and $5,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $5,100,000,000 in budget authority and $5,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $5,100,000,000 in budget authority and $5,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $5,100,000,000 in budget authority and $5,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $5,100,000,000 in budget authority and $5,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $5,100,000,000 in budget authority and $5,100,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $5,100,000,000 in budget authority and $5,100,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(h) The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $43,000,000 in budget authority and $43,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(j) The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $1,250,000,000 in budget authority and $1,250,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(l) The House Committee on Small Business shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $14,285,000 in budget authority and $14,285,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(m) The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays as follows: $1,340,000,000 in budget authority and $1,340,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $1,336,000,000 in budget authority and $1,336,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1997, $1,336,000,000 in budget authority and $1,336,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1998, $1,336,000,000 in budget authority and $1,336,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1999, $1,336,000,000 in budget authority and $1,336,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2000, $1,336,000,000 in budget authority and $1,336,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 2001, and $1,336,000,000 in budget authority and $1,336,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(o) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase revenues, as follows: $17,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $30,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, $64,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, $103,130,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, $115,930,000,000 in fiscal year 2000, $183,774,000,000 in fiscal year 2001, and $195,520,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

(p) For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and the term ''new budget authority'' has the meaning given to such term in section 3(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

It was decided in the negative	Yeas	56
	Nays	367
	Answered present	1

¶69.17 [Roll No. 344]

AYES—56

Becerra	Frank (MA)	Payne (NJ)
Bonior	Gonzalez	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Green	Reynolds
Clay	Hastings (FL)	Sabo
Clayton	Hilliard	Sanders
Clyburn	Hinchey	Scott
Collins (IL)	Jackson-Lee	Serrano
Collins (MI)	Johnson, E. B.	Stark
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Stokes
Coyne	Martinez	Thompson
DeFazio	McDermott	Torres
Dellums	McKinney	Tucker
Dixon	Meek	Velazquez
Engel	Mfume	Waters
Fattah	Miller (CA)	Watt (NC)
Fields (LA)	Mink	Woolsey
Filner	Nadler	Wynn
Foglietta	Oberstar	Yates
Ford	Owens	

NOES—367

Abercrombie	Christensen	Forbes
Ackerman	Chrysler	Fowler
Allard	Clement	Fox
Andrews	Clinger	Franks (CT)
Armey	Coble	Franks (NJ)
Bachus	Coburn	Frelinghuysen
Baesler	Coleman	Frisa
Baker (CA)	Collins (GA)	Frost
Baker (LA)	Combest	Funderburk
Baldacci	Condit	Furse
Ballenger	Cooley	Gallegly
Barcia	Costello	Ganske
Barr	Cox	Gejdenson
Barrett (NE)	Cramer	Gekas
Barrett (WI)	Crane	Gephardt
Bartlett	Crapo	Geren
Barton	Cremeans	Gibbons
Bass	Cubin	Gilchrest
Bateman	Cunningham	Gillmor
Beilenson	Danner	Gilman
Bentsen	Davis	Goodlatte
Bereuter	de la Garza	Goodling
Bevill	Deal	Gordon
Bilbray	DeLauro	Goss
Bilirakis	DeLay	Graham
Bliley	Deutsch	Greenwood
Blute	Diaz-Balart	Gunderson
Boehlert	Dickey	Gutierrez
Boehner	Dicks	Gutknecht
Bonilla	Dingell	Hall (OH)
Bono	Doggett	Hall (TX)
Borski	Dooley	Hamilton
Boucher	Doolittle	Hancock
Brewster	Dornan	Hansen
Browder	Doyle	Harman
Brown (CA)	Dreier	Hastert
Brown (OH)	Duncan	Hastings (WA)
Brownback	Dunn	Hayes
Bryant (TN)	Durbin	Hayworth
Bryant (TX)	Edwards	Hefley
Bunn	Ehlers	Hefner
Bunning	Ehrlich	Heineman
Burr	Emerson	Herger
Burton	English	Hilleary
Buyer	Ensign	Hobson
Callahan	Eshoo	Hoekstra
Calvert	Evans	Hoke
Camp	Everett	Holden
Canady	Ewing	Horn
Cardin	Farr	Hostettler
Castle	Fawell	Houghton
Chabot	Fazio	Hoyer
Chambliss	Fields (TX)	Hunter
Chapman	Flanagan	Hutchinson
Chenoweth	Foley	Hyde

Inglis	Mineta	Seastrand
Istook	Minge	Sensenbrenner
Jacobs	Moakley	Shadegg
Jefferson	Molinari	Shaw
Johnson (CT)	Montgomery	Shays
Johnson (SD)	Moorhead	Shuster
Johnson, Sam	Moran	Sisisky
Johnston	Morella	Skaggs
Jones	Murtha	Skeen
Kanjorski	Myers	Skelton
Kaptur	Myrick	Slaughter
Kasich	Neal	Smith (MI)
Kelly	Nethercutt	Smith (NJ)
Kennedy (MA)	Neumann	Smith (TX)
Kennedy (RI)	Ney	Smith (WA)
Kennelly	Norwood	Solomon
Kildee	Nussle	Souder
Kim	Obey	Spence
King	Olver	Spratt
Kingston	Ortiz	Stearns
Klink	Orton	Stenholm
Klug	Oxley	Stockman
Knollenberg	Packard	Studds
Kolbe	Pallone	Stump
LaFalce	Parker	Stupak
LaHood	Pastor	Talent
Lantos	Paxon	Tanner
Largent	Payne (VA)	Tate
Latham	Pelosi	Tauzin
LaTourette	Peterson (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Laughlin	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (NC)
Lazio	Petri	Tejeda
Leach	Pickett	Thomas
Levin	Pombo	Thornberry
Lewis (CA)	Pomeroy	Thornton
Lewis (KY)	Porter	Thurman
Lightfoot	Portman	Tiahrt
Lincoln	Poshard	Torkildsen
Linder	Pryce	Torricelli
Lipinski	Quillen	Traficant
LoBiondo	Quinn	Upton
Lofgren	Radanovich	Vento
Longley	Rahall	Visclosky
Lowey	Ramstad	Volkmer
Lucas	Reed	Vucanovich
Luther	Regula	Waldholtz
Maloney	Richardson	Walker
Manton	Riggs	Walsh
Manzullo	Rivers	Wamp
Markey	Roberts	Ward
Martini	Roemer	Watts (OK)
Mascara	Rogers	Weldon (FL)
Matsui	Rohrabacher	Weldon (PA)
McCarthy	Ros-Lehtinen	Weller
McCollum	Rose	White
McCrery	Roth	Whitfield
McDade	Roukema	Wicker
McHale	Roybal-Allard	Williams
McHugh	Royce	Wilson
McInnis	Salmon	Wise
McIntosh	Sanford	Wolf
McKeon	Sawyer	Wyden
Meehan	Saxton	Young (AK)
Menendez	Scarborough	Young (FL)
Metcalf	Schaefer	Zeliff
Meyers	Schiff	Zimmer
Mica	Schroeder	
Miller (FL)	Schumer	

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Bishop

NOT VOTING—10

Archer	Livingston	Towns
Berman	McNulty	Waxman
Flake	Mollohan	
Kleczka	Rush	

So the amendment was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

When Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 149, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee.

The previous question having been ordered by said resolution.

Pursuant to House Resolution 149, the following amendment was considered as adopted:

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, October 1, 1998, October 1, 1999, October 1, 2000, and October 1, 2001:

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

Fiscal year 1996: $1,057,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,058,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,099,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,138,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,189,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,247,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,316,600,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $14,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: −$24,393,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: −$34,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$48,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$58,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$69,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$71,859,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $103,815,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $108,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $114,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $120,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $126,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $133,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $140,425,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,285,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,321,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,355,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,388,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,421,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,459,800,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $1,287,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $1,313,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $1,326,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $1,363,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $1,400,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,414,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,437,300,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: −$229,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: −$255,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: −$227,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: −$224,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: −$211,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$167,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$120,700,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: $5,195,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: $5,516,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: $5,809,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: $6,099,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2000: $6,374,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $6,614,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $6,806,100,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, October 1, 1998, October 1, 1999, October 1, 2000, and October 1, 2001 are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $37,600,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $193,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $40,200,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $187,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $42,300,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $185,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,700,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $183,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $184,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $45,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $186,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New direct loan obligations, $46,100,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $187,600,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1996 through 2002 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $267,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $269,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $277,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $281,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $287,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $287,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $287,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $13,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $9,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $5,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

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

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $16,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $15,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $14,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $4,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $3,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $3,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $19,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $17,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $18,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $17,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $17,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $13,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $12,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $8,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $2,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $4,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $2,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $1,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $123,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $40,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $42,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $43,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $43,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $44,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $43,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $43,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $6,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $1,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $45,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,600,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $45,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $16,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $44,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $19,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $45,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $14,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $45,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $21,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $45,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $44,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $22,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $121,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $127,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $127,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $132,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $136,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $141,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $146,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $149,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $148,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $177,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $175,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $186,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $185,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $195,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $194,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $206,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $203,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $214,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $212,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $224,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $222,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $234,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $232,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $222,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $231,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $235,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $248,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $243,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $255,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $265,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $267,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $277,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $5,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $8,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $9,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $10,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $37,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $38,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $21,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $38,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $39,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $18,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $39,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $39,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $19,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $40,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $17,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $16,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $16,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $16,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $15,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $12,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $11,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $11,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, $295,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $295,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, $304,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, $308,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $308,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $314,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $314,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $319,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $319,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $320,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $322,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $322,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, $36,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a)(1) Not later than July 14, 1995, the House committees named in paragraphs (1) through (12) of subsection (b) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) Each committee named in paragraphs (1) through (11) of subsection (b) shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee for—

(A) fiscal year 1996,

(B) the 5-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2000, and

(C) the 7-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2002,

does not exceed the total level of direct spending in that period in the paragraph applicable to that committee.

(3) Each committee named in paragraphs (2)(B), (4)(B), (5)(B), and (6)(B) of subsection (b) shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction as set forth in the paragraph applicable to that committee.

(4) The Committee on Ways and Means shall carry out subsection (b)(12).

(b)(1) The House Committee on Agriculture: $35,824,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $171,886,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $263,102,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(2)(A) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services: −$12,897,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, −$43,065,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and −$57,184,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(B) The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: $0 in fiscal year 1996, −$100,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and −$260,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(3) The House Committee on Commerce: $293,665,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $1,726,600,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $2,625,094,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(4)(A) The House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities: $13,727,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $61,570,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $95,520,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(B) In addition to changes in law reported pursuant to subparagraph (A), the House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities shall report program changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would result in a reduction in outlays as follows: −$720,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, −$5,908,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and −$9,018,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(5)(A) The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: $57,725,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $313,647,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $455,328,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(B) In addition to changes in law reported pursuant to subparagraph (A), the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: −$988,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, −$9,618,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and −$14,740,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(6)(A) The House Committee on International Relations: $14,246,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $62,076,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $83,206,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(B) In addition to changes in law reported pursuant to subparagraph (A), the House Committee on International Relations shall shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that would reduce the deficit by: −$19,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, −$95,000,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and −$123,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(7) The House Committee on the Judiciary: $2,580,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $14,043,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $20,029,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(8) The House Committee on National Security: $38,769,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $224,682,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $328,334,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(9) The House Committee on Resources: $1,558,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $6,532,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $12,512,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(10) The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: $16,636,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $83,227,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $117,079,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(11) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs: $19,041,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $105,965,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $154,054,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(12)(A) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee for—

(i) fiscal year 1996,

(ii) the 5-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2000, and

(iii) the 7-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2002,

does not exceed the following level in that period: $356,336,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $2,152,905,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $3,297,787,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(B) In addition to changes in law reported pursuant to subparagraph (A), the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction such that the total level of revenues for that committee for—

(i) fiscal year 1996,

(ii) the 5-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2000, and

(iii) the 7-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2002,

is not less than the following amount in that period: $1,027,612,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, $5,371,087,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $7,836,405,000,000 in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(c)(1) Not later than September 14, 1995, the House committees named in paragraphs (2) and (3) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Budget Committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revisions.

(2) In addition to changes in laws reported pursuant to subsection (b)(3), the House Committee on Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee for—

(A) fiscal year 1996,

(B) the 5-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2000, and

(C) the 7-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2002,

does not exceed the following level in that period: $287,165,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $1,592,200,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $2,338,694,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(3) In addition to changes in laws reported pursuant to subsection (b)(12), the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending such that the total level of direct spending for that committee for—

(A) fiscal year 1996,

(B) the 5-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2000, and

(C) the 7-year period beginning with fiscal year 1996 and ending with fiscal year 2002,

does not exceed the following level in that period: $349,836,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1996, $2,018,505,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2000, and $3,009,387,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

(d) For purposes of this section, the term ''direct spending'' has the meaning given to such term in section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 5. AGRICULTURAL SAVINGS.

Congress shall re-examine budget reductions for agricultural programs in the United States Department of Agriculture for fiscal years 1999 and 2000 unless the following conditions are met—

(1) land values on agricultural land on January 1, 1998, are at least 95 percent of the same values on the date of adoption of this resolution;

(2) there is enacted into law regulatory relief for the agricultural sector in the areas of wetlands regulation, the Endangered Species Act, private property rights and cost-benefit analyses of proposed regulations;

(3) there is tax relief for producers in the form of capital gains tax reduction, increased estate tax exemptions and mechanisms to average tax loads over strong and weak income years; and

(4) there is no government interference in the international market in the form of agricultural trade embargoes in effect and there is successful implementation and enforcement of trade agreements,

including the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) to lower export subsidies and reduce import barriers to trade imposed by foreign governments.

SEC. 6. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) SENSE OF 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 1996 budget included $8,000,000,000 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 sale.

(b) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts realized from sales of assets shall be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

(c) DEFINITION.—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.

(d) TREATMENT OF LOAN ASSETS.—For purposes of this section, the sale of loan assets or the prepayment of a loan shall be governed by the terms of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

SEC. 7. INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE COMPLIANCE INITIATIVE.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—(1) For purposes of points of order under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and concurrent resolutions on the budget—

(A) the discretionary spending limits under section 601(a)(2) of that Act (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the current fiscal year and each outyear;

(B) the allocations to the Committee on Appropriations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of that Act; and

(C) the appropriate budgetary aggregates in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget,

shall be adjusted to reflect the amounts of additional new budget authority or additional outlays (as defined in paragraph (2)) reported by the Committee on Appropriations in appropriation Acts (or by the committee of conference on such legislation) for the Internal Revenue Service compliance initiative activities in any fiscal year, but not to exceed in any fiscal year $405,000,000 in new budget authority and $405,000,000 in outlays.

(2) As used in this section, the terms ''additional new budget authority'' or ''additional outlays'' shall mean, for any fiscal year, budget authority or outlays (as the case may be) in excess of the amounts requested for that fiscal year for the Internal Revenue Service in the President's Budget for fiscal year 1996.

(b) REVISED LIMITS, ALLOCATIONS, AND AGGREGATES.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate or the House of Representatives (as the case may be) shall submit to that chairman's respective House appropriately revised—

(1) discretionary spending limits under section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the current fiscal year and each outyear;

(2) allocations to the Committee on Appropriations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of that Act; and

(3) appropriate budgetary aggregates in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget,

to carry out this subsection. These revised discretionary spending limits, allocations, and aggregates shall be considered for purposes of congressional enforcement under that Act as the discretionary spending limits, allocations, and aggregates.

(c) REPORTING REVISED SUBALLOCATIONS.—The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

(d) CONTINGENCIES.—

(1) The Internal Revenue Service and the Department of the Treasury have certified that they are firmly committed to the principles of privacy, confidentiality, courtesy, and protection of taxpayer rights. To this end, the Internal Revenue Service and the Department of the Treasury have explicitly committed to initiate and implement educational programs for any new employees hired as a result of the compliance initiative made possible by this section.

(2) This section shall not apply to any additional new budget authority or additional outlays unless—

(A) the chairmen of the Budget Committees certify, based upon information from the Congressional Budget Office, the General Accounting Office, and the Internal Revenue Service (as well as from any other sources they deem relevant), that such budget authority or outlays will not increase the total of the Federal budget deficits over the next five years; and

(B) any funds made available pursuant to such budget authority or outlays are available only for the purpose of carrying out Internal Revenue Service compliance initiative activities.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Baselines are projections of future spending if existing policies remain unchanged.

(2) Under baseline assumptions, spending automatically rises with inflation even if such increases are not provided under current law.

(3) Baseline budgeting is inherently biased against policies that would reduce the projected growth in spending because such policies are scored as a reduction from a rising baseline.

(4) The baseline concept has encouraged Congress to abdicate its constitutional responsibility to control the public purse for programs which are automatically funded under existing law.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that baseline budgeting should be replaced with a form of budgeting that requires full justification and analysis of budget proposals and maximizes congressional accountability for public spending.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EMERGENCIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 exempted from the discretionary spending limits and the Pay-As-You-Go requirements for entitlement and tax legislation funding requirements that are designated by Congress and the President as an emergency.

(2) Congress and the President have increasingly misused the emergency designation by—

(A) designating funding as an emergency that is neither unforeseen nor a genuine emergency, and

(B) circumventing spending limits or passing controversial items that would not pass scrutiny in a free-standing bill.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress should study alternative approaches to budgeting for emergencies, including codifying the definition of an emergency and establishing contingency funds to pay for emergencies.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRIVATIZATION OF THE STUDENT LOAN MARKETING ASSOCIATION (SALLIE MAE).

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) The Student Loan Marketing Association was established in 1972 as a government-sponsored corporation dedicated to ensuring adequate private sector funding for federally guaranteed education loans.

(2) Since 1972, student loan volume has grown from $1,000,000,000 a year to $25,000,000,000 a year. The Student Loan Marketing Association was instrumental in fostering this expansion of the student loan program.

(3) With securitization and 42 secondary markets, there currently exist numerous alternatives for lenders wishing to sell or liquidate their portfolios of student loans.

(4) Maintaining Student Loan Marketing Association as a Government-sponsored enterprise exposes taxpayers to an unnecessary liability.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense Congress that the Student Loan Marketing Association should be restructured as a private corporation.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING DEBT REPAYMENT.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Congress has a basic moral and ethical responsibility to future generations to repay the Federal debt;

(2) the Congress should enact a plan that balances the budget, and then also develops a regimen for paying off the Federal debt;

(3) after the budget is balanced, a surplus should be created, which can be used to begin paying off the debt; and

(4) such a plan should be formulated and implemented so that this generation can save future generations from the crushing burdens of the Federal debt.

SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING REPEAL OF HOUSE RULE XLIX AND THE LEGAL LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) rule XLIX of the Rules of House of Representatives (popularly known as the Gephardt rule) should be repealed;

(2) the fiscal year 1996 reconciliation bill should be enacted into law before passage of the debt limit extension; and

(3) the debt limit should only be set at levels, and for durations, that help assure a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 or sooner.

SEC. 13. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS FOR DIRECT LOANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 understates the cost to the Government of direct loans because administrative costs are not included in the net present value calculation of Federal direct loan subsidy costs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the cost of a direct loan should be the net present value, at the time the direct loan is disbursed, of the following cash flows for the estimated life of the loan:

(1) Loan disbursement.

(2) Repayments of principal.

(3) Interest costs and other payments by or to the Government over the life of the loan after adjusting for estimated defaults, prepayments, fees, penalties, and other recoveries.

(4) In the case of a direct loan made pursuant to a program for which the Congressional Budget Office estimates that for the coming fiscal year (or any prior fiscal year) loan commitments will equal or exceed $5,000,000,000, direct expenses, including expenses arising from—

(A) activities related to credit extension, loan origination, and loan servicing;

(B) payments to contractors, other Government entities, and program participants;

(C) management of contractors;

(D) collection of delinquents loans; and

(E) write-off and close-out of loans.

SEC. 14. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING COMMISSION ON THE SOLVENCY OF THE FEDERAL MILITARY AND CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUNDS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the Federal retirement system, for both military and civil service retirees, currently has liabilities of $1.1 trillion, while holding assets worth $340 billion and anticipating employee contributions of $220 billion, which leaves an unfunded liability of $540 billion.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that a high-level commission should be convened to study the problems associated with the Federal retirement system and make recommendations that will ensure the long-term solvency of the military and civil service retirement funds.

The question being put,

Will the House agree to said concurrent resolution, as amended?

The SPEAKER announced that pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV the yeas and nays were ordered, and the call was taken by electronic device.

It was decided in the affirmative .... { Yeas .... 238 / Nays ...... 193 }

¶69.18 [Roll No. 345]

YEAS—238

Allard	Frisa	Montgomery
Archer	Funderburk	Moorhead
Armey	Gallegly	Morella
Bachus	Ganske	Myers
Baker (CA)	Gekas	Myrick
Baker (LA)	Geren	Nethercutt
Ballenger	Gilchrest	Neumann
Barr	Gillmor	Ney
Barrett (NE)	Gilman	Norwood
Bartlett	Gingrich	Nussle
Barton	Goodlatte	Oxley
Bass	Goodling	Packard
Bateman	Goss	Parker
Bereuter	Graham	Paxon
Bilbray	Greenwood	Petri
Bilirakis	Gunderson	Pombo
Bliley	Gutknecht	Porter
Blute	Hall (TX)	Portman
Boehlert	Hancock	Pryce
Boehner	Hansen	Quillen
Bonilla	Hastert	Quinn
Bono	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Brownback	Hayworth	Ramstad
Bryant (TN)	Hefley	Regula
Bunn	Heineman	Riggs
Bunning	Herger	Roberts
Burr	Hilleary	Rogers
Burton	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Hoekstra	Ros-Lehtinen
Callahan	Hoke	Roth
Calvert	Horn	Roukema
Camp	Hostettler	Royce
Canady	Houghton	Salmon
Castle	Hunter	Sanford
Chabot	Hutchinson	Saxton
Chambliss	Hyde	Scarborough
Chenoweth	Inglis	Schaefer
Christensen	Istook	Schiff
Chrysler	Johnson (CT)	Seastrand
Clinger	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Jones	Shadegg
Coburn	Kasich	Shaw
Collins (GA)	Kelly	Shays
Combest	Kim	Shuster
Condit	King	Skeen
Cooley	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Cox	Klug	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Kolbe	Smith (WA)
Cremeans	LaHood	Solomon
Cubin	Largent	Souder
Cunningham	Latham	Spence
Davis	LaTourette	Stearns
Deal	Laughlin	Stockman
DeLay	Lazio	Stump
Diaz-Balart	Leach	Talent
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Tate
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
Dornan	Lightfoot	Taylor (MS)
Dreier	Linder	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	Livingston	Thomas
Dunn	LoBiondo	Thornberry
Ehlers	Longley	Tiahrt
Ehrlich	Lucas	Torkildsen
Emerson	Manzullo	Upton
English	Martini	Vucanovich
Ensign	McCollum	Waldholtz
Everett	McCrery	Walker
Ewing	McDade	Walsh
Fawell	McHugh	Wamp
Fields (TX)	McInnis	Watts (OK)
Foley	McIntosh	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	McKeon	Weldon (PA)
Fowler	Metcalf	Weller
Fox	Meyers	White
Franks (CT)	Mica	Whitfield
Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)	
Frelinghuysen	Molinari	
Wicker	Young (AK)	Zeliff
Wolf	Young (FL)	Zimmer

NAYS—193

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Owens
Ackerman	Gordon	Pallone
Andrews	Green	Pastor
Baesler	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Payne (VA)
Barcia	Hamilton	Pelosi
Barrett (WI)	Harman	Peterson (FL)
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)
Beilenson	Hayes	Pickett
Bentsen	Hefner	Pomeroy
Bevill	Hilliard	Poshard
Bishop	Hinchey	Rahall
Bonior	Holden	Rangel
Borski	Hoyer	Reed
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Reynolds
Brewster	Jacobs	Richardson
Browder	Jefferson	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rose
Brown (OH)	Johnston	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Kanjorski	Rush
Cardin	Kaptur	Sabo
Chapman	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Sawyer
Clayton	Kennelly	Schroeder
Clement	Kildee	Schumer
Clyburn	Klink	Scott
Coleman	LaFalce	Serrano
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Sisisky
Conyers	Levin	Skaggs
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Coyne	Lincoln	Slaughter
Cramer	Lipinski	Spratt
Danner	Lofgren	Stark
de la Garza	Lowey	Stenholm
DeFazio	Luther	Stokes
DeLauro	Maloney	Studds
Dellums	Manton	Stupak
Deutsch	Markey	Tanner
Dicks	Martinez	Tejeda
Dingell	Mascara	Thompson
Dixon	Matsui	Thornton
Doggett	McCarthy	Thurman
Dooley	McDermott	Torres
Doyle	McHale	Torricelli
Durbin	McKinney	Towns
Edwards	Meehan	Traficant
Engel	Meek	Tucker
Eshoo	Menendez	Velazquez
Evans	Mfume	Vento
Farr	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Fattah	Mineta	Volkmer
Fazio	Minge	Ward
Fields (LA)	Mink	Waters
Filner	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Flake	Mollohan	Waxman
Flanagan	Moran	Williams
Foglietta	Murtha	Wilson
Ford	Nadler	Wise
Frank (MA)	Neal	Woolsey
Frost	Oberstar	Wyden
Furse	Obey	Wynn
Gejdenson	Olver	Yates
Gephardt	Ortiz	
Gibbons	Orton	

NOT VOTING—4

Berman	Kleczka
Collins (IL)	McNulty

So the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Ordered, That the Clerk request the concurrence of the Senate in said concurrent resolution.

¶69.19 PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

On motion of Mr. GILMAN, by unanimous consent, the Committee on International Relations was granted permission until midnight, Friday, May 19, 1995, to file a report on the bill (H.R. 1516) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes.

¶69.20 WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1158

Mr. DREIER, by direction of the Committee on Rules, called up the following resolution (H. Res. 151):

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

When said resolution was considered.

After debate,

On motion of Mr. DREIER, the previous question was ordered on the resolution to its adoption or rejection and under the operation thereof, the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby said resolution was agreed to was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

¶69.21 MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

¶69.22 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LIVINGSTON, pursuant to House Resolution 151, called up the following conference report (Rept. No. 104–124):

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1158) ''making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes,'' having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS

CHAPTER I