

Lanett, AL, is evidence that small town America is alive and well.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER: IT MUST BE RESTORED

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the U.S. Senate, since the inception of the 104th Congress, has thus far participated in two significant debates. The first determined the role of the Federal Government in the affairs of the States; and the second will decide whether, after decades of insane spending of the American taxpayers' money, the U.S. Congress will finally get around to controlling itself with a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

All of us should recognize the importance of these significant issues. Certainly, I do. However, one wonders whether liberal politicians, who time after time have beaten back attempts to restore moral and spiritual principles to our society, are not content for Congress to focus its attention on the Nation's economic woes while spiritual issues—for example, protecting unborn life and restoring school prayer—are being sidetracked with harsh rhetoric such as extreme, worthless, and insignificant.

Mr. President, lest our leftward-tilted friends become too satisfied with the neglect of religious and spiritual values in America, they should be reminded of what our Nation's first President acknowledged—and what so many in Congress have disregarded—that our Nation's material and spiritual wealth is bestowed by the Creator only when we seek His guidance in our Nation's affairs. George Washington stated:

*** the propitious smiles of heaven can never be expected on a nation which disregards the eternal rules of order and right which heaven itself has ordained.

Mr. President, in 1962, the Supreme Court forfeited by judicial fiat the rights of millions of American children to invoke in their schools the blessings and guidance of God. Consequently, this act begat a popular culture, the values, discipline, and moral standards of which are devoid of God and laden with relativism. A greater crime against our children could hardly be conceived.

Today, all of us should take note of the desperate need to return to our Nation's children their constitutional right to voluntary prayer in the public schools. In this regard, a guest column published by the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer and authored by Dr. Norman Geisler, dean of Southern Evangelical Seminary in Charlotte, NC, is very worthy of broad consideration. Dr. Geisler titled it "10 Reasons for Voluntary School Prayer."

Dr. Geisler is a foremost theologian as evidenced by his impressive catalog of degrees and achievements. He has lectured and traveled in 50 States and 24 countries on 6 continents. Dr. Geisler has been honored and listed in many leading publications including

"The Who's Who in Religion," "The Writer's Who's Who," and "Men of Achievement." He has authored or co-authored 45 books on a wide range of social, moral, and religious issues.

Mr. President, I fervently hope that all Senators will spend a few minutes reading Dr. Geisler's convincing defense of the right of children to pray in public schools. His defense of one of our Founding Father's rule(s) of heaven has never been more needed nor more eloquently stated.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the January 30 guest column in the Charlotte Observer, "10 Reasons for Voluntary School Prayer," be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Charlotte Observer, Jan. 30, 1995]

10 REASONS FOR VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER

(By Norman L. Geisler)

There are many good reasons for a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayer in the public schools. Ten come to mind.

1. Our government was based on religious principles from the very beginning: The Declaration of Independence says: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by God with certain unalienable rights . . ." Indeed, it speaks of God, creation, God-given moral rights, the providence of God, and a final Day of Judgment—all of which are religious teachings. Indeed, the Supreme Court affirmed (Zorach, 1952) that "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being." And school prayer has been an important part of our religious experience from the very beginning.

2. The First Amendment does not separate God and government but actually encourages religion. It reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The first clause merely declares that the federal government cannot establish one religion for all the people. It says nothing about "separation of church and state." In fact, five of the 13 states that ratified it had their own state religions at the time. The second clause insists that the government should do nothing to discourage religion. But forbidding prayer in schools discourages religion.

3. Early congressional actions encouraged religion in public schools. For example, the Northwest Treaty (1787 and 1789) declared: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary for good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of learning shall forever be encouraged." Thus, religion, which includes prayer, was deemed to be necessary.

PRESIDENTS ENCOURAGED PRAYER

4. Early presidents, with congressional approval, made proclamations encouraging public prayer. President Washington on Oct. 3, 1789, declared: "Whereas it is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favour, and Whereas both Houses of Congress have, by their joint committee, requested me 'to recommend to the people of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer. . . .'"

5. Congress has prayed at the opening of every session since the very beginning. Indeed, in a moment of crisis at the very first Continental Congress Benjamin Franklin urged prayer and observed that "In the beginning of the Contest with G. Britain, when we were sensible to danger, we had daily prayer in this room for Divine protection.—

Our prayers, Sir, were heard, & they were graciously answered. . . . And have we now forgotten that powerful Friend? or do we imagine we no longer need His assistance? . . . I therefore beg leave to move—that henceforth prayer imploring the assistance of Heaven, and its blessing on our deliberations, be held in this Assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service." Congress has begun with prayer ever since. If the government can pray in their session, why can't the governed pray in their (school) sessions?

6. Public schools had prayer for nearly 200 years before the Supreme Court ruled that state-mandated class prayers were unconstitutional (Engel, 1962). The fact that prayer was practiced for nearly 200 years establishes it by precedent as a valid and beneficial practice in our schools.

7. Since the court outlawed prayer, the nation has been in steady moral decline. Former Secretary of Education William Bennett revealed in his cultural indexes that between 1960 and 1990 there was a steady moral decline. During this period divorce doubled, teenage pregnancy went up 200%, teen suicide increased 300%, child abuse reached an all-time high, violent crime went up 500% and abortion increased 1000%. There is a strong correlation between the expulsion of prayer from our schools and the decline in morality.

8. Morals must be taught, and they cannot properly be taught without religion. There cannot be a moral law without a moral Law Giver. And there is no motivation for keeping the moral law unless there is a moral Law Giver who can enforce it by rewards and punishments.

SECULAR HUMANISM ESTABLISHED

9. Forbidding prayer and other religious expressions in public schools establishes, in effect, the religion of secularism.

The Supreme Court has affirmed that there are religions, such as "secular humanism," which do not believe in God (Torcaso, 1961). Justice Potter (Abington, 1963) rightly feared that purging the schools of all religious beliefs and practices would lead to the "establishment of a religion of secularism." In fact, the beliefs of secular humanism are just the opposite of the Declaration of Independence. By not allowing theistic religious expressions, the courts have favored the religious beliefs of secular humanism, namely, no belief in God, God-given moral laws, prayer and a Day of Judgment.

10. To forbid the majority the right to pray because the minority object, is to impose the irreligion of the minority on the religious majority. Forbidding prayer in schools, which a three-quarters majority of Americans favors, is the tyranny of the minority. It is minority rule, not democracy. Why should an irreligious minority dictate what the majority can do? The majority wishes to preserve our moral and spiritual values and, thus, our good nation.

"MEET THE PRESS"—FEBRUARY 5, 1995

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the NBC News program, "Meet the Press," of yesterday, Sunday, February 5, 1995, be printed in the RECORD. The guests were Senator BOB DOLE, Senate majority leader, and Senator ROBERT C. BYRD. The moderator was Tim Russert of NBC, with panelists Robert Novak, of the Chicago Sun-Times, and

Lisa Myers, of NBC News, and roundtable guest William Safire, a columnist with the New York Times.

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

TRANSCRIPT FROM NBC NEWS "MEET THE PRESS," FEB. 5, 1995

Guests: Senator Bob Dole and Senator Robert Byrd.

Moderator: Tim Russert, NBC News.

Panel: Robert Novak, Chicago Sun-Times and Lisa Myers, NBC News.

Roundtable guest: William Safire, columnist, the New York Times.

Mr. RUSSERT. Welcome again to Meet the Press. Our issue this Sunday morning: a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. Is it a good idea? Will it work? Will it pass? We'll ask our guest in his first Sunday morning interview in more than eight years. He's now serving his 37th year in the US Senate, the legendary Robert C. Byrd, Democrat from West Virginia.

Then we'll get the Republican view from a senator who would prefer to be president. We'll talk about budget, taxes, and presidential politics with Bob Dole, Republican of Kansas.

And in our roundtable, a look at the political landscape in China, Russia, and here in America with author and New York Times columnist William Safire.

And beginning today and every Sunday, we'll end our program with the Meet the Press Minute. We're going to share with you rare archival footage from our Meet the Press library. This morning you'll see young congressman John F. Kennedy talking about Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower. The date: December 2nd, 1951.

And joining me in the questioning today, Lisa Myers of NBC News and Robert Novak of the Chicago Sun-Times. And with us now, Senator Robert C. Byrd, Democrat from West Virginia.

Senator, welcome back to Meet the Press. Senator BYRD. Thank you.

Mr. RUSSERT. We have a \$200 billion deficit, a \$4 trillion debt. Why wouldn't you be for a law forcing Congress to balance the budget?

Senator BYRD. You say, "for a law." This is not a law. This amendment will amend the basic organic law of this country, which is above an ordinary statute. There are two reasons it's in the main: It is bad constitutional policy and it is bad economic policy. As to its being bad constitutional policy, the Constitution is a charter of government. It is a charter of certain basic, individual rights. It is decidedly not a charter of economic policy, and for the first time, if this amendment were adopted, it would be writing into the Constitution economic policy.

Also, this amendment would interfere with the majoritarian democratic control of the Congress. It would institute minority rule by imposing supermajorities, supermajority requirements on the development of fiscal policy. It would also tamper with all three parts of the tri-part constitutional structure of government that was set into place by the framers 206 years ago.

As to its being bad economic policy, it would severely damage the Nation's ability to develop a sane, sensible fiscal policy. It would cripple efforts to stabilize the business cycle in that it would create a severe fiscal drag on the economy at a time when the economy may already be weak.

It would hamper the capacity of the nation to make long-term investments in fiscal and human infrastructure. It would make it almost impossible for our nation to coordinate its economic policy with the economic policies of other nations. Moreover, it would put

into the hands of the courts the management of macroeconomic policy. And finally, it would be devastating for a group such as the elderly. It would devastate Medicare, other programs that aid the elderly such as Meals on Wheels, veterans' programs, veterans' pensions, veterans' compensation, veterans' health care, and it would also be very destructive of environmental policy and other social policies which the nation—which are good for the nation and good for its people.

Mr. RUSSERT. Senator—

Senator BYRD. So these in the main are the fears that I have concerning this amendment. Now if it didn't do any of these—if it didn't do any of these, it would mean that it does nothing, in which case it would be but an empty promise in the Constitution, and that would undermine the faith of the American people and the Constitution.

Mr. RUSSERT. Senator Dole, our next guest, said that there'll be a vote within the next three weeks on the balanced budget amendment. Will there be?

Senator BYRD. I hope we'll not rush this matter. Sixty-eight percent of the Republicans, 77 percent of the Democrats and 83 percent of the Independents feel that the American people ought to know what's in this amendment before we adopt it. It takes time, and I hope that Mr. Dole will give the Senate time to inform the American people. Woodrow Wilson said that the informing function of the legislative branch was as important as the legislative function.

The American people don't know what's in this measure, and we senators who vote on it ought to also be told what the plan is, what the details are for achieving a balanced budget in seven years. The American people are entitled to that.

The American people are smart consumers. When they go to the store, they press and squeeze the tomatoes and the cantaloupes and the vegetables; they look under the hood when they buy a car, they kick the tires. They need to know what's in this amendment. They're entitled to know. We shouldn't distrust them. We shouldn't treat them like children, and we should let them know what's under the hood. They want to know that.

Mr. RUSSERT. Do you have the 34 votes necessary to block the amendment as of now?

Senator BYRD. It's a very close call right now. It could go either way, but I believe that if the American people are informed as to what's in this plan, they're going to be so concerned that, "the knees of senators will buckle," in the words of one of the House leaders. So I think the American people are entitled to know, and we're treating them like children if we don't tell them.

Mr. RUSSERT. Will you use every tactic you know to stop this?

Senator BYRD. I'm glad you asked me that. I'm not interested in dilatory tactics. I'm only interested in the American people having the information that they ought to have. And I hope that we would debate this sufficiently for them to be informed. And I believe that Mr. Dole, the majority leader—and he's a very capable majority leader; I'm very fond of him—I hope that he will give the Senate ample opportunity to debate this matter so that the American people, who send us here, will be informed.

Mr. RUSSERT. What's ample opportunity? Weeks, months?

Senator BYRD. We've got to remember that the constitutional convention met behind closed doors. It met for almost four months to write this Constitution. Now surely we shouldn't be in a hurry to vote on something that is going to deliver irreparable injuries to the basic organic document. It would seem to me that anything less than 3 weeks for debate—from 3 to 4 or 5 weeks ought to

be sufficient time in which to inform the American people and inform ourselves. We're entitled to know what the details are of the plan which would achieve this goal.

Mr. RUSSERT. Are you concerned, Senator, that by putting forth the Democratic Party as the party that blocks a constitutional amendment, you're going to give the Republicans a huge political issue in the presidential race in '96?

Senator BYRD. I'm not concerned in this instance so much about party as I am about the Constitution of the United States. And what this amendment will do to the institutions of government, the three branches of the government—it will impact on the executive, on the judiciary and on the legislative. And it will change forever. It's not like a statute which can be repealed later in the same year by the Congress. It's an amendment which will change the Constitution we'll be delivering to our children, a Constitution that is far different from the one which was handed down to us by our forefathers.

Mr. RUSSERT. Lisa.

Ms. MYERS. Senator, you have said that this amendment would mean radical changes in people's lives, that it would be devastating to the elderly, to the environment, to veterans, to a whole series of people. What about the devastation to your five grandchildren, though, of continuing to pile up these mountains of debt? Aren't these deficits that we're running today tantamount to stealing from them?

Senator BYRD. I agree that we have to do something about the deficits. We have to reduce them, and we have done something. I think we ought to stay on a steady, strong course such as the one we set in 1990 at the budget summit when we passed a bill that would reduce the deficits by \$482 billion over five years, and again in 1993 when we passed a package with President Clinton's help that would reduce the deficit over \$432 billion over the next five years, and it has done better than that.

And remember this, that in the case of the 1993 budget deficit reduction package, not one Republican in the Senate, not one Republican in the House, voted for that budget reduction package because it increased taxes some and it cut programs and it inflicted some pain. Now that's the course we should stay on: additional multifaceted budget deficit bills. And let's don't tamper with the Constitution, because I don't want to pass a Constitution on to my children that is a different Constitution, providing for a different form of government, than we have had in our time.

Ms. MYERS. Senator, President Clinton is sending up a budget tomorrow which projects \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see, at least for the next decade. How soon are you willing to commit to balance the budget?

Senator BYRD. I began my commitment in 1990 at the budget summit under Mr. Bush and under a Democratic Congress. I continued my commitment in 1993 with the deficit reduction package that I've already described. We ought to stay on that course.

I'm concerned about the President's budget which will be sent to the Congress tomorrow. I'm not in favor of the \$63 billion tax cut over a period of the next five years. I'm also not in favor of the \$205 billion tax cut which is in the so-called Contract With America. I think we shouldn't be cutting taxes now. I must say that Mr. Clinton is going to pay for his tax cut with reductions in programs. But the monies that are saved from reductions in programs ought to go toward balancing the budget and reducing the deficit.

Now as to the Contract With America, let me tell you what my contract is. There's my

contract with America. This is the Constitution of the United States of America. That's the only contract I have with America. That contract was written 206 years ago. It didn't suddenly bloom in the last election. So I'm concerned about these proposed tax cuts. I think it's folly at a time like this when we ought to be doing everything we can to reduce the deficit to be talking about cutting taxes.

Ms. MYERS. Senator, one last thing. The Washington Post—I'm sure you're familiar with this headline—has called you "the king of pork." Given your commitment to balance the budget, are you now willing to tell the people of West Virginia that they're going to have to settle for less?

Senator BYRD. I took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States 13 times in the last 48 years. I took that oath. I swore to God and I put my hands on God's Gospel when I did it. Now I am of a generation that believes in keeping one's oath. I'm talking about my oath to the Constitution in this situation here. I'm talking about this immortal document that was written by men. And I think it's somewhat a pretense for those of us in our generation to assume that we're wiser than the framers of that constitutional document who lived 200 years ago.

Mr. NOVAK. Senator Byrd, tomorrow the House of Representatives will pass a line item veto which would give the president authority to veto individual items in bills instead of the whole bills. You oppose that. Now you have said that when Robert Byrd does a filibuster in the Senate, you will make it clear that it is a filibuster. Are you ready to filibuster the line item veto?

Senator BYRD. Bob, there are people in this town who wouldn't know a filibuster if they met it on the street. I don't intend to engage in dilatory tactics, dilatory quorum calls and so on. Now that's the way of the old filibuster. But there is such a thing as an unlimited debate, and that's one of the two things in particular that makes the Senate the premier upper body in the world today, the right of unlimited debate and the right to amend. Now we owe it to the American people to debate these matters.

There are people, I think, who have the attitude, it seems to me, that if we debate a bill three days or a week or two weeks, that we're filibustering. Now a line item veto, again, would shift power from the legislative branch to the president. It disturbs the balances of powers, the separation of powers, the checks and balances in the Constitution. And we ought not to alter that Constitution lightly. So I will fight that, again, as I have fought it before. But I don't intend to engage in dilatory tactics, that kind of filibuster.

Mr. NOVAK. Senator Byrd, you have also said that you thought perhaps the Republicans, who have been in opposition in the minority much more than the Democrats, know how to be a minority party more in the Senate. Are you attempting to guide the new Democratic leader, Senator Thomas Daschle, in how to be an opposition party, because at times you seem more like the opposition leader than Senator Daschle?

Senator BYRD. Well, let me tell you about that. The two things that we've had up in the Senate, in which I've taken a little time on, were the so-called unfunded mandates. Now Congress can't bind the next Congress. Congress can change that law even in this Congress. And I felt that the Congress ought to take more time to debate. I'm not in favor of ramming things through just because there's a so-called charter, Contract With America, that somebody signed. I didn't sign it.

So I was on the Senate floor at a time when I wanted to stop that contract—so-

called contract—from being rammed through, or one of its parts, and I also saw coming behind that this constitutional amendment on the balanced budget. And, no, Tom Daschle's doing a good job. I want to see him succeed. I want to help him. I think he's off to a good start. I walked away from the leadership. I could have had it again, I knew where the votes were. But I'm not interested in being the leader of the Senate. I'm interested in doing my job as a senator, which I came here to do.

Mr. NOVAK. Senator, you've been quoted, sir, as saying you thought the Senate has lost its soul. Why do you think it's lost its soul?

Senator BYRD. Well, one reason why I say that is that we seem to have lost our sense of history. We have no institutional memory in the Senate, it seems to me. We ought to understand that it is our responsibility to defend the institution, to defend the Constitution and to take the time to do it. I think sometimes we bend whichever way the wind blows. We don't realize that being a United States senator is the highest public office that this country can give. Presidents come and presidents go, but senators don't fade away very easily sometimes.

Mr. RUSSERT. Senator, is the Senate less civil now than it was?

Senator BYRD. Yes, it is far more partisan now than it was when I came here.

Mr. RUSSERT. Why?

Senator BYRD. I think there are too many who put party first, last and always. Party is important, but I don't rank it as the first thing in my life or in the history of this country. I believe that we have a duty to study as legislators, to try to know what we're doing and to try to do what's right for the country. And that's what I see, what I think is wrong. We're too partisan. There are some who seem to think that the Senate is a crucible that was intended to enable us to forge the party's fortunes for the next half-century. But I believe—getting back to this situation, I believe and hope that we'll have the time—we'll take the time to study this matter carefully. It's going to come to a final vote. It'll be voted up or it'll be voted down. I hope we'll take the time because it's far too important to rush through.

Mr. RUSSERT. Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, we thank you for joining us this morning.

Senator BYRD. Thank you.

Mr. RUSSERT. Coming next, Bob Dole. He wants to be your president. We'll find out why after this message.

(Announcements.)

Mr. RUSSERT. We're back with the Republican leader of the U.S. Senate, Bob Dole.

Senator, lots of speculation about you.

Senator DOLE. Really?

Mr. RUSSERT. The week of April 14, 1945, 2nd Lieutenant Bob Dole, 10th Mountain Division, trying to take Hill 913 in Northern Italy, wounded. Fifty years later, the week of April 14, 1995, what will Senator Bob Dole do?

Senator DOLE. Will probably make—well, we'll make a formal announcement that we're a candidate for president of the United States. Can't do it on the 14th, that happens to be Good Friday. But it will be that week.

Mr. RUSSERT. That week. And why are you picking that week?

Senator DOLE. Well, it will be warmer. It also, I think, has some—you know, that's a week that meant a lot to me a long time ago. And I think it puts a focus on America and what's happened in the past 50 years, some of us who were involved and where we intend to go from here. But, you know, we haven't picked a definite date, but I assume it's going to be that week.

Mr. RUSSERT. The week of April 14th. Will it underscore the difference in your military experience as opposed to Bill Clinton's?

Senator DOLE. That's not the purpose, but I assume some people might suggest that. But I picked it because I thought it was a fairly important experience in my lifetime, and it's not aimed at anyone else.

Mr. RUSSERT. You're going to challenge Bill Clinton for the presidency. It's an intensely—

Senator DOLE. Well, if I get the nomination. But if you want to bestow it on me today—

Mr. RUSSERT. I'm a registered Independent. I don't have that power, but—

Senator DOLE. That's all right.

Mr. RUSSERT. It's an intensely personal choice for a voter to make. How is Bob Dole different than Bill Clinton?

Senator DOLE. Well, I don't want to describe Bill Clinton, but I would just say as far as Bob Dole is concerned, if people are looking for someone with experience and someone who's been tested in a lot of ways and somebody who gets up every morning and knows that people can have difficulties—because I have a little difficulty dressing and things like that—that being sensitive, I guess, to people's concerns, who I think has a good record of conservative views on taxes and spending and—but also understands that we need to reach out as a party. You know, that's where I come from. Much like Jack Kemp, I must say, when dealing with black Americans, Hispanics, it seems to me that if we're going to be a majority party, it's going to be up to us to make that happen. That means we reach out to people.

Mr. RUSSERT. You're 71 years old. In 1996—

Senator DOLE. That's chronological. I'm probably about 55, otherwise. I know, I always subtract the four years I spent in the hospital, so that gets me down to 67 right there.

Mr. RUSSERT. In 1996 you'll be 73 years old, which would be the oldest for any man to begin his first term as president. In light of that, would you commit to the American people that you would only serve one term as president?

Senator DOLE. Well, I must say that's an option that people have talked about. But we haven't made a decision. I assume we will make that decision before we announce so the American people will know. Some people might like it; some might say, "Well, you're a lame duck on day one." There have been a lot of one-term presidents in the past few years, in the past two decades or so, but it's a judgment we haven't made.

Mr. RUSSERT. You have been in Washington for 36 years?

Senator DOLE. I guess that's right. Not quite—34 years.

Mr. RUSSERT. Why wouldn't people say, "Bob Dole, you created this mess. Who are you to suggest you can fix it?"

Senator DOLE. Well, I think basically I've tried to keep in touch with real people all the time I've been in Washington. I know where I'm from; I've never forgotten my roots in Kansas. And secondly, again, I think many of us have been fighting the battle. We're happy to have the replacements, the troops, the cavalry come riding in as they did last November. Now we have a majority in the House and Senate, we can really make these things happen.

Mr. RUSSERT. Lots of discussion about President Clinton and the so-called character issue. How big of an issue do you think that would be in a presidential race?

Senator DOLE. I don't know. I mean, I think the media, others—certainly we're all going to be subject to total scrutiny. But my

view is maybe it's an issue; I think the overriding issue should be where will this person—this nominee, whoever—take us or take America and does he or she have any ideas? So it's going to be a difficult race. We have a number of outstanding Republicans, you know, going to be involved in the primary process. So anybody who's thinking about it is going to have to give up about a year and a half of their life.

Mr. RUSSERT. Your wife Elizabeth Hanford Dole, former secretary of labor, secretary of transportation, educated at Duke, Oxford and Harvard Law. Will she be an activist first lady like Hillary Rodham Clinton?

Senator DOLE. Not in that sense—not in the policy sense. But Elizabeth certainly has her own career and would like to—you know, I haven't discussed this with her and you're going to get me in trouble. I mean, I can handle most things, but I want to be careful here. So it would be—obviously, she would want to be doing something, maybe more traditional first lady efforts. But she's been involved in the Red Cross. She likes it. It's a public service, making a difference in people's lives.

Mr. RUSSERT. But you don't think the first lady should be involved directly in policy formulation?

Senator DOLE. I think it's a very high risk. I said that when Hillary Clinton was assigned health care. It's a high risk. If it fails, A, and, B, if it—to keep it from failing, how much do you give way? I think it was a mistake then and I think it would be a mistake for any future first lady or first man.

Mr. RUSSERT. One issue that is going to be on the ballot in 1996 in California, you were talking about the politics of inclusion, reaching out to black Republicans, like Jack Kemp, is a proposition or referendum which is going to say that, "Race or color will not be a criteria for either discriminating against or granting preferential treatment to anyone." Would you be in favor of such a referendum or proposition?

Senator DOLE. Well, right now we've asked the Congressional Research Service to send us all the bills that involve—with preferences, and we're looking at it. I mean, it—again, with my record, I think I can look at it with some credibility. Has it worked? Has it had an adverse or reverse reaction? Why did 62 percent of white males vote Republican in 1994? I think it's because of things like this, where sometimes the best qualified person does not get the job because he or she may be of one color, one—and I'm beginning to believe that may not be the way it should be in America.

Mr. RUSSERT. So that this referendum, which would, in effect, eliminate affirmative action, is something that you could support?

Senator DOLE. Well, you know, I haven't read that. It's something that we're looking at. Let me say that. I want to be fair. I want people to have opportunities in America by creating more jobs and not having to struggle every time. If you have somebody that wants a raise, "Well, what's your color? What's your ethnic background?" You know, the people in America now are paying a price for things that were done before they were born. We did discriminate; we did suppress people. It was wrong. Slavery was wrong. But should future generations have to pay for that? Some would say yes. I think it's a tough question.

Mr. RUSSERT. Lisa.

Ms. MYERS. Senator, the balanced budget amendment—you just heard Senator Byrd.

Senator DOLE. Yes.

Ms. MYERS. Why don't Republicans just get it over with and lay out a seven-year plan on how you would accomplish a balanced budget?

Senator DOLE. Well, we were sort of hoping the president in his budget would give us

some clues on a seven-year plan. He didn't give you any clue on anything. He didn't cut spending. It's—doesn't even cut the deficit. All he does is extend these caps and there's no real spending cuts. But I'm going to say a thing about Robert Byrd. He's the master of the game. And I say that with admiration. He knows the Senate rules. He knows it will not have a—vote very soon on a balanced budget amendment because he knows every trick in the book; in fact, he wrote the book. So I believe it will pass by a very close vote. And we'll lay out all we can. We'll be as specific as we can. But it's like a seven-year weather forecast. You know, we don't know what's going to happen. What may sh—we don't know what economic—maybe there'll be some calamity somewhere in the world, maybe some conflict we're involved in.

But that—in my view, this is a way to, in effect, skirt responsibility. If we don't do anything, we're going to increase spending in the next—the deficit by 18 percent in the next 20 to 30 years. We're never going to have a balanced budget. We have to make tough decisions. It's going to affect everybody, and we ought to be prepared for it.

Ms. MYERS. When will you lay out as much as you can?

Senator DOLE. Well, Senator Domenici, chairman of the Budget Committee, is working on that now.

Ms. MYERS. So the Republicans will have at least an outline on how you balance the budget over seven years?

Senator DOLE. Well, we'll have as much information as we can, but with the und—

Ms. MYERS. While the amendment is being debated?

Senator DOLE. Sure, with the understanding that, you know, we can't be certain of anything.

Ms. MYERS. Right.

Senator DOLE. These are all economic assumptions. The economy may go up or down. But I think we'll do the best we can and this so-called "right to know" amendment—we've offered an amendment called the "need to lead" amendment. It's about time the Democrats started some leadership around here instead of trying to scare people on Social Security or veterans or everything else. We'll never have a balanced budget if everybody is going to be exempt.

Ms. MYERS. All right. Let's talk about the nomination of Dr. Henry Foster to be surgeon general, President Clinton's choice. Are you troubled by the fact that Dr. Foster now says he performed as many as a dozen abortions?

Senator DOLE. I'm troubled by the fact that we were not—more troubled by the fact that we were not given that information before the nomination was sent up. I think the administration, maybe they should have known; they surely asked the question. That troubles me almost as much as knowing they've sent up this nomination. Will it be in some difficulty? Yes.

Ms. MYERS. How much difficulty?

Senator DOLE. I don't know yet. It depends on—I know Senator Coats, of Indiana, a member of the Labor Committee, has indicated strong opposition. We haven't had a discussion of it, a so-called "conference level" where all Republicans were present.

Ms. MYERS. Will you oppose the nomination?

Senator DOLE. I'm not certain. I don't like what I hear or what I read. I haven't met with the nominee.

Ms. MYERS. But you don't like it because he performed a dozen—

Senator DOLE. That's right. I think it's one thing to be an obstetrician, but, again, it's sort of—I think again, it doesn't show—well, I think they should have checked it more carefully.

Ms. MYERS. But even though that Dr. Foster says that he—most of these abortions, less than a dozen over, I think, some 30 years of practice, were performed in cases of rape—

Senator DOLE. Right.

Ms. MYERS [continuing]. Incest or danger to the life of the mother.

Senator DOLE. Again, let's get him on the record and let's see what the testimony is. My view is, we shouldn't shoot down somebody before they've even had a hearing, and you may decide that based on everything that is laid out and his record in other areas, his record on teen pregnancy—he's done a lot of good things, don't misunderstand me—that maybe he should be confirmed. The general rule is that the president is entitled to his nominees. And that's been the general rule around here forever.

Ms. MYERS. So you do not agree, then, with some anti-abortion activists who say the very fact that he performed abortions is a disqualifying factor?

Senator DOLE. I may turn out to be that way, but, again, I—since I get to vote and they don't, I want to see the evidence.

Ms. MYERS. Well, if you feel that strongly about it, if you're elected president, would you then promise to never appoint anyone who favors abortion rights to any judicial position?

Senator DOLE. Well, I'd rather wait until I get elected to answer that, but—

Ms. MYERS. But if you feel that strongly about it, Senator, doesn't it carry over—

Senator DOLE. No, I feel strongly about hearing the facts. I mean, it's—I know it's not—a lot of precedent for it in this town, but I'd like to have the facts laid out—everything he's done. If that one thing disqualifies him, we'll see what happens.

Mr. NOVAK. Senator Dole, since neither you nor any other Republicans leaders are planning to do anything on abortion in this Congress, which would satisfy the strong pro-life constituency you have, critics say that taking off on Dr. Foster is a cheap way out of that predicament, instead of trying for a human life amendment, which you probably couldn't get through the Senate at all, you can just satisfy the pro-lifers by attacking Dr. Foster. Is there some validity to that?

Senator DOLE. Well, I must—I haven't thought of that. I mean, I happen to be pro-life. I think we agree with Ralph Reed when they ask about prayer in school and these other issues, and he's the executive director of the Christian Coalition, that we need to address jobs and welfare reform and tax cuts. This should be our priority. It doesn't mean we're not going to address these issues some time in the next two years.

Mr. NOVAK. Senator, you have been known for scathing criticism of supply side, as you once said that—had a little joke with the—

Senator DOLE. That wasn't my joke. I repeated it and it became my joke.

Mr. NOVAK. But the—the good—

Senator DOLE. Good news, bad news.

Mr. NOVAK. The good news was, a bus full of supply siders crashed; the bad news was some of them survived. With that background—

Senator DOLE. No, there were three empty seats.

Mr. NOVAK. Three empty seats, all right. Well, you can tell it better than I can.

Senator DOLE. Yeah.

Mr. NOVAK. With that background, sir, how can you hope to get support from the supporters of Jack Kemp who has now dropped out of the presidential race?

Senator DOLE. Well, we've already picked up his supporters in Iowa. Darrell Carney is

on the Dole team. He was Kemp's chairman. We're going to pick up a lot of support of Iowa. Plus, I think, people looking at Jack Kemp and Bob Dole's records, they find them fairly consistent, plus the effort to reach out to other people to broaden the party. But I must say, if you look back when we were saying those things—and that was not my joke, but—pretty good—always got a laugh, so I kept repeating it. Bob Hope still uses some of his stuff he had 25 years ago. So what we were saying then is what Republicans are doing now.

Ten years ago when we had to fight and win by one vote, the budget battle in 1985, House Republicans were saying, "We don't want to cut spending, just cut taxes." Now they're saying, "Cut spending first." That's been my position ever since I've been here. So I think it's consistent. I don't think—I think it's going to appeal to many people who say, "Cut spending first before we have a big tax cut."

Mr. NOVAK. In line with Mr. Russert's question about whether you would only serve one term, there's also been speculation that you might name your selection for vice president and run as a tandem as Ronald Reagan did with Richard Schweiker in 1976. Are you considering Jack Kemp for that?

Senator DOLE. Well, certainly Jack would be on any list I put together, along with Pete Wilson and Colin Powell and—

Mr. NOVAK. In advance of the convention?

Senator DOLE. Well, if I did that, we have—again, that's a decision that hasn't been made. I think some think it's a plus and some think it's a minus and some haven't thought about it.

Mr. NOVAK. But it's possible?

Senator DOLE. Yeah.

Mr. NOVAK. And you also had—who else—

Senator DOLE. You know, it's not really a short list. It includes a number of people. We have a number of outstanding governors—Governor Voinovich; Tommy Thompson, who's thinking about running; Jim Edgar; Bill Weld; Governor Whitman. You've got this whole list of people that I think would be outstanding running mates. And some may run for president.

Mr. NOVAK. You would include General Power on that list, though?

Senator DOLE. Oh, yes.

Mr. NOVAK. Colin Powell.

Senator DOLE. I had a good visit with him two or three weeks ago. We didn't talk about this specific thing, but—

Mr. NOVAK. Did he say he was a Republican?

Senator DOLE. No. But he—the thing that encouraged me—he did know that polling was going on in America and that his name was in the polling.

Mr. NOVAK. Let me ask you two quick questions on issues, sir.

Senator DOLE. Thank you. He knew he was running ahead of me.

Mr. NOVAK. Let me ask you two quick questions on issues. The minimum—President Clinton has asked for an increase in the minimum wage; Speaker Gingrich and the House leadership is against it. You have now taken a position. Do you see any kind of a tradeoff where the Republicans support an increase in the minimum wage and the Democrats support a cut in the capital gains tax?

Senator DOLE. I knew that would occur to you. I haven't thought about it fully—might be a good trade. But I think first we want to take a look at the minimum wage. He goes back and says, "Well, Bob Dole and Newt Gingrich supported one before." But we also had a sub-minimum wage—a training wage and we also excluded certain size companies. Where has he been the last two years with the increase in min—why did we wait until

now? Maybe because he made the deal with Mexico and there's all the criticism with that, he thought maybe he ought to do something for low-income people.

My colleague, Senator Kassebaum, is very wary of increasing the minimum wage. She thinks we ought to have, if anything, a targeted minimum wage that goes to low-income people, that most of this is not going to people in the poverty level, it's going to go to, you know, job entrants, young people and some whose families make \$50,000, \$60,000 a year.

Mr. NOVAK. But you don't rule it out. You don't rule out supporting it.

Senator DOLE. With the deal you've suggested, I'd—you know, that throws some new light on it. That might make it very attractive.

Mr. NOVAK. One last thing. You wrote in a letter—you and several of your colleagues wrote a letter to Secretary of the Treasury Rubin a couple weeks ago asking, "What was the role of the U.S. Treasury and the International Monetary Fund in the devaluation of the Mexican peso, which has led to all this trouble?" Are you going to pursue that? Are you going to ask for hearings? Just what do you have in mind? Is there some scandal involved there?

Senator DOLE. Well, we don't know. I mean, there could be because there's a feeling that somebody was feasting off these devaluations around the world forever. It might be some of the big concerns on Wall Street. We don't know the facts, but we're going to try to find out.

Senator D'Amato is very determined, and he told Secretary Rubin just last week, he's going to monitor this almost on a daily or weekly basis. And we're going to continue to push to sort of peg the peso to the dollar at 3.52.

Mr. NOVAK. You are going to push for that?

Senator DOLE. Sure.

Mr. NOVAK. When will those hearings be held, sir?

Senator DOLE. Well, I know—whenever—I know Senator D'Amato and Secretary Rubin met last week. I think it's going to be an ongoing thing at a staff level and at the necessary time maybe have hearings.

Mr. RUSSERT. Finally, Senator, our colleague Mark Shields, talking about Newt Gingrich the other day, said, quote, "Imagine a Republican leadership team comprised of a good guy and a bad guy and Bob Dole is the good guy?"

Senator DOLE. That shows you can finally make it in this town.

Mr. RUSSERT. Has Newt Gingrich's rhetoric softened Bob Dole?

Senator DOLE. I don't think it's so much that, it's been—everybody's been comparing Gingrich and Clinton, and I've been able to be the spectator and people have sort of forgotten about me. And they say, "Gee, well, it's not the same fellow I met last week." So maybe some of the things that have been said—but I think it's been more the comparison. Let's face it, Newt is in line to be president. He's in the line of succession, which is more than most of us can say. And he and Clinton—the speaker is very powerful, the most powerful speaker we've had in a long, long time; doing a good job and we're working closely together.

Mr. RUSSERT. Should he temper his rhetoric?

Senator DOLE. Well, I think things are settling down. I've noticed a little different—you know, I look down the hall now and then from the Senate over to the House and I don't hear anything. Used to be able to hear it, just putting your head—so I think it's settling down on the House side.

Mr. RUSSERT. In 1976, When Bob Dole ran, he was described as a hatchet man, and ac-

cused the Democrat wars—World War I, World War II, Korea, were Democrat wars.

Senator DOLE. It was in my briefing book.

Mr. RUSSERT. Well, it—in 1988, you said to George Bush, "Stop lying about my record." In 1996—

Senator DOLE. See. I only made two mistakes.

Mr. RUSSERT. Well—but in 1996, will there be a different Bob Dole running for president?

Senator DOLE. I think—well, I hope so. I mean, you try to—if you don't try to learn from your mistakes, you ought to get out of the business, whatever it is, whether it's media or politics. And certainly I've said things I shouldn't have said. Now I've never been more relaxed about what I'm doing now. I mean, it seems to me that, you know, I'm at sort of peace with myself. I know what I want to do. I'm not going to be around criticizing any of my running mates or—not running mates, but anybody out there running on the Republican side. I've never personally attacked President Clinton or Mrs. Clinton. I gave that up. I had a round of that several years ago.

Mr. RUSSERT. Senator Dole, thanks for joining us.

Senator DOLE. Thank you.

Mr. RUSSERT. And we'll see you in Russell, Kansas, in April.

Senator DOLE. I hope so. That's right, Meet the Press will be there, right?

Mr. RUSSERT. Well, I lost the Super Bowl bet; I'll be there.

We'll be right back with William Safire.

(Announcements.)

Mr. RUSSERT. Welcome back to Meet the Press. With us now, William Safire.

Bill, welcome. We have a trade war with China?

Mr. SAFIRE. Yeah. We weren't able to apply human rights to the Chinese, and so the Clinton administration said, "We'll do anything you want, we'll give you MFN, we'll trade with you," and that policy has been a big flop. And what has happened is now American business has said, "Well, we can't fight on human rights grounds, but we're certainly ready to fight on CD grounds." And I think that's kind of sad to see. We should be standing for principle rather than just saving \$300 million on a—on the trade war.

Mr. RUSSERT. Who's going to lead China in the next century?

Mr. SAFIRE. Big question. It can go any one of four ways. If it goes the establishment way, Xiang, then China will hold together the way it is now. I don't think that'll happen. He's a transitional figure. If it goes to Lee, he's the tough guy of Tiananmen. And then you would have repression and a very tough dictatorship. If it goes to Xu Rangzhi—he's the economist; he's more the good guy, looks like Mayor Koch actually, but a sound citizen. And then there's a dark horse, Xiao Zhou, who is the Newt Gingrich of China, the head of the legislature there, and nobody knows what he stands for.

Mr. RUSSERT. Who's going to lead the United States of America in the next century?

Mr. SAFIRE. In the next century—

Mr. RUSSERT. Well—

Mr. SAFIRE [continuing]. Are you talking about—you skipping over 1996 and—

Mr. RUSSERT. All right, we'll start at '96. I was trying to let you off the hook, but got to '96, Safire.

Mr. SAFIRE. OK. We see Dole, who is awfully good as a majority leader, and that's the big weakness. He's a compromiser. And when you asked earlier, what about a one-term commitment, the very fact that they're talking about that, and he's allowing the talk to continue, suggests that perhaps he's better off in the job he's in. He looked over his shoulder sort of on today's program and

I think mentioned Pete Wilson out there. So if Gingrich goes for it, that would weaken Gramm and help Dole. It's a wonderful business.

Mr. RUSSERT. We have to take a quick break. We'll be back with more Bill Safire after this.

(Announcements.)

Mr. RUSSERT. Bill Safire, we've talked with you about Russia quite a bit on this program. President Clinton said at the State of the Union, "American children go to bed now and there's no nuclear missiles from Russia aimed at them." But what is this real situation in Russia?

Mr. SAFIRE. Things are in terrific turmoil at the moment because of the Chechnyan war. Boris Yeltsin's popularity has gone right into the tank. I mean, he's in single digits. He's below—you know, way below any other major leader. That's because the reformers have deserted him, or they think he's deserted them. And the Zhirinovskys nationalists have also deserted him, because he's brought discredit on the armed forces, and he's got nobody, except he's got himself surrounded with about 70,000 or 80,000 soldiers who answer directly to him around Moscow. The big question—here we are talking about American elections and who's going to be the candidate. The question in Russia is: Will there be an election in 1996?

Mr. RUSSERT. Well—

Mr. SAFIRE. There are some good men around, Yavlinsky and—you know, it's coming along. But if the popularity of Yeltsin stays so low, he may not want to have an election.

Mr. RUSSERT. And cancel the election.

Mr. SAFIRE. And postpone it for a few years, and that will be terrible.

Mr. RUSSERT. A chilling thought to end our roundtable this morning. Bill Safire, Bob Novak, Lisa Myers, thank you very much. We'll be right back with our Meet the Press Minute.

(Announcements.)

Mr. RUSSERT. *Deja vu*: December, 1951, President Truman was in the third year of his term, there was widespread speculation about another Democrat challenging him. And the big unknown: the plans of General Dwight David Eisenhower. Let's take a look. (File footage from December 2, 1951).

Mr. ERNEST LINDLEY. Who, in your opinion, would make the strongest Democratic nominee for the presidency next year?

Representative JOHN F. KENNEDY (Democrat, Massachusetts): Well, as—I've only heard of one or two men discussed, and as it seems fairly inevitable that if President Truman is a candidate for reelection, he will receive the nomination. I would say that he would be probably the strongest. Now there's been some talk of General Eisenhower running. I don't know whether General Eisenhower's a Republican or a Democrat.

Ms. MARTHA ROUNTREE. You're not convinced that he is a Republican, though, are you?

Representative KENNEDY. I have no reason to be convinced he's a Republican or a Democrat, as he's ignored politics for a long time, quite rightly, in his military career. But there are those who say they know, and in view of that, perhaps we can accept their opinion.

Once General Eisenhower takes off his uniform, leaves a very critical situation in Western Europe and takes a position on issues like civil rights and labor legislation, etc., and becomes a candidate and runs for office, I think we'd get a better idea of whether he is going to be able to sweep the country or not.

(End of footage.)

Mr. RUSSERT. Hmm. General Colin Powell, are you listening?

That's all for today. Join Giselle Fernandez later tonight for the "NBC Nightly News." And tomorrow on "Today," continuing coverage of the O.J. Simpson trial. Tomorrow night on the "NBC Nightly News" with Tom Brokaw, remarkable advances in the treatment of strokes.

We'll be back next week when our guest will be another presidential hopeful, former Vice President Dan Quayle. If it's Sunday, it's Meet the Press.

(Announcements.)8se Law,

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of House Joint Resolution 1, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution.

Pending:

Daschle motion to commit the resolution, with instructions to report back forthwith, with Daschle amendment No. 231, to require a budget plan before the amendment takes effect.

Dole amendment No. 232 (with instructions to commit), to establish that if Congress has not passed a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution by May 1, 1995, within 60 days thereafter, the President shall transmit to Congress a detailed plan to balance the budget by the year 2002.

Dole amendment No. 233 (to amendment No. 232), in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to say a few words about the amendment filed by the distinguished minority leader Thursday or Friday of last week. Actually, he called it the right-to-know amendment. I call it the right-to-stall amendment because that is what it amounts to.

The balanced budget amendment represents the kind of change that the American people asked for last November. The American people know the Federal Government, they know the bureaucrats who run it, and they know that those bureaucrats need to be put on a fiscal diet.

In contrast, the proposal offered by the distinguished minority leader, with all due respect, is offered in defense of the status quo and business as usual. If my colleagues supporting the Daschle proposal had been in the first Congress, we never would have adopted the first amendment of the Bill of Rights. Just imagine James Madison defending the free speech clause of the first amendment to some of our colleagues today:

"Does this mean you can't yell 'fire' in a crowded theater," they would ask?

"Does it protect obscenity? If not, what is the line between obscenity and protected free speech? We cannot accept the free speech clause without these details spelled out," they would say.

"Does the free-speech clause protect the American flag from desecration? If so, we cannot accept the first amendment."

Some of my colleagues made that very clear when they turned down the flag amendment twice a few years ago.

What about the religion clause, the free-exercise clause and the establishment clause of the first amendment, would the supporters of the Daschle proposal, had they been in the first Congress, have demanded an accounting of just when and how the Government can aid religious schools?

Would they have insisted on knowing all of the circumstances under which citizens or local governments can put a menorah or a creche on public property?

Would they have turned down the first amendment because the first Congress would not fulfill the ludicrous task of answering these questions? Or would they have accepted the principles contained in the first amendment and have allowed those principles to develop as they have over the years?

Just imagine if the following clause in article I, section 9 came before the Constitutional Convention of 1787 in Philadelphia:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; * * *

"Oh, no," my colleagues of today would have said had they been there, "tell us how much the appropriations will be over the next 7 years or we cannot adopt this provision in the Constitution."

What about the clause in article I, section 8 giving Congress the power to regulate foreign and interstate commerce? "Oh, no," some of our colleagues, had they been in Philadelphia in 1787, would have said, "we cannot give Congress the power to regulate commerce until we know the tariffs and the interstate regulations Congress will enact over the next 7 years."

Here and now let us adopt the principle of a balanced budget with the careful exceptions of wartime or when a supermajority consensus is reached for a pressing national purpose on a rollcall vote. Then, after we adopt the principle, we can implement it over the next 7 years, adjusting the budget to take into account changing circumstances during that time.

Yesterday, on the Frank Sesno show on CNN, I debated with Alice Rivlin. It was interesting to me that at the very time that we are making the case on the floor that the Federal Government is not serious about balancing the budget, that unless we have a balanced budget constitutional amendment, we will not get to a balanced budget by the year 2002, the President is filing his