National Police have died fighting the scourge of drugs;

(5) in one recent year alone, according to data of the United States Government, the United States had 141,000 new heroin users and the United States faces historic levels of heroin use among teenagers between the ages of 12 and 17;

(6) once Colombian heroin is in the stream of commerce it is nearly impossible to interdict because it is concealed and trafficked in very small quantities;

(7) the best and most cost efficient method of preventing Colombian heroin from entering the United States is to destroy the opium poppies in the high Andes mountains where Colombian heroin is produced;

(8) the elite anti-narcotics unit of the Colombian National Police has the responsibility to eradicate both coca and opium in Colombia, including the reduction and elimination of cocaine and heroin production, and they have done a remarkably effective job with the limited and outdated equipment at their disposal;

(9) more than 40 percent of the anti-narcotics operations of the Colombian National Police involve hostile ground fire from narco-terrorists and 90 percent of such operations involve the use of helicopters;

(10) the need for better high performance helicopters by the Colombian National Police, especially for use in the high Andes mountains, is essential for more effective eradication of opium in Colombia;

(11) on December 23, 1997, one of the antiquated Vietnam-era UH-1H Huey helicopters used by the Colombian National Police in an opium eradication mission crashed in the high Andes mountains due to high winds and because it was flying above the safety level recommended by the original manufacturer;

(12) in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105-118), amounts were appropriated for the procurement by the United States for the Colombian National Police of three UH-60L Blackhawk utility helicopters that can operate safely and more effectively at the high altitudes of the Andes mountains where Colombian opium grows at altitudes as high as 12,000 feet;

(13) the Blackhawk helicopter is a high performance utility helicopter, with greater lift capacity, that can perform at the high altitudes of the Andes mountains, as well as survive crashes and sustain ground fire, much better than any other utility helicopter now available to the Colombian National Police in the war on drugs;

(14) because the Vietnam-era Huey helicopters that the United States has provided the Colombian National Police are outdated and have been developing numerous stress cracks, a sufficient number should be upgraded to Huey II's and the remainder should be phased-out as soon as possible;

(15) these Huey helicopters are much older than most of the pilots who fly them, do not have the range due to limited fuel capacity to reach many of the expanding locations of the coca fields or cocaine labs in southern Colombia, nor do they have the lift capacity to carry enough armed officers to reach and secure the opium fields in the high Andes mountains prior to eradication;

(16) the elite anti-narcotics unit of the Colombian National Police has a stellar record in respecting for human rights and has received the commendation of a leading international human rights group in their operations to reduce and eradicate illicit drugs in Colombia;

(17) the narco-terrorists of Colombia have announced that they will now target United States citizens, particularly those United States citizens working with their Colombian counterparts in the fight against illicit drugs in Colombia;

(18) a leading commander of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia ("FARC") announced recently that the objective of these narco-terrorists, in light of recent successes, will be "to defeat the Americans";

(19) United States Government personnel in Colombia who fly in these helicopters accompanying the Colombian National Police on missions are now at even greater risk from these narco-terrorists and their drug trafficking allies;

(20) in the last six months four anti-narcotics helicopters of the Colombian National Police have been downed in operations;

(21) Congress intends to provide the necessary support and assistance to wage an effective war on illicit drugs in Colombia and provide the equipment and assistance needed to protect all of the men and women of the Colombian National Police as well as those Americans who work side by side with the Colombian National Police in this common struggle against illicit drugs;

(22) the new Government of Bolivia has made a commitment to eradicate coca and cocaine production in that country within 5 years;

(23) the United States should support any country that is interested in removing the scourge of drugs from its citizens; and

(24) Bolivia has succeeded, in large measure due to United States assistance, in reducing acreage used to produce coca, which is the basis for cocaine production.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that—

(1) the President should, with funds made available under Public Law 105-118, expeditiously procure and provide to the Colombian

National Police three UH-60L Blackhawk utility helicopters solely for the purpose of assisting the Colombian National Police to perform their responsibilities to reduce and eliminate the production of illicit drugs in Colombia and the trafficking of such illicit drugs, including the trafficking of drugs such as heroin and cocaine to the United States;

(2) if the President determines that the procurement and transfer to the Colombian National Police of three UH-60L Blackhawk utility helicopters is not an adequate number of such helicopters to maintain operational feasibility and effectiveness of the Colombian National Police, then the President should promptly inform Congress as to the appropriate number of additional UH-60L Blackhawk utility helicopters for the Colombian National Police so that amounts can be authorized for the procurement and transfer of such additional helicopters; and

(3) assistance for Bolivia should be maintained at least at the level assumed in the fiscal year 1998 budget submission of the President and the Administration should act accordingly.

SANTORUM AMENDMENTS NOS. 2263-2264

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. SANTORUM) proposed two amendments to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 2263

On page , insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE 105TH CONGRESS, 2ND SESSION SHOULD REAUTHORIZE FUNDS FOR THE FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

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

(1) Eighteen states and dozens of localities have spent nearly \$1 billion to protect over 600,000 acres of important farmland;

(2) The Farmland Protection Program has provided cost-sharing for eighteen states and dozens of localities to protect over 82,000 acres on 230 farms since 1996;

(3) The Farmland Protection Program has generated new interest in saving farmland in communities around the country;

(4) The Farmland Protection Program represents an innovative and voluntary partnership, rewards local ingenuity, and supports local priorities;

(5) Current funds authorized for the Farmland Protection Program will be exhausted in the next six months;

(6) The United States is losing two acres of our best farmland to development every minute of every day;

(7) These lands produce three quarters of the fruits and vegetables and over one-half of the dairy in the United States;

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals contained in this resolution assume that the 105th Congress, 2nd Session will reauthorize funds for the Farmland Protection Program.

AMENDMENT No. 2264

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON HEALTH CARE QUALITY.

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

(1) Out of a total 549 plans under the FEHBP, which includes fee-for-service, point of service, and HMOs, only 186 were fully accredited;

(2) Out of a total 549 plans under the FEHBP, which includes fee-for-service, point of service, and HMOs, 7 were denied accreditation.

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

KEMP THORNE AMENDMENT NO. 2265

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. KEMP THORNE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MARKET ACCESS PROGRAM.

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

(1) The Market Access Program (MAP) continues to be a vital and important part of U.S. trade policy aimed at maintaining and expanding U.S. agricultural exports, countering subsidized foreign competition, strengthening farm income and protecting American jobs. Further, the Senate finds that:

(A) The Market Access Program is specifically targeted towards small business, farmer cooperatives and trade associations.

(B) The Market Access Program is administered on a cost-share basis. Participants, including farmers and ranchers, are required to contribute up to 50 percent or more toward the cost of the program.

(2) The Market Access Program has been a tremendous success by any measure. Since the program was established, U.S. agricultural exports have doubled. In FY 1997, U.S. agricultural exports amounted to \$57.3 billion, resulting in a positive agricultural trade surplus of approximately \$22 billion, and contributing billions of dollars more in increased economic activity and additional tax revenues.

(3) The Market Access Program has also helped maintain and create needed jobs throughout the nation's economy. More than one million Americans now have jobs that depend on U.S. agricultural exports. Further, every billion dollars in additional U.S. agricultural exports helps create as many as 17,000 or more new jobs.

(4) U.S. agriculture, including farm income and related jobs, is more dependent than ever on maintaining and expanding U.S. agricultural exports as federal farm programs are gradually reduced under the FAIR Act of 1996.

(5) In addition to the Asian economic situation and exchange rate fluctuations, U.S. agricultural exports continue to be adversely impacted by continued subsidized foreign competition, artificial trade barriers and other unfair trade practices.

(6) The European Union (EU) and other foreign competitors continue to heavily outspend the U.S. by more than 10 to 1 with regard to export subsidies.

(A) In 1997, the EU budgeted \$7.2 billion for export subsidies aimed at capturing a larger share of the world market at the expense of U.S. agriculture.

(B) EU and other foreign competitors also spent nearly \$500 million on market promotion activities. The EU, spends more on wine promotion than the U.S. currently spends on all commodities and related agricultural products.

(C) The EU has announced a major new initiative aimed at increasing their exports to Japan—historically, the largest single market for U.S. agriculture exports.

(7) U.S. agriculture is the most competitive industry in the world, but it can not and should not be expected to compete alone against the treasuries of foreign governments.

(8) Reducing or eliminating funding for the Market Access Program would adversely affect U.S. agriculture's ability to remain competitive in today's global marketplace. A reduction in U.S. agricultural exports would translate into lower farm income, a worsening trade deficit, slower economic growth, fewer export-related jobs, and a declining tax base.

(9) U.S. success in upcoming trade negotiations on agriculture schedule to begin in 1999 depends on maintaining an aggressive trade strategy and related policies and programs. Reducing or eliminating the Market Access Program would represent a form of unilateral disarmament and weaken the U.S. negotiating position.

(10) The Market Access Program is one of the few programs specifically allowed under the current Uruguay Round Agreement.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that funding for the Market Access Program (MAP) should be fully maintained as authorized and aggressively utilized by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to encourage U.S. agricultural exports, strengthen farm income, counter subsidized foreign competition, and protect American jobs.

GRAMM (AND BIDEN) AMENDMENT NO. 2266

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. GRAMM, for himself and Mr. BIDEN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

“SEC. . EXTENSION OF VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION TRUST FUND.

“(a) DISCRETIONARY LIMITS.—In the Senate, in this section and for the purposes of allocations made for the discretionary category pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the term ‘discretionary spending limit’ means—

“(1) with respect to fiscal year 1999—
“(A) for the defense category: \$271,570,000,000 in new budget authority and \$266,635,000,000 in outlays;

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

“(C) for the violent crime reduction category: \$5,800,000,000 in new budget authority and \$4,953,000,000 in outlays;

“(2) with respect to fiscal year 2000—
“(A) for the discretionary category: \$532,693,000,000 in new budget authority and \$558,711,000,000 in outlays; and

“(B) for the violent crime reduction category: \$4,500,000,000 in new budget authority and \$5,554,000,000 in outlays;

“(3) with respect to fiscal year 2001—
“(A) for the discretionary category: \$537,632,000,000 in new budget authority and \$558,415,000,000 in outlays; and

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

“(4) with respect to fiscal year 2002—
“(A) for the discretionary category: \$546,574,000,000 in new budget authority and \$556,269,000,000 in outlays; and

“(B) for the violent crime reduction category: \$4,500,000,000 in new budget authority and \$4,530,000,000 in outlays;

“as adjusted in strict conformance with subsection (b) of section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act.

“(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider—

“(A) a revision of this resolution or any concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such a resolution) that provides discretionary spending in excess of the discretionary spending limit or limits for such fiscal year; or

“(B) any bill or resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such bill or resolution) for fiscal year 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 that would cause any of the limits in this section (or suballocations of the discretionary limits made pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) to be exceeded.

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

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

“(d) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the concurrent resolution, bill, or joint resolution, as the case may be. 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.

“(e) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, new entitlement authority, revenues, and deficits for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.”.

COVERDELL AMENDMENTS NOS. 2267–2268

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. COVERDELL) proposed two amendments to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 2267

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING EFFORTS TO COMBAT MEDICARE FRAUD AND ABUSE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that while fighting Medicare fraud and abuse is critical, so is the avoidance of criminalizing those parties whose errors were made inadvertently. The Senate applauds heightened attention to fraud and abuse issues in the effort to promote Medicare solvency. In evaluating the enforcement activities of the Department of Justice regarding fraud and abuse, the Senate should ensure that standards of proof as prescribed by law are present in these activities. It is incumbent upon the Senate to ensure that parties are not subject to criminal penalties absent a finding of specific intent to defraud.

AMENDMENT No. 2268

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING NATIONAL RESPONSE TO THE THREAT OF ILLEGAL DRUGS.

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

(1) the provisions of this resolution assume that Congress will significantly increase funding for drug interdiction operations by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Customs Service, Coast Guard, Department of Defense and other responsible agencies;

(2) the provisions of this resolution assume that Congress will continue to support and increase funding for anti-drug education and prevention efforts aimed at informing every American child in the middle school and high school age brackets about the dangers of drugs and at empowering them to reject illegal drug use;

(3) increasing grassroots parental involvement should be a key component of our national drug education and prevention efforts;

(4) Congress should promote efforts to establish annual measures of performance for evaluating the effectiveness of the National Drug Control Strategy.

COVERDELL (AND GRASSLEY) AMENDMENT NO. 2269

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. COVERDELL, for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING WASTEFUL SPENDING DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ACQUISITION PRACTICES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) According to the Defense Department's Inspector General, despite efforts to streamline government purchases, the military, in some cases, paid more than ‘fair value’ for many items;

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

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—it is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that the Defense Department should continue efforts to eliminate wasteful spending such that defense spending allocated in the FY 99 budget, and all subsequent budgets, is spent in the manner most efficient to maintain and promote military readiness for U.S. armed forces around the globe.

COVERDELL (AND KYL) AMENDMENT NO. 2270

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. COVERDELL for himself and Mr. KYL) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE UNITED STATES' RESPONSE TO THE CHANGING NATURE OF TERRORISM

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) The threat of terrorism to American citizens and interests remains high, with Americans suffering one-third of the total terrorist attacks in the world in 1997.

(2) The terrorist threat is changing—while past acts were generally limited to the use of conventional explosives and weapons, terrorists today are exploring technological advances and increasingly lethal tools and strategies to pursue their agenda;

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

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

(5) The multi-faceted nature of the terrorist threat encompasses not only foreign terrorists targeting American citizens and interests abroad, but foreign terrorists operating within the United States itself, as well as domestic terrorists;

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

(7) Terrorists exploit America's free and open society to illegally enter the country, raise funds, recruit new members, spread propaganda, and plan future activities;

(8) Terrorists are also making of use of computer technology to communicate, solicit money and support, and store information essential to their operations;

(9) State sponsors of terrorism and other foreign countries are known to be developing computer intrusion and manipulation capabilities which could pose a threat to essential public and private information systems in the United States;

(10) The infrastructure deemed critical to the United States are the telecommunication networks, the electric power grid, oil and gas distribution, water distribution facilities, transportation systems, financial networks, emergency services, and the continuity of government services, the disruption of which could result in significant losses to the United States' economic well-being, public welfare, or national security.

(11) A national strategy of infrastructure protection, as required by the Defense Appropriations Act of 1996, and subsequent amendments, has yet to be issued; and

(12) We as a nation remain fundamentally unprepared to respond in a coordinated and effective manner to these growing terrorist threats.

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

(1) The federal government must take the lead in establishing effective coordination between intelligence-gathering and law enforcement agencies, among federal, state, and local levels of government, and with the private sector, for the purpose of assessing, warning, and protecting against terrorist attacks;

(2) Technical preparedness for the detection and analysis of chemical and biological weapons, and for swift and adequate emergency response to their use by terrorists, must be a near-term continuing priority;

(3) The United States must seek full international cooperation in securing the capture and conviction of terrorists who attack or pose a threat to American citizens and interests;

(4) The United States should fully enforce its laws intended to deny foreign terrorist organizations the ability to raise money in the United States, prevent the evasion of our immigration laws and furthering of criminal activities, and curtail the use of our country as a base of operations; and

(5) A national strategy, adequate to addressing the complexity of protecting our critical infrastructures, and as required by the Defense Appropriations Act of 1996 and subsequent amendments, must be completed and implemented immediately.

COVERDELL (AND DODD) AMENDMENT NO. 2271

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. COVERDELL for himself and Mr. DODD) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING A MULTINATIONAL ALLIANCE AGAINST DRUG TRAFFICKING.

FINDINGS.—the Senate finds that—

(1) the traffic in illegal drugs greatly threatens democracy, security and stability in the Western Hemisphere due to the violence and corruption associated with drug trafficking organizations;

(2) drug trafficking organizations operate without respect for borders or national sovereignty;

(3) the production, transport, sale, and use of illicit drugs endangers the people and legitimate institutions of all countries in the hemisphere;

(4) no single country can successfully confront and defeat this common enemy;

(5) full bilateral cooperation with the United States to reduce the flow of drugs is in the national interests of our neighbors in the hemisphere;

(6) in addition, victory in the hemispheric battle against drug traffickers requires expanded multilateral cooperation among the nation of the region.

SENSE OF THE SENATE.—it is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that in addition to existing bilateral cooperative efforts, the Administration should promote at the Summit of the Americas and in other fora the concept of a multinational hemispheric "war alliance" bringing together the United States and key illicit drug producing and transiting countries in the Western Hemisphere for the purpose of implementing a coordinated plan of action against illegal drug trafficking and promoting full cooperation against this common menace.

MACK AMENDMENT NO. 2272

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. MACK) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) heart disease was the leading cause of death or for both men and women in every year from 1970 to 1993;

(2) mortality rates for individuals suffering from prostate cancer, skin cancer, and kidney cancer continue to rise;

(3) the mortality rate for African American women suffering from diabetes is 134 percent higher than the mortality rate of Caucasian women suffering from diabetes;

(4) asthma rates for children increased 58 percent from 1982 to 1992;

(5) nearly half of all American women between the ages of 65 and 75 reported having arthritis;

(6) AIDS is the leading cause of death for Americans between the ages of 24 and 44;

(7) the Institute of Medicine has described United States clinical research to be "in a state of crisis" and the National Academy of Sciences concluded in 1994 that "the present cohort of clinical investigators is not adequate";

(8) biomedical research has been shown to be effective in saving lives and reducing health care expenditures;

(9) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has contributed significantly to the first overall reduction in cancer death rates since recordkeeping was instituted;

(10) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has resulted in the identification of genetic mutations for

osteoporosis; Lou Gehrig's Disease, cystic fibrosis, and Huntington's Disease; breast, skin and prostate cancer; and a variety of other illnesses;

(11) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has been key to the development of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) and Positron Emission Tomography (PET) scanning technologies;

(12) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has developed effective treatments for Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia (ALL). Today, 80 percent of children diagnosed with Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia are alive and free of the disease after 5 years; and

(13) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health contributed to the development of a new, cost-saving cure for peptic ulcers.

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

(1) appropriations for the National Institutes of Health should be increased by 100 percent over the next 5 fiscal years;

(2) appropriations for the National Institutes of Health should be increased by \$2,000,000,000 in year 1999 over the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1998;

(3) the budget resolution takes a major step toward meeting this goal; and

(4) at a minimum, appropriations for the National Institutes of Health should match the recommendations provided in the budget resolution.

HATCH (AND JEFFORDS) AMENDMENT NO. 2273

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. HATCH, for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

On page 28, strike lines 1 through 17, and insert the following:

SEC. 202. TOBACCO RESERVE FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates may be increased and allocations may be increased for legislation that reserves the Federal share of receipts for tobacco-related programs and activities authorized by comprehensive Senate-passed tobacco legislation.

(b) REVISED AGGREGATES.—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 increased aggregates to carry out this section. These aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) APPLICATION OF SECTION 202 OF H. CON. RES. 67.—For the purposes of enforcement of section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) with respect to this resolution, the increase in receipts resulting from tobacco legislation used to reimburse the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund shall not be taken into account.

SESSIONS AMENDMENT NO. 2274

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. SESSIONS) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING LIMITATIONS ON ATTORNEYS' FEES UNDER ANY NATIONAL TOBACCO SETTLEMENT.

It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals

in this resolution assume that legislation providing for a national tobacco settlement should provide the following:

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State that receives funds under such legislation may not utilize more than \$5,000,000 to pay attorneys' fees on behalf of attorneys for the State in connection with an action maintained by a State against one or more tobacco companies to recover tobacco-related Medicaid expenditures, or for other causes of action.

(2) The limitation described in paragraph (1) shall apply to attorneys' fees provided for or in connection with an action of the type described in such paragraph under any—

- (A) court order;
- (B) settlement agreement;
- (C) Contingency fee arrangement;
- (D) arbitration procedure;
- (E) alternative dispute resolution procedure (including mediation); or
- (F) other arrangement providing for the payment of attorneys' fees.

(3) The limitation described in paragraph (1) shall not apply to any amounts provided for the attorneys' reasonable and customary expenses.

(4) No award of attorneys' fees shall be made under any national tobacco settlement until the attorneys involved have—

(A) provided to the Governor of the appropriate State, a detailed time accounting with respect to the work performed in relation to any legal action which is the subject of the settlement or with regard to the settlement itself; and

(B) made public disclosure of the time accounting under subparagraph (A) and any fee agreements entered into, or fee arrangements made, with respect to any legal action that is the subject of the settlement.

BURNS (AND BAUCUS) AMENDMENT NO. 2275

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. BURNS, for himself and Mr. BAUCUS) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 86, *supra*; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PERMANENT EXTENSION OF INCOME AVERAGING FOR FARMERS.

It is the sense of Congress that the provisions of this resolution assume that if the revenue levels are reduced pursuant to section 201 of this resolution for tax legislation, such amount as is necessary shall be used to permanently extend income averaging for farmers for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

THE TEXAS LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL COMPACT CONSENT ACT

SNOWE AMENDMENT NO. 2276

Mr. DOMENICI (for Ms. SNOWE) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 629) to grant the consent of the Congress to the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act".

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDING.

Congress finds that the compact set forth in section 5 is in furtherance of the Low-

Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 2021b *et seq.*).

SEC. 3. CONDITIONS OF CONSENT TO COMPACT.

The consent of Congress to the compact set forth in section 5—

(1) shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) is granted subject to the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 2021b *et seq.*); and

(3) is granted only for so long as the regional commission established in the compact complies with each provision of the Act.

SEC. 4. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.

Congress may alter, amend, or repeal this Act with respect to the compact set forth in section 5 after the expiration of the 10-year period following the date of enactment of this Act, and at such intervals thereafter as may be provided in the compact.

SEC. 5. TEXAS LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE COMPACT.

(a) CONSENT OF CONGRESS.—In accordance with section 4(a)(2) of the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 2021d(a)(2)), the consent of Congress is given to the States of Texas, Maine, and Vermont to enter into the compact set forth in subsection (b).

(b) TEXT OF COMPACT.—The compact reads substantially as follows:

"TEXAS LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL COMPACT

"ARTICLE I. POLICY AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 1.01. The party states recognize a responsibility for each state to seek to manage low-level radioactive waste generated within its boundaries, pursuant to the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act, as amended by the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985 (42 U.S.C. 2021b-2021j). They also recognize that the United States Congress, by enacting the Act, has authorized and encouraged states to enter into compacts for the efficient management and disposal of low-level radioactive waste. It is the policy of the party states to cooperate in the protection of the health, safety, and welfare of their citizens and the environment and to provide for and encourage the economical management and disposal of low-level radioactive waste. It is the purpose of this compact to provide the framework for such a cooperative effort; to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens and the environment of the party states; to limit the number of facilities needed to effectively, efficiently, and economically manage low-level radioactive waste and to encourage the reduction of the generation thereof; and to distribute the costs, benefits, and obligations among the party states; all in accordance with the terms of this compact.

"ARTICLE II. DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 2.01. As used in this compact, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, the following definitions apply:

"(1) 'Act' means the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act, as amended by the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985 (42 U.S.C. 2021b-2021j).

"(2) 'Commission' means the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Commission established in Article III of this compact.

"(3) 'Compact facility' or 'facility' means any site, location, structure, or property located in and provided by the host state for the purpose of management or disposal of low-level radioactive waste for which the party states are responsible.

"(4) 'Disposal' means the permanent isolation of low-level radioactive waste pursuant to requirements established by the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission and

the United States Environmental Protection Agency under applicable laws, or by the host state.

"(5) 'Generate,' when used in relation to low-level radioactive waste, means to produce low-level radioactive waste.

"(6) 'Generator' means a person who produces or processes low-level radioactive waste in the course of its activities, excluding persons who arrange for the collection, transportation, management, treatment, storage, or disposal of waste generated outside the party states, unless approved by the commission.

"(7) 'Host county' means a county in the host state in which a disposal facility is located or is being developed.

"(8) 'Host state' means a party state in which a compact facility is located or is being developed. The State of Texas is the host state under this compact.

"(9) 'Institutional control period' means that period of time following closure of the facility and transfer of the facility license from the operator to the custodial agency in compliance with the appropriate regulations for long-term observation and maintenance.

"(10) 'Low-level radioactive waste' has the same meaning as that term is defined in Section 2(9) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 2021b(9)), or in the host state statute so long as the waste is not incompatible with management and disposal at the compact facility.

"(11) 'Management' means collection, consolidation, storage, packaging, or treatment.

"(12) 'Operator' means a person who operates a disposal facility.

"(13) 'Party state' means any state that has become a party in accordance with Article VII of this compact. Texas, Maine, and Vermont are initial party states under this compact.

"(14) 'Person' means an individual, corporation, partnership or other legal entity, whether public or private.

"(15) 'Transporter' means a person who transports low-level radioactive waste.

"ARTICLE III. THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 3.01. There is hereby established the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Commission. The commission shall consist of one voting member from each party state except that the host state shall be entitled to six voting members. Commission members shall be appointed by the party state governors, as provided by the laws of each party state. Each party state may provide alternates for each appointed member.

"SEC. 3.02. A quorum of the commission consists of a majority of the members. Except as otherwise provided in this compact, an official act of the commission must receive the affirmative vote of a majority of its members.

"SEC. 3.03. The commission is a legal entity separate and distinct from the party states and has governmental immunity to the same extent as an entity created under the authority of Article XVI, Section 59, of the Texas Constitution. Members of the commission shall not be personally liable for actions taken in their official capacity. The liabilities of the commission shall not be deemed liabilities of the party states.

"SEC. 3.04. The commission shall:

"(1) Compensate its members according to the host state's law.

"(2) Conduct its business, hold meetings, and maintain public records pursuant to laws of the host state, except that notice of public meetings shall be given in the non-host party states in accordance with their respective statutes.

"(3) Be located in the capital city of the host state.