Calendar No. 405

104TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. CON. RES. 57

[Report No. 104–271]

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

MAY 13, 1996

Placed on the calendar

Calendar No. 405

104TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. CON. RES. 57

[Report No. 104–271]

Setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 13, 1996

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

---

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and including the appropriate levels for fiscal year 2002.

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

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

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

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

Fiscal year 1997: $1,086,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: $1,129,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: $1,176,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: $1,229,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $1,289,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $1,359,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: −$14,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: −$18,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: −$22,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: −$21,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: −$21,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: −$14,800,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: $108,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: $113,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: $119,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: $125,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $131,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $137,700,000,000.

(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 1997: $1,318,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: $1,361,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: $1,392,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: $1,433,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $1,453,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $1,499,100,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: $1,314,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: $1,353,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: $1,382,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: $1,415,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $1,433,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $1,467,400,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: $228,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $223,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $206,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $185,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $143,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $108,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997: $5,445,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $5,719,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $5,971,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,204,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,395,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,547,000,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $41,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $36,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $36,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $36,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $36,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $36,600,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $267,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: $267,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: $268,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: $269,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $270,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $271,300,000,000.

SEC. 102. DEBT INCREASE.

The amounts of the increase in the public debt subject to limitation are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $286,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: $273,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: $252,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: $232,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $190,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $151,900,000,000.

SEC. 103. 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 1997: $384,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: $401,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: $422,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: $444,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $463,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $485,700,000,000.

(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 1997: $310,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: $323,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: $335,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: $349,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $363,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $378,800,000,000.

SEC. 104. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The 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 1997 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $265,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $263,700,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $267,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $262,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $269,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $265,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $271,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $268,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $187,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $274,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $267,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $185,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $276,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $267,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $183,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $14,200,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,333,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,110,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,342,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,262,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $12,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,358,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, $11,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,346,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $12,400,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,395,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,409,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, $4,387,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,409,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $16,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $16,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

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

(B) Outlays, $15,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $15,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $15,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $2,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,033,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $2,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,039,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $2,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,045,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $2,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,036,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $2,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $2,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,031,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $20,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $21,900,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $37,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

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

(B) Outlays, $20,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $41,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $19,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $20,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $38,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $19,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $20,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $38,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $19,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $19,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $38,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $19,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $19,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $38,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $12,500,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,794,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,870,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $12,500,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,346,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $12,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,743,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,586,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $11,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,736,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,652,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $10,500,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,595,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,641,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, $8,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,570,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $6,709,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $7,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−2,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,856,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $197,340,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $9,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $5,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,787,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $196,750,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $10,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $6,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,763,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $196,253,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $7,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,759,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $195,883,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $11,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $7,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,745,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $195,375,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, $7,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,740,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $194,875,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $41,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $38,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $43,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $37,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $43,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $35,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $43,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $34,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $43,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $33,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, $33,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $15,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,222,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,133,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $9,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,242,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,133,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,265,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,171,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $7,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,288,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,171,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $7,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,317,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,202,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $6,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $6,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,343,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $2,202,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $49,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $50,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,219,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,469,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

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

(B) Outlays, $48,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $19,040,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,760,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $50,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $49,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,781,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $13,854,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, $50,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,884,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,589,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $51,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $50,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $23,978,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,319,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $52,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $51,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $25,127,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,085,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $131,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $131,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $187,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $137,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $137,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $94,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

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

(B) Outlays, $144,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $152,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $152,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $160,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $159,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $167,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $166,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $193,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $191,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $205,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $204,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $216,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $214,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $227,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $225,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $239,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $237,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $253,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $251,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $232,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $240,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $241,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $245,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $246,500,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $264,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $264,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $264,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $268,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $282,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $281,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $7,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $10,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $8,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $9,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $11,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, $12,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $10,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 1997:

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

(B) Outlays, $39,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $935,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,362,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $38,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $39,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $962,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,925,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $38,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $39,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $987,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,426,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $38,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $40,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,021,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $24,883,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $38,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $37,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,189,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $24,298,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

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

(B) Outlays, $39,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,194,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $23,668,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $21,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $20,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $22,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $21,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $23,300,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $23,300,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $19,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $19,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $19,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $19,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $13,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $13,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $13,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $13,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, $282,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $282,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, $289,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $289,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, $293,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $293,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $294,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $294,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, $298,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $298,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, $303,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $303,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(19) The corresponding levels of gross interest on the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1997: $348,134,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: $351,040,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: $348,265,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: $349,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: $351,111,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: $352,656,000,000.

(20) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,900,000,000.

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

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

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

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

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

(B) Outlays, \$0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 2000:

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

(B) Outlays, −\$500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

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

(B) Outlays, −$1,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$3,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$3,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, −$43,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$43,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, −$35,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$35,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, −$34,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$34,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, −$36,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$36,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, −$38,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$38,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, −$40,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$40,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 105. RECONCILIATION.

(a) FIRST RECONCILIATION OF SPENDING REDUCTIONS.—

(1) SENATE COMMITTEES.—Not later than June 14, 1996, the committees named in this subsection shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY.—The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays $1,994,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and $29,376,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(B) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays $95,402,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(b) FINAL RECONCILIATION OF SPENDING REDUCTIONS.—

(1) SENATE COMMITTEES.—If legislation is enacted pursuant to subsection (a), then no later than July 12, 1996, the committees named in this subsection shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY.—The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays $86,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and $251,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(B) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays $79,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and $649,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(C) COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and

Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays $3,628,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and $3,605,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(D) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays $0 in fiscal year 1997 and $19,396,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(E) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays $84,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and $1,433,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(F) COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.—The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays $87,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and $2,212,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(G) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays $6,716,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and $169,707,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(H) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit $955,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and

$8,789,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(I) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays $0 in fiscal year 1997 and $476,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(J) COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES.—The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays $725,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and $3,097,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(K) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending (as defined in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) to reduce outlays $175,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and $5,198,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(c) RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS.—

(1) SENATE COMMITTEE.—If the legislation is enacted pursuant to subsections (a) and (b), then no later than September 18, 1996, the Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction necessary to reduce revenues by not more than $15,359,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 and $116,104,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002 and reduce outlays $1,692,000,000 in fiscal year 1997 and $11,524,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2002.

(d) TREATMENT OF RECONCILIATION BILLS FOR PRIOR SURPLUS.—For purposes of section 202 of House Concurrent Resolution 67 (104th Congress), legislation which reduces revenues pursuant to a reconciliation instruction contained in subsection (c) shall be taken together with all other legislation enacted pursuant to the reconciliation instructions contained in this resolution when determining the deficit effect of such legislation.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

SEC. 201. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) DEFINITION.—As used in this section and for the purposes of allocations made pursuant to section 302(a) or 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the discretionary category, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(1) with respect to fiscal year 1997—

(A) for the defense category $266,362,000,000 in new budget authority and $264,568,000,000 in outlays; and

(B) for the nondefense category $222,845,000,000 in new budget authority and $266,797,000,000 in outlays;

(2) with respect to fiscal year 1998—

(A) for the defense category $267,831,000,000 in new budget authority and $262,962,000,000 in outlays; and

(B) for the nondefense category $221,322,000,000 in new budget authority and $258,698,000,000 in outlays;

(3) with respect to fiscal year 1999, for the discretionary category $493,221,000,000 in new budget authority and $525,742,000,000 in outlays;

(4) with respect to fiscal year 2000, for the discretionary category $500,037,000,000 in new budget authority and $525,071,000,000 in outlays;

(5) with respect to fiscal year 2001, for the discretionary category $492,468,000,000 in new budget authority and $517,708,000,000 in outlays; and

(6) with respect to fiscal year 2002, for the discretionary category $501,177,000,000 in new budget authority and $515,979,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted for changes in concepts and definitions and emergency appropriations.

(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 year 1998 (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such a resolution) that provides discretionary spending in excess of the sum of the defense and nondefense discretionary spending limits for such fiscal year;

(B) any concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 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 for such fiscal year; or

(C) any appropriations bill or resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such appropriations bill or resolution) for fiscal year 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 that would exceed any of the discretionary spending limits in this section or suballocations of those limits made pursuant to section 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) EXCEPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—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.

(B) ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY LIMITS IN FY 1997.—Until the enactment of reconciliation legislation pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of section 105 of this resolution and for purposes of the application of paragraph (1), only subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) shall apply to fiscal year 1997.

(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, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 202. TAX RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates may be reduced and allocations may be revised for legislation that reduces revenues by providing family tax relief, fuel tax relief, and incentives to stimulate savings, investment, job creation, and economic growth if such legislation will not increase the deficit for—

(1) fiscal year 1997;

(2) the period of fiscal years 1997 through 2001; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006.

(b) REVISED 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 sections 302(a) and 602(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 committee shall report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to sections 302(b) and 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

SEC. 203. SUPERFUND RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—After the enactment of legislation that reforms the Superfund program and extends Superfund taxes, in the Senate, budget authority and outlays allocated to the Committee on Appropriations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate functional levels, the appropriate budget aggregates, and the discretionary spending limits in section 201 of this resolution may be revised to provide additional budget authority and the outlays flowing from that budget authority for the Superfund program, pursuant to this section.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) ALLOCATIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS.—In the Senate, upon reporting of an appropriations measure, or when a conference committee submits a conference report thereon, that appropriates funds for the Superfund program in excess of $1,302,000,000, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit revised allocations, functional levels, budget aggregates, and discretionary spending limits to carry out this section that adds to such allocations, levels, aggregates, and limits an amount that is equal to such excess. These revised allocations, levels, aggregates, and limits shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations, levels, aggregates, and limits contained in this resolution.

(B) COMMITTEE SUBALLOCATIONS.—The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 following the revision of the allocations pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(2) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments under this subsection shall not exceed—

(A) the net revenue increase for a fiscal year resulting from the enactment of legislation that extends Superfund taxes; and

(B) $898,000,000 in budget authority for a fiscal year and the outlays flowing from such budget authority in all fiscal years.

SEC. 204. SCORING OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

Notwithstanding section 606(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the determinations under sections 302, 303, 311, and 602 of such Act shall take into account any new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, receipts, or deficit effects as a consequence of the provisions of sections 251(b)(2)(D) and

252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 205. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

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

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE CONGRESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND SENATE

SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the prohibition on scoring asset sales has discouraged the sale of assets that can be better

managed by the private sector and generate receipts to reduce the Federal budget deficit;

(2) the President's fiscal year 1997 budget included $3,900,000,000 in receipts from asset sales and proposed a change in the asset sale scoring rule to allow the proceeds from these sales to be scored;

(3) assets should not be sold if such sale would increase the budget deficit over the long run; and

(4) the asset sale scoring prohibition should be repealed and consideration should be given to replacing it with a methodology that takes into account the long-term budgetary impact of asset sales.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the term "sale of an asset" shall have the same meaning as under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS THAT TAX REDUCTIONS SHOULD BENEFIT WORKING FAMILIES.

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

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON A BIPARTISAN COMMISSION ON THE SOLVENCY OF MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Trustees of medicare have concluded that ‘‘the medicare program is clearly unsustainable in its present form’’;

(2) the Trustees of medicare concluded in 1995 that ‘‘the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, which pays inpatient hospital expenses, will be able to pay benefits for only about 7 years and is severely out of financial balance in the long range’’;

(3) preliminary data made available to the Congress indicate that the Hospital Trust Fund will go bankrupt in the year 2001, rather than the year 2002, as predicted last year;

(4) the Public Trustees of medicare have concluded that ‘‘the Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund shows a rate of growth of costs which is clearly unsustainable’’;

(5) the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement and Tax Reform concluded that, absent long-term changes in medicare, projected medicare outlays will increase from about 4 percent of the payroll tax base today to over 15 percent of the payroll tax base by the year 2030;

(6) the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement and Tax Reform recommended, by a vote of 30 to 1, that spending and revenues available for medicare must be brought into long-term balance; and

(7) in the most recent Trustees' report, the Public Trustees of medicare ''strongly recommend that the crisis presented by the financial condition of the medicare trust funds be urgently addressed on a comprehensive basis, including a review of the program's financing methods, benefit provisions, and delivery mechanisms.''.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that in order to meet the aggregates and levels in this budget resolution—

(1) a special bipartisan commission should be established immediately to make recommendations concerning the most appropriate response to the short-term solvency and long-term sustainability issues facing the medicare program; and

(2) the commission should report to Congress its recommendations prior to the adoption of a concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1998 in order that the committees of jurisdiction may consider these recommendations in fashioning an appropriate congressional response.

SEC. 304. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONSIDERING A CHANGE IN THE MINIMUM WAGE IN THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) proposals to increase the minimum wage have important economic and budgetary consequences, as there are about 3,600,000 workers at or below the minimum wage under current law, according to the Congressional Budget Office ("CBO");

(2) S. 413, a bill to increase the minimum wage, would increase costs for State and local governments by $1,030,000,000 over the period 1996 to 2000, according to the CBO, and would, therefore, violate section 425(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 regarding unfunded intergovernmental mandates;

(3) S. 413 would increase costs for the private sector by $12,300,000,000 over the period 1996 to 2000 and would reduce jobs by between 100,000 and 500,000, according to the CBO;

(4) increasing the minimum wage would have significant interactions with other Federal spending and tax programs, including welfare programs and the earned income credit;

(5) States have the authority to increase the minimum wage in their States, and, as of February 1996, 10 States, plus Puerto Rico and Washington, D.C., had minimum wages above the Federal minimum wage;

(6) although raising the minimum wage will increase incomes for some workers, it is a poorly targeted approach to helping poor and low-income families because—

(A) it will eliminate jobs for some minimum- and low-wage workers;

(B) 85 percent of workers in poor families are paid more than the minimum wage, and nearly 60 percent are paid more than $5.25 per hour, according to the CBO;

(C) most minimum wage workers are not poor, with some 70 percent in households with incomes above 150 percent of the poverty line, according to the CBO; and

(D) most minimum wage workers do not stay at the minimum wage very long, with two-thirds getting a pay raise within the first year, according to the CBO;

(7) the best approach to increasing wages and incomes for working families is to promote policies

that enhance economic growth and job creation, such as increasing net national savings and investment by balancing the Federal budget and promoting private savings and investment through fundamental tax reform;

(8) legislation to change the minimum wage should be considered in the Senate in an orderly manner as part of the regular consideration of matters related to the budget and the economy and not as an unscheduled amendment to unrelated legislation;

(9) there are important issues which should be considered in the same legislation and in conjunction with proposals to raise the minimum wage, such as allowing for improvements in the workplace by enabling cooperative efforts between labor and management as provided for in S. 295, the Team Work for Employees and Management Act of 1995, and maintaining a training wage to minimize job loss for new entrants into the job market; and

(10) the Senate should schedule consideration of legislation that addresses in the same bill, as a single proposal, the minimum wage and the provisions of S. 295 no later than the month of June 1996.

SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS IN BUDGET ESTIMATES.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the report accompanying a concurrent resolution on the budget should include an analysis, prepared after consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, of the concurrent resolution's impact on revenues and outlays for entitlements for the period of 30 fiscal years; and

(2) the President should include in his budget each year, an analysis of the budget's impact on revenues and outlays for entitlements for the period of 30 fiscal years, and that the President should also include generational accounting information each year in the President's budget.

SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON MEDICARE TRANSFERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) home health care provides a broad spectrum of health and social services to approximately 3,500,000 medicare beneficiaries in the comfort of their homes;

(2) the President has proposed reimbursing the first 100 home health care visits after a hospital stay through medicare part A and reimbursing all other visits through medicare part B, shifting re-

sponsibility for \$55,000,000,000 of spending from the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund to the general revenues that pay for medicare part B;

(3) such a transfer does nothing to control medicare spending, and is merely a bookkeeping change which artificially extends the solvency of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund;

(4) this transfer of funds camouflages the need to make changes in the medicare program to ensure the long-term solvency of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, which the Congressional Budget Office now states will become bankrupt in the year 2001, a year earlier than projected in the 1995 report by the Trustees of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds;

(5) Congress will be breaking a commitment to the American people if it does not act to ensure the solvency of the entire medicare program in both the short- and long-term;

(6) the President's proposal would force those in need of chronic care services to rely upon the availability of general revenues to provide financing for these services, making them more vulnerable to benefits changes than under current law; and

(7) according to the National Association of Home Care, shifting medicare home care payments from part A to part B would deemphasize the importance of home care by eliminating its status as part of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, thereby undermining access to the less costly form of care.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that in meeting the spending targets specified in the budget resolution, Congress should not accept the President's proposal to transfer spending from one part of medicare to another in its efforts to preserve, protect, and improve the medicare program.

SEC. 307. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON REPEAL OF THE GAS TAX.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the President originally proposed a $72,000,000,000 energy excise tax (the so-called BTU tax) as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (OBRA 93) which included a new tax on transportation fuels;

(2) in response to opposition in the Senate to the BTU tax, the President and the Congress adopted instead a new 4.3 cents per gallon transportation fuels tax as part of OBRA 93, which represented a 30 percent increase in the existing motor fuels tax;

(3) the OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax has cost American motorists an estimated $14,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000 since it went into effect on October 1, 1993;

(4) the OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax is regressive, creating a larger financial impact on lower and middle income motorists than on upper income motorists;

(5) the OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax imposes a disproportionate burden on rural citizens who do not have access to public transportation services, and who must rely on their automobiles and drive long distances, to work, to shop, and to receive medical care;

(6) the average American faces a substantial tax burden, and the increase of this tax burden through the OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax represented and continues to represent an inappropriate and unwarranted means of reducing the Nation's budget deficit;

(7) retail gasoline prices in the United States have increased an average of 19 cents per gallon since the beginning of the year to the highest level since the Persian Gulf War, and the OBRA 93

transportation fuels tax exacerbates the impact of this price increase on consumers;

(8) continuation of the OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax will exacerbate the impact on consumers of any future gasoline price spikes that result from market conditions; and

(9) the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution will assume a net tax cut totaling $122,000,000,000 over six years, which exceeds the revenue impact of a repeal of the OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax, and will establish a reserve fund which may be used to provide other forms of tax relief, including relief from the OBRA 93 transportation fuels tax, on a deficit neutral basis.

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

(1) the Congress and the President should immediately approve legislation to repeal the 4.3 cents per gallon transportation fuels tax contained in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 through the end of 1996;

(2) the Congress and the President should approve, through the fiscal year 1997 budget process, legislation to permanently repeal the 4.3 cents per

gallon transportation fuels tax contained in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993; and

(3) the savings generated by the repeal of the 4.3 cents per gallon transportation fuels tax contained in OBRA 93 should be fully passed on to consumers.

SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MEDICARE TRUSTEES REPORT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Trustees of the Medicare Hospital Insurance (HI) Trust Fund serve as fiduciaries for one of the Federal Government's most important programs, and as fiduciaries provide critically important information each year to the Congress and the public on the financial status of the Medicare HI Fund;

(2) the Trustees are required to issue a report on the financial status of the medicare HI Trust Fund by April 1 of each year;

(3) the April 1995 Trustees Report stated that the Medicare HI Trust Fund would go bankrupt in the year 2002, but in 1995 the Congress and the President could not agree on a plan to extend the solvency of the medicare program;

(4) in 1996, the Congress and the public require timely information on the full and exact nature

of medicare's financial condition in order to understand what actions must be taken to extend the solvency of the of the Medicare HI Trust Fund; and

(5) despite the April 1 deadline, the 1996 Medicare Trustees Report has not yet been issued, and each day of delay further jeopardizes Congress' ability to respond appropriately to forestall the program's bankruptcy.

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

(1) the Medicare Trustees should discharge their fiduciary and statutory responsibilities and issue their 1996 report as soon as possible; and

(2) in light of the Trustees' delay thus far, the Chief Actuary of the Medicare Trust Fund should share with Congress immediately any preliminary information on the current financial status of the Trust Fund.