

that we use substandard technology in the census so that fails too. Why? Because he believes that errors in the census are to his party's political advantage.

Two years ago the Census Bureau put forth a new plan for the 2000 census. It is a plan founded on 200 years of experience in conducting the census. It is a plan created with the understanding of 60 years of research on who was missed in the census. It is a plan with the advice of hundreds of experts, inside and outside the Census Bureau.

The plan for the 2000 census has been endorsed by dozens of organizations and hundreds of individuals, groups like the American Chamber of Commerce, the Researchers Association, the American Statistical Association, the Cities of New York and Los Angeles, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the National Academy of Sciences, the National Association of Regional Councils, the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the United States Conference of Mayors. These are all organizations committed to a fair and accurate census in the year 2000.

Despite this broad and overwhelming support, the opponents of the census continue their attack. Why? Because they believe the errors in the census are to their political advantage. I used to believe that all of the misstatements in their rhetoric were just because the speakers did not know much about the census, and I would go to the floor and try to set the record straight so that my colleagues could judge the facts for themselves. But now I truly believe that the mistakes in my opponents' statements are purposeful and they are there to confuse and mislead the public.

Today you have already heard a number of my colleagues talk about the importance of a fair and accurate census and the high cost of the errors in the census. That cost is very human and very real. The 1990 census, according to the General Accounting Office, had 26 million errors in it, people missed, people counted twice, and people counted in the wrong place. Most of those missed were urban and rural poor; most of those counted twice are suburban and white.

The opponents of an accurate census cry out against the idea that we should correct the census for those counted twice. "Don't you dare take people out of my county," they cry. At the same time, they fight with the same energy to make sure that nothing is done to account for those missed in the census for those that have historically been undercounted. Why? Because they believe that errors in the census are to their political advantage.

The opponents of a fair and accurate census say that the 1990 census was pretty good; the second best ever, they say.

The 1990 census was the most unfair census ever measured. Is that what they consider pretty good? Unfortunately, it is.

The opponents of an accurate census want to continue this system, where those fortunate enough to have two homes are counted twice, and the poor and the minorities are missed. It is time for the American public to reject ideas like that and the people who promote them. We need an accurate census and we need to support the plan that has been put forward by the National Academy of Sciences and the Census Bureau to count every single American.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the special order just presented.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCKEON). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE CHILDREN'S PROTECTION FROM INTERNET PREDATORS ACT OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Congressional Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus, I am introducing the Children's Protection From Internet Predators Act of 1998 to help combat the exploitation of our children on the Internet.

While the Internet is one of the most powerful tools in finding missing children, its vast reach is unfortunately also being used to hurt our children. Child pornography has resurfaced with a vengeance with the advent of computer technology. Now, child predators have a new medium to lure our children away through chat rooms and web pages.

Child pornography has flourished on the Internet, with child pornography being traded freely in chat rooms, news groups and private E-mail.

During one week in March of this year, the Houston Chronicle reported that U.S. customs agents, who are charged with investigating Internet crimes against children, seized computers from a home and a church, saying the equipment was used to send and receive child pornography through the Internet.

Apparently that was not the only seizure of child porn during that week. A man was accused of possessing and distributing pornographic images of children on the Internet. A subsequent search of his home revealed thousands of pornographic images on his computers, including at least 150 illegal porno-

graphic images of children as young as six years of age.

Chat rooms on the Internet are being used by predators to lure our children away from their families. We read in the newspapers about tragic incidents. One of a chemical engineer who traveled from Oklahoma to Corpus Christi, planning a sexual rendezvous with a 13-year-old girl he met over the Internet. In Tacoma, Washington, a 36-year-old man was arrested for raping a girl he met and lured over an Internet chat room.

Well, today I am introducing the Children's Protection from Internet Predators Act of 1998 in Congress. It will fund the U.S. Customs Service child pornography enforcement program. That program is called the International Child Pornography Investigation and Coordination Center. It is designed to help combat the growing problem of child pornography and child predators on the Internet.

Child pornography and incidents of children being lured on the Internet vastly outnumber the people and the resources in the law enforcement community who are trained to handle such crimes. Well, this legislation gives an extra \$2 million to law enforcement to track, monitor and stop child exploitation on the Internet.

My concern with the lack of funding provided for the U.S. Customs Service child pornography enforcement program is obvious. Ever mindful of the widespread benefits which the Customs Service provides, I am greatly discouraged that the fiscal year 1999 budget does not provide adequate funding for this program. So I urge my colleagues to take this issue seriously, that we fund the \$2 million necessary to help protect our children from victimization.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree that this is a small price to pay to reduce the exploitation of our children.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the Chamber on campaign finance reform and to just base some brief remarks about that.

First, I wish to express tremendous gratitude to the 104th Congress for the work it did on a bipartisan basis to pass Congressional accountability. Getting Congress under all the laws that we impose on the rest of the Nation was the first bill that the 104th Congress, the Congress of the last term, presented to President Clinton to sign, and it puts Congress under all the laws it exempted itself from, the civil rights laws, OSHA, fair pay provisions, a 40 hour workweek and so on.

Now, some Members of Congress may not like all those laws, but the fact is that we imposed those laws on the rest

of the Nation, and we need to make sure we abide by them ourselves. We will write better laws if we have to live by the laws that we impose on the rest of the Nation. That was the first bill we passed, and I think it is a major reform.

Another reform was the gift ban. We were going to model what was in the Senate side to limit gifts. In fact, we actually outlawed any gift, unless it was inconsequential. A hat or a T-shirt would still be allowed under our rules, but we got rid of all those free meals that were quite expensive and being abused, and that was a reform that passed on a bipartisan basis.

We also passed a lobby disclosure bill in the last term. The significance of that was it had not been amended since 1947, and in 1954 the Supreme Court basically gutted the provisions, so we had a very weak lobby disclosure law. The 104th Congress passed lobby disclosure.

Congressional accountability, getting us under all the laws we impose on the rest of the Nation, gift ban, lobby disclosure, passed in the last Congress on a bipartisan basis, and they are reforms I am very proud we passed.

The one area we left really unanswered was campaign finance reform. We have had votes during the 11 years I have been here, but we have never really coalesced on a bipartisan basis around a bill that we could pass. There was one bill presented to President Bush, but when that bill had the opportunity to be presented to President Clinton, it never got there.

Right now we have an historic opportunity to take up 11 substitute bills on campaign finance reform. We have a complete and open rule. We will have nongermane amendments made in order. There are important amendments, but the technicality of not being germane will be disallowed by the Committee on Rules. In other words, they will make in order these nongermane amendments that some perceive will improve the very substitutes that will be offered.

I would like to address one of those substitutes. I would like to address the McCain-Feingold bill in the Senate and a bill that my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and I and so many other Members on the Republican and Democrat sides of the aisle have offered.

One of the substitutes, referred to as either Meehan-Shays or Shays-Meehan or McCain-Feingold or Feingold-McCain, is a bipartisan amendment that bans soft money. Now, soft money is the unlimited sums that individuals, corporations, labor unions and other interest groups give to the political parties, supposedly for party building and registration, but they get right back down to the candidates and have circumvented our campaign laws. We seek to ban soft money on both the Federal and State level for Federal candidates.

We also want to call the sham issue ads what they are, campaign ads. We want to make sure that these issue ads that really are campaign ads are called

what they are, campaign ads. Therefore, they come under the campaign laws.

We do this by adding to the "magic word test" that moves an issue ad to a campaign ad. Right now an issue ad that says "vote for" or "vote against," "reelect," "defeat", that trips from an issue ad into a campaign ad and then comes under campaign laws.

□ 2015

It does not mean people's freedom of speech has been deprived, it just means they come under the same rules that everyone else comes under who has to abide by the campaign laws.

We do this by adding another provision to the magic word test. If you use the candidate's name or an image of that candidate, it becomes a campaign ad 60 days prior to an election. When it becomes a campaign ad, it means that the expenditures have to be reported and the limits of contributions have to be adhered to. It means that no corporate money can be used in those ads, and no union dues money can be used in those ads.

We also codify Beck. The Beck decision is a decision by the Supreme Court that says if you are not a union worker, your agency fee, does not have to include money going for political purposes. It means you will pay less.

We codify the Beck decision and require that unions notify nonunion members covered by union contracts that they do not have to participate in the political process through their union dues.

We also improve the Federal Election Commission's, disclosure and enforcement requirements. Disclosure will be done by filing electronically within 4 hours after receiving a major contribution in the last 20 days of an election; and then 48 hours later it will be made public and be available on the Internet for anyone who is interested.

We also say that wealthy candidates can contribute up to \$50,000 to their own campaigns and still have the \$62,000 contribution from their political party. But anything more than \$50,000 means that then the political parties cannot contribute to a wealthy candidate who is using his or her own money.

We ban unsolicited mass mailings using the frank 6 months prior to the election. That means, by May no franked mail can be sent that is district-wide, the kind that would be a newsletter or questionnaire.

Then we also make sure that it is clear that foreign money and money raised on government property is illegal. We would intuitively think it is illegal. But if it is soft money, it is basically viewed by most as not being illegal.

In other words, it is not illegal to call from the White House or from Congress for a soft money donation, because soft money, the unlimited sums that individuals, corporations, and labor unions give to the political parties, is not deemed campaign money. It is deemed soft money for party building. We know now it is used as cam-

campaign money; but technically, under the law, someone who seeks foreign money contributions or raises money from a government building is not breaking the law.

Now, I believe strongly that we need to hold every executive branch employee accountable for his or her actions, and every President. One of my concerns has been that my own party is very eager to hold President Clinton accountable for wrongdoing, and that part I acknowledge is important, but then there is a big disconnect because too many of my own party do not want to do the other part of that process. The other part of the process is to reform the law where it needs to be reformed.

When this Congress investigated President Nixon, a Democrat Congress, they did two things. They held President Nixon accountable for the misdeeds he did and his administration did, and they reformed the law, the 1974 campaign finance law reforms. They did both. They held the President accountable and they reformed the system. In my view, that gave them credibility to look at what the President had done.

Unfortunately, in this Chamber too many of my colleagues, I think, on the other side of the aisle do not want to hold the President accountable where he needs to be held accountable but want to reform the system, which I am grateful for. Too many on my side of the aisle want to hold the President accountable but do not want to reform the system. We have to do both. That is our job. Our job is to do both.

In the next few weeks we will be debating a constitutional amendment presented by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and then we will be debating 11 substitutes. One of them is a commission bill. The commission bill has merit, if it was not being compared to a bill that bans soft money and takes the sham issue ads and calls them what they are, campaign ads, codifies Beck, improves the FEC disclosure and enforcement, deals with franking, and makes illegal the foreign money and fund-raising on government property. You might need a commission bill if you did not have this bill to choose.

But we are going to deal with 11 substitutes and we have a fair and open rule. Any amendments can be offered. It means we are going to have extensive debate on the floor. It means it is going to be protracted. It is going to be a very long process.

But I do think, if Members on both sides of the aisle just do what they think is right, if they try not to be partisan in the process, that this will be a good education for us and the American people.

My hope is the commission bill will not pass, at least not get as many votes as the Shays-Meehan or Meehan-Shays

bill, because we structured the debate so that 11 substitutes are being offered, and each substitute can have unlimited amendments.

So we are going to take each substitute, we are going to debate it, offer amendments, and then we are going to vote it up or down. It is conceivable that the commission bill could get 230 votes. If it did, and Meehan-Shays or Shays-Meehan got 225, even though the Shays-Meehan bill got more than 218 votes it is trumped by one that did better.

My hope is that while the commission bill, under certain circumstances, on a certain day and at a certain time would have made sense, it does not make sense now. I am hoping that my colleagues will choose not to vote for that bill and trump the Meehan-Shays bill.

I am also hopeful that the bill offered by the freshmen, which is a bipartisan bill and has many meritorious parts to it, it bans soft money on the Federal level, not the State, and we think while we have an honest disagreement with our colleagues, mostly freshmen, that we just think it really relocates a lot of the soft money to the States' political parties for them to spend for the candidates.

We feel that you have to deal with the sham issue ads. I mean, we have an extraordinary problem that these ads have become more and more blatant and more and more dishonest. They are dishonest in not disclosing who is paying for them allowing unlimited sums by some individuals. They also allow groups that may represent a particular interest that do not want to disclose their interest, to spend money and campaign against an opponent without disclosing that their real interest is something else.

For example, the NRA, the National Rifle Association, may campaign against someone, never bringing up the issue that they really oppose them on, that person supported the assault weapon ban, and making it sound like that candidate is bad for other reasons. We want the NRA to just be up front and say it is their ad, and we want them to have to abide by all the rules that anyone else has to disclose where they get their money, and raise their money under the requirements of the campaign law.

You will have pro-choice groups and pro-life groups that want to do the same thing. And you have pro-assault weapon ban groups as well as the NRA that opposes the assault weapon ban. So it is going to apply to everyone, and it should.

The bottom line is that we are going to have extensive debate on campaign finance reform in the next few weeks. I am very hopeful that it will do credit to this Congress to debate this issue. That is why I ran for public office, not to deal with this issue behind closed doors but to do it in the light of day.

I conclude by pointing out that some on my side of the aisle, in particular,

will say behind closed doors that the American people do not care about campaign finance reform. I challenge them to say it publicly. I submit that the American people do care about campaign finance reform. They are not apathetic, they are just frustrated. I think we sometimes confuse their frustrations with apathy.

I send out a questionnaire in the fall of the first year; and then in the winter of the second year, I sent out the results. I also send out every vote that I have made in the first year. This document will tell people how I voted on every issue, besides also pointing out where I had 38 community meetings that people could come to.

But in the questionnaire results, I asked the question, which is the most important issue for Congress to address? That was question A. There were about 30 choices, or close to that. The last choice was "other", in case they had something other than the choices I offered. The balanced budget came up as the first concern, the most important issue. Tax is the second. Campaign finance reform came third. Some could say, well, it was only their third choice. It beat education, health care and crime.

Admittedly, it was a mutually exclusive list, so only 8.3 percent of my constituents chose that as the most important issue. I would not have even been one of them. As much as I believe campaign finance reform is important, I would have chosen the balanced budget as the most important issue to deal with, getting our country's financial house in order.

It does not mean that I think taxes or campaign finance reform or education or health care are unimportant, they are just not my first choice. But it showed up as the third choice in the question, what is the most important issue? It showed up as the seventh choice as what is the second most important issue.

Then I made this very biased statement and asked my constituents whether or not they agreed with it: Our democracy is threatened by the influence of unlimited campaign contributions by individuals, corporations, labor unions, and other interest groups. Our democracy is threatened.

I asked people whether they strongly agreed, agreed, no opinion, disagreed, strongly disagreed. The response was the following: 51.7 percent of my constituents believed that our democracy is threatened by the influence of unlimited campaign contributions by individuals, corporations, labor unions, and other interest groups.

The unlimited contributions, that is soft money. That is what we are banning. And 32.5 percent of my constituents agreed with that statement. In other words, 84.2 percent of my constituents believe our democracy is threatened by soft money, the unlimited campaign contributions by individuals, corporations, labor unions, and other interest groups.

I realize that every district is different. I realize that I represent a district of very informed voters, in many cases well-to-do, although I have a lot of poor people who live in my urban areas of Stamford and Norwalk and Bridgeport. But when 84.2 percent of my constituents believe their democracy is threatened, it certainly is a message to me.

I wager if other Members ask the same question, they would get the same result. They could have chosen that they had no opinion or they disagreed or they strongly disagreed with the statement, but 84 percent of my constituents strongly agree or agree.

I am hopeful, almost prayerful, that we will be able to look back at the end of this month and say we did our job, we responded to the wishes of our constituency, and we also responded to our own intuitive sense.

I do not think there is a Member in this Chamber who does not recognize that soft money is polluting the system. It has become a narcotic that both political parties are getting addicted to.

My hat is off to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have taken a disproportionate share of support for the Meehan-Shays or Shays-Meehan bill, and I am respectfully appreciative of my colleagues on this side of the aisle who are taking a strong stand for this bill, even though they still constitute a minority of those who are supporting Shays-Meehan or Meehan-Shays.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and particularly, if I could, my colleagues on this side of the aisle for kind of bucking the trend. I think you are doing the right thing. I am convinced of it. I believe if we do the right thing, if we ban soft money, if we call sham issue ads what they are, campaign ads, and have them come under the campaign laws, and have everyone have their freedom of voice under the same rules that everyone else has to deal with, codify Beck, improve FEC disclosure and enforcement, make sure that wealthy candidates cannot buy an election by getting support from the political parties when they are already putting so much of their own money in, banning unsolicited franked mass mailings 6 months to an election, and making sure that foreign money and raising money on government property is illegal, making sure that that is illegal, passing that bill without amendment, without amendment, and sending it on back to the Senate, I think that you will see an amazing response from our Senators.

□ 2030

I think they will know that this House had the courage to do what was right, and there will be extraordinary pressure, and maybe even a bit of conscience taking on the part of our Senators, saying, "We know only 53 voted for it last time," which is a majority in the Senate, "we need to pick up 7 more votes."

But I feel pretty confident that if we do our job, the Senate will do its job and pass their bill, McCain-Feingold, which is the compatible piece to Shays-Meehan.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 11 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

THE USER FEE ACT OF 1998
(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, tonight I do the unimaginable. On behalf of the President of the United States of America, I am introducing the "User Fee Act of 1998." This is a 96-page bill and it contains over \$25 billion of increases in what are technically called "user fees," but what they should more accurately be called is tax increases, because that is what a user fee is, Mr. Speaker.

These 36 tax increase were included in President Clinton's budget for fiscal year 1999 that is not going to be brought on this floor by the Democratic minority. The President, of course, included these 36 tax increases in an attempt to provide his adminis-

tration with more taxpayer dollars to spend on big government spending schemes.

These user fees increase the cost on families through increased entrance fees for national parks, on farmers through increased safety and inspection fees, and on older Americans through increased Food and Drug Administration costs, Medicare costs, and Social Security fees, if you would believe that, Mr. Speaker.

Passing costs from the government to taxpayers, no matter we call it, are tax increases on the American people. American families would have less money in their pockets if President Clinton's initiative were made law. I introduce this bill today not as a show of support for the President, but as a crystal clear opportunity for the House to show who is taking more of the taxpayers' dollars.

Account Title		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Discretionary Fee Proposals						
Offsetting Collections Deposited in Appropriations Accounts:						
Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Fees	President	-10	-10	-10	-10	-10
	CBO	-7	-15	-15	-25	-25
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration Licensing Fees	President	-17	-21	-21	-21	-21
	CBO	-10	-21	-21	-21	-21
Food Safety and Inspection Service, Meat, Poultry, and Egg Products Inspection Fee	President	-473	-573	-573	-573	-573
	CBO	0	-573	-573	-573	-573
Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Cost-Share Fee	President	-10	-15	-15	-25	-25
	CBO	-2	-5	-5	-10	-10
Farm Services Administration, Farm Service Fee	President	-10	-15	-15	-25	-25
	CBO	-7	-15	-15	-25	-25
Department of Commerce National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Navigational Assistance Fee	President	-3	-11	-11	-11	-11
	CBO	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20
NOAA, Fisheries Management Fee	President	-22	-22	-22	-22	-22
	CBO	-182	-189	-207	-219	-228
Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Fees	President	-182	-197	-210	-225	-241
	CBO	-6	-12	-12	-12	-12
International Trade Administration, Trade Promotion Fees	President	-6	-12	-12	-12	-12
	CBO	-6	-12	-12	-12	-12
Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration Fees	President	-128	-128	-128	-128	-128
	CBO	-12	-128	-128	-128	-128
Physician, Provider, and Supplier Enrollment Registration Fees	President	-20	-21	-21	-22	-23
	CBO					
Managed Care Organization Application and Renewal Fees	President	-37	-38	-39	-41	-42
	CBO					
Initial Provider Certification Fees	President	-10	-10	-11	-11	-12
	CBO					
Provider Recertification Fees	President	-52	-54	-56	-58	-61
	CBO					
Paper Claims Submission Fees	President	-110	-114	-118	-122	-126
	CBO					
Duplicate and Unprocessable Claims Fees	President	-36	-37	-38	-39	-41
	CBO					
Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management, Hardrock Location and Maintenance Fees	President	-39	-40	-41	-42	-43
	CBO	-39	-40	-41	-42	-43
Department of Labor Alien Labor Certification Fee	President	0	-40	-40	-40	-40
	CBO					
Department of Transportation Coast Guard, Navigational Assistance Fee	President	-35	-165	-165	-165	-165
	CBO	0	0	0	0	0
Surface Transportation Board Fees	President	-16	-16	-16	-16	-16
	CBO	-5	0	0	0	0
Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Permit Fee	President	-7	-14	-14	-14	-14
	CBO	-7	-14	-14	-14	-14
Federal Emergency Management Administration, Radiological Emergency Preparedness Fees	President	-13	-13	-13	-13	-13
	CBO	0	0	0	0	0
National Transportation Safety Board, Aviation Accident Investigation Fee	President	-6	-6	-6	-6	-6
	CBO					
Social Security Administration, Claimant Representative Fees	President	-7	-9	-9	-9	-9
	CBO	-1	-9	-9	-9	-9
Offsetting Collections Deposited in Receipt Accounts:						
Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Railroad Safety Inspection Fees	President	-82	-82	-82	-82	-82
	CBO	-83	-83	-83	-83	-83
Department of Treasury, Customs Merchandise Processing Fee	President	-48	-48	-48	-48	-48
	CBO	-48	-48	-48	-48	-48
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Pesticide Registration Fees	President	-16	-16	-16	-16	-16
	CBO	-8	-8	-8	-8	-8
Pesticide Registration Fees EPA, Chemical Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fee	President	-15	-24	-24	-24	-24
	CBO	-313	-314	-322	-332	-342
Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Extend NRC Fee	President	-313	-314	-322	-332	-342
	CBO	-12	-17	-17	-17	-17
Social Security Administration, Claimant Representative Fees	President	-12	-17	-17	-17	-17
	CBO					
Mandatory Fee Proposals						
Offsetting Collections Deposited in Appropriations Accounts:						
Department of Health and Human Services, Medicare Cost-Based Provider Audit Fees	President	-395	-395	-395	-395	-395
	CBO	-265	-274	-283	-293	-305
Bank Examination Fees	President	-89	-94	-97	-101	-106
	CBO	-48	-100	-109	-118	-128
Offsetting Collections Deposited in Receipt Accounts:						
Department of Health and Human Services, Medicare Premiums	President	-127	-679	-814	-1025	-1234
	CBO					
Department of the Interior, Interior/USDA, Entrance and Recreation Fees	President	0	-86	-88	-88	-90
	CBO		-94	-97	-99	-102
Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Concession Fees	President	-3	-6	-12	-18	-25
	CBO	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3
Collections Deposited in Governmental Receipt Accounts:						
Federal Aviation Administration, Proposed User Fees	President	0	-1700	-1700	-1700	-850
	CBO	0	-1700	-1700	-1700	-850