

should not be jeopardized by an attempt to avoid the real choices necessary to produce a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Thank you, Mr. President.

AMENDMENT NO. 1028

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

At the end of the section in title I regarding the "WAIVER OF CERTAIN VACCINATION REQUIREMENTS", insert the following new subsection:

"(b) REPORT.—The Attorney General, in conjunction with the Secretaries of Health and Human Services and State, shall report to Congress within 6 months of the date of enactment of this Act on how to establish an enforcement program to ensure that immigrants who receive waivers from the immunization requirement pursuant to section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act comply with the requirement of that section after the immigrants enter the United States, except when such immunizations would not be medically appropriate in the United States or would be contrary to the alien's religious or moral convictions."

AMENDMENT NO. 1029

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

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

Section 310001(b) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14211(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(7) for fiscal year 2001, \$4,355,000,000; and

"(8) for fiscal year 2002, \$4,455,000,000.

Beginning on the date of enactment of this legislation, the discretionary spending limits contained in Section 201 of H.Con.Res. 84 (105th Congress) are reduced as follows:

for fiscal year 2001, \$4,355,000,000 in new budget authority and \$5,936,000,000 in outlays;

for fiscal year 2002, \$4,455,000,000 in new budget authority and \$4,485,000,000 in outlays.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, this amendment extends the crime law trust fund through 2002 at the funding levels of the budget agreement.

This amendment has the same effect as the Biden-Gramm-Hatch amendment passed by the Senate 98 to 2 on June 27, 1997.

Let me point out just one practical effect of my amendment. The Senate Judiciary Committee reported major youth violence legislation last week—this Hatch-Sessions bill calls for \$1.5 billion from the crime law trust fund in 2001 and 2002—this is almost one-half of the dollars to fund a new Republican youth violence block grant.

Now, I do not agree with many of the specifics of this block grant and I look forward to debating these issues on the floor.

But, the bottom line is real simple—if we do not pass this amendment, there will be no trust fund in 2001 and 2002, and so, there will be no youth violence block grant in 2001 and 2002—no matter what form this block grant ultimately takes.

And, it is the same for prisons, 100,000 cops, and violence against women. If

we do not pass my amendment, there will be no trust fund in 2001 and 2002, and there will be no more funding for prisons and no more to fight violence against women.

I also want to point out to my colleagues that I believe that there are Budget Act points of order which could be lodged against my amendment. I say that just so all of us are clear about my amendment. I would move to waive such a point of order were it raised. I just want my colleagues to understand this fact as we pass this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1030

(Purpose: To provide funding for the Community Policing to Combat Domestic Violence Program)

On page 29, line 18, insert "That of the amount made available for Local Law Enforcement Block Grants under this heading, 10,000,000 shall be for the Community Policing to Combat Domestic Violence Program established pursuant to section 1701(d) of part Q of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968: *Provided further*," after "*Provided*,".

AMENDMENT NO. 1031

On page 65, on line 25 after "expenses" insert the following: *Provided further*, That the number of political appointees on board as of May 1, 1998, shall constitute not more than fifteen percentum of the total full-time equivalent positions at the Office of the United States Trade Representative."

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Withholding, and I do not intend to object, I understand it is pretty well worked out, but there was one language inclusion.

Mr. GREGG. It is all done.

Mr. HOLLINGS. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 1024-1031), en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we are going to have some further discussion on this bill, the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill, and I understand there are at least a couple of votes. This package of amendments has eliminated four of the votes. In fact, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw amendments Nos. 992, 996, 997, and 998.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (Nos. 992, 996, 997, and 998) were withdrawn.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, just for the information of the Members, we are now down to what appears to be final passage, plus potentially four votes. Hopefully, we can reduce that further. We are certainly going to work on that. And then we can complete the bill. I understand we are going to proceed to these votes and final passage around 3:15. That is the plan presently.

**THE BUDGET AGREEMENT**

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, let me speak briefly on the budget agreement

which was reached late last night, and mention my thoughts on this. This agreement is obviously not everything that everybody wanted. But it is a giant step in the right direction. It is especially a giant step on the issue of cutting taxes for the working American family, or that group of Americans in the middle-income brackets who are struggling with the costs of raising children and sending those children to college.

For a family whose income is in the range of \$32,000 or \$35,000, this tax cut could well represent a tax cut of almost 50 percent for a family of four. That is a big tax cut. For that same family, should they have a child who is headed off to college, this could represent a tax cut of up to 75 percent. That is a huge tax cut.

In addition, if you are in a working family situation and you are trying to make ends meet, you are going to be able to take advantage of this child credit coming to you to help you support the cost of raising your children—\$500 per child. And all of these tax cuts that I am talking about are directed at middle-income Americans. In fact, almost all of them phase out as you get into incomes over \$100,000.

Further, if you are a family where one of the spouses is staying at home to try to raise your children, under today's law, you can't have an IRA account that is deductible. That stay-at-home spouse can't have an IRA account that is deductible. Under this bill, the mother that is home raising the children will have the opportunity to have an IRA account that will be deductible and safe for her retirement. That is a major step forward.

In addition, there is a significant estate tax savings, especially for small business people and for farmers. Estate tax savings, which means that when somebody works all their life to build up a grocery store, a restaurant, or a gas station business, or some other small business, they are not going to lose that business to taxes when they die. They are going to be able to pass on that business to their children. That is very important.

So this is a major step forward. It is the first significant tax cut—it is the first tax cut for middle-income Americans in 16 years. It should have been done a long time ago. But it has taken a Republican Congress and a commitment of a Republican Congress to have this as our No. 1 goal, and a commitment to accomplishment. While we have accomplished this tax cut, we have at the same time put in place a spending pattern which controls the rate of growth of Federal spending so that we can reach a balanced budget by the year 2002. We may even reach it before that, according to present estimates. But that was another major goal of this Republican Congress—to balance the budget.

So we have done two very significant things here. We have balanced the budget, and we managed to cut taxes

for working Americans, and especially for working Americans who have families to raise. That is good news. Is it everything we want? Of course not. I would like to see more action in the area of Medicare, for example. But the will wasn't there—both at the White House and, unfortunately, in the other body. But as a practical matter, the spending restraints in this bill are very significant.

The rate of growth in spending in this bill is approximately one-half of 1 percent over the next 5 years in discretionary nondefense accounts—one-half of 1 percent. That is the lowest rate of growth of spending that has occurred in the last 20 years in this Government in the area of discretionary accounts. That is significant. Because we have that low rate of growth of spending on the discretionary side of the ledger, we are able to bring into balance the budget agreement of this Government by the year 2002. We will have to go back and we will have to revise the issue of Medicare. There is no question about that. That remains a big issue of public policy. But within the Medicare accounts we made some very substantive and positive changes in this bill.

In the spending package is the proposal for Choice Care. Choice Care gives seniors approximately the same type of options which we as Members of Congress have—the ability to go out into the marketplace and choose from a variety of different health care plans. The practical effect of that is to bring the market forces into play to control the rate of growth of the cost of Medicare and, at the same time, give seniors much more choice, many more options, in the way they get their health care provided. Choice Care is a very positive, substantive, long-term reform for the Medicare system, and it is in this bill. So there were significant steps taken in that account, too.

But, most importantly, you have to return to the fact that not only do we balance the budget, but we give these very significant tax cuts to working Americans—especially working Americans who are trying to raise a family. Isn't it about time? This is relief that is long overdue. As this Government finally gets its fiscal house in order, as we move toward a balanced budget, who should be the recipient of that positive event, of that good fiscal management? Well, the people who paid for the Government should be the recipient of that.

That is what this bill essentially does. It turns back to those folks who are paying the cost of the Government some of their hard-earned dollars so that they can make the decision as to how they are spent rather than having that decision made here in Washington. We do not happen to believe, those of us who support this tax cut, that the Federal Government is a better manager of your dollars if you are running a household than you are. We think that if you have money to decide how you want to raise your children and to

use it on spending for your children's education, you are going to do a better job of spending than in educating your children than if the Federal Government takes your money, brings it here to Washington, and then redistributes it to you.

So this tax cut is a very important event, and a big win—a big win—for the working American family. Thus, I am certainly hopeful that we will pass this package later this week and make that major step forward, or that significant step forward, in assisting families in this country meet the costs of raising kids and see that at the same time we move this Government toward a balanced budget.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we are here to consider the Commerce, State, Justice bill.

I ask of the Chair, how is the time being allocated relative to the Wellstone amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order on the Wellstone amendments, they are entitled to 30 minutes equally divided on each of the two amendments.

Mr. GREGG. So the time is still available, the full 30 minutes on each amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. GREGG. I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

#### THE BUDGET COMPROMISE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has now arrived.

Let me just remind colleagues once again. When we look at the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998—we wouldn't put that entire conference report in the RECORD, obviously. But I ask unanimous consent that section 5 on page 4, which only contains some seven lines, be printed in the RECORD at this particular point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

Fiscal year 1998: \$5,593,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$5,841,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2000: \$6,088,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001: \$6,307,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$6,481,200,000,000.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, it shows the public debt for the fiscal year 2001 at \$6,307,300,000,000, and it shows for fiscal year 2002 the public debt has increased to \$6,481,200,000,000, an increase of \$173.9 billion. It does not show a balanced budget. It does not

show, I emphasize, a balanced budget in the fiscal year 2002. We all know from the agreement last evening that rather than cutting taxes only \$85 billion, it was a net tax cut of \$90 billion. So we have increased the loss of revenue some \$5 billion. We also know that the spending under the particular 1998 budget agreed to last evening increased some \$52 billion.

So what we have done since we made that agreement—and the conference report was adopted last month—is to actually increase spending more, and reduce the revenues more. So we know that come the year 2002, we will not have the first balanced budget in 33 years. The document itself shows it is in deficit because the debt increases that last year. Why will the debt increase if we had a balanced budget?

It is quite obvious that we have not taken significant steps for the middle class or the working Americans as has been described here. If we really wanted to help working Americans, we could have cut payroll taxes. But the truth of the matter is that we cut capital gains taxes for the rich. We cut the inheritance tax for the rich. So we didn't do it for working Americans. We kept that high payroll tax up. We left out the working Americans, and we agreed on both sides to call it balance, which is a total fraud.

I yield the floor.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES— H.R. 2209

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous agreement, the Chair is authorized to appoint conferees on H.R. 2209.

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BENNETT, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first of all, I ask unanimous consent that Elise Gould, a fellow in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor during today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1032

(Purpose: To clarify the income eligibility requirements for victims of domestic violence)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk in behalf of myself, Senator TORRICELLI, Senator LANDRIEU, and Senator AKAKA.