

cutting. They are all going around being proud to cut. I do not believe in dismantling the Government.

I got the first triple A credit rating of any State from Maryland around to Texas. So I have been down the road. We know how to pay our bills. I have said time and again we need more South Carolina-led Government than Washington Government in South Carolina.

So I go along with my Republican colleagues on that particular score. But when they come around here now and they say, about welfare and pulling the wagon—that is another one. Pulling the wagon. The idea is, of course, that we here are pulling the wagon and the welfare people are all squatting in the wagon. We are all in the wagon and nobody is pulling it, except maybe the Japanese who are buying the bonds. Yes. Get trade policy, and try to go against Japan. If the Chinese want to get out of this soup that they are in on CD's, tell them to buy a few Treasury bills and the Secretary of Treasury will come over and say, "I am sorry. We didn't mean to talk. We have a special relationship."

We are in the hands of the Philistines because we have to sell those bonds to finance this debt. That is what is going on. They all know it. We are all in the wagon to the point of \$1 billion a day, and nobody is pulling it. So let us get away from that particular expression. But they do not want Government and everything else.

Another thing, then I will close. But I have to refer to this because I have the greatest respect for, and I have worked very closely with the distinguished Senate majority whip, TRENT LOTT of Mississippi.

Senator LOTT said, "Nobody, Republican, Democrat, conservative, liberal, moderate, is even thinking about using Social Security to balance the budget."

Absolutely false. They are not thinking about it; they are working on it. When I was buddied up with the distinguished Senators from Texas and New Hampshire in Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, I talked to Senator GRAMM, and the first page he gave me was an across the board cut entitlements including Social Security. I said, "PHIL, I can tell you now that is a nonstarter. You will not get a single Democrat, including me, that is going to vote for that one." So, we exempted Social Security and split it in half with entitlements and discretionary spending on one side and defense on the other. I knew he was particularly anxious to cut Social Security. I am particularly unanxious to cut any kind of Social Security because it pays for itself. If you want a contract for America, let us pull out the 1935 contract for the senior citizens of America. As a result of that agreement, taxes are paid, put in a trust fund, and they want to violate it.

On July 10, I offered the Social Security Preservation Act before the Budget Committee. There were 20 yeas with the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM] voting nay. Then, the distinguished

Senator from Texas came along last year and introduced his Balanced Budget Implementation Act on February 16, 1993, at page S1635, and I read: "Exclusion from budget. Section 13301(a) of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: This subsection shall apply to fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 2001."

I put section 13301 into the Budget Enforcement Act because I did not want to use the Social Security funds. We put it into statutory law by almost a unanimous vote on this floor. There were only two dissenters, but we had 98 others who supported it. But the Senator from Texas, in his own budget there, is proposing it.

Madam President, it is against the law to cite the deficit using the Social Security trust funds, but Members of Congress and the White House violate it at every level. I cannot get them to enforce the law. I do not want to go along with any constitutional amendment that violates that law, because I am talking about truth in budgeting. That is how we passed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings.

I could go on, Mr. President, but I want to yield. I will tell you, this off-Broadway show generalities and percentages fails to tell the American people the true facts about the fiscal crisis we face. I challenge them, or anyone on this side of the aisle, or on any aisle in any House, to give me a 1-year budget that only grows by 3 percent.

Republicans can continue to give us the gamesmanship and the percentage arguments, but let us cut out this blame game. There is one thing we cannot charge William Jefferson Clinton with and that is the responsibility for the deficit. He came up with a plan to cut it \$500 billion during his first year. The second year he has proposed terminating 131 programs and consolidating 271 programs into 27. He has not left much for "President" DOLE, if he ever takes over this budget in Government.

I do not believe in dismantling the Government. I think we live in the real world and we have to come out here and quit dancing around the fire. Let's end the argument and provide the American people with a 1-year budget that has only a 3-percent increase and puts Government in the black. They cannot do it without taxes.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding time, and I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Utah may want to speak.

Mr. HATCH. I notice the Senator from Minnesota is trying to get to an appointment. So why do we not proceed. If I could ask some comity, I know the Senator from Arkansas is waiting, too. Senator SPECTER would like to speak. I will defer my remarks until later if we can go to Senator SPECTER for a few minutes after the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and then to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas; is that OK?

Mr. BUMPERS. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous that be the case—first the Senator from Minnesota and then the Senator from Pennsylvania and then the Senator from Arkansas and perhaps myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania be allowed to speak for several minutes—he has a plane to catch—after which I would go forward with my remarks.

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

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for yielding for a few moments. I am about to join colleagues in going to St. Louis for an event in honor of Senator Danforth. I appreciate this time.

NOMINATION OF DR. HENRY FOSTER, JR., TO BE SURGEON GENERAL

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to withhold judgment on Dr. Henry Foster, Jr., the nominee for Surgeon General, until we know all the facts. I do not believe that performing a legal medical procedure should be a litmus test for confirmation for Surgeon General of the United States.

According to news reports, Dr. Foster flatly denies what purports to be a transcript of his statement that he performed "a lot of amniocentesis and therapeutic abortions, probably near 700."

I am very much concerned about allegations that Dr. Foster misrepresented his record. If the issue is veracity and character, that may be a basis for disqualification. If the facts support Dr. Foster's statement that he has "performed fewer than a dozen pregnancy terminations, all in hospitals, and were primarily to save the lives of women or because the women had been the victims of rape or incest," then his status looks much stronger, although the White House still has to answer for its representation that he had performed only one abortion.

If some wish to deny Dr. Foster confirmation because he has performed any abortions, then I believe the Senate should debate and carefully consider whether a nominee should be disqualified where he has performed a

medical procedure which is legal under the U.S. Constitution.

I do not believe that there ought to be a litmus test which would disqualify a person from being Surgeon General if he/she has performed a medical procedure which is legal under the U.S. Constitution. It is already difficult to persuade qualified people to accept governmental appointments because so often the character of an individual is irreparably damaged by charges before the facts are known. What is printed in the newspaper, uttered on television, or heard on the radio simply cannot be erased. The facts cannot catch up with that.

I hope that the President and the Senate will give Dr. Foster an opportunity to state his case before we rush to judgment.

I thank the Chair, and again I thank my colleague from Minnesota for permitting the interruption.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me just associate myself with the very, very thoughtful and important remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I thank my colleague for the timely and I think judicious and very important statement that he made on the floor.

Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from Utah for his graciousness. I know he wanted to respond to some of the remarks of my colleague from West Virginia and the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, let me, first of all, present a little bit of context, which I think is important to this debate. The Congressional Budget Office has calculated that to reach a balanced budget by 2002, subtracting interest that we would save from projected spending cuts, still we would have to cut a trillion dollars. The question is, where are we going to make the cuts? The question is, what kind of standard of fairness will be employed, and will this be some standard of fair sacrifice, shared sacrifice, if you will?

I have a lot of passion about this issue because I think this is the central issue of this Congress in this decade. But I think objectivity serves my subjectivity. I believe I can marshal evidence that will support my point of view, evidence that I want the people in Minnesota, our State, and people around the country, to carefully consider.

If you add to the equation the proposed \$82 billion of defense increases over the next 5 years in the Contract With America, and in addition the \$364 billion that would be required to pay for additional Republican tax cuts, Mr. President—by the way, tax cuts which I have not supported since I think it is difficult, to use the old Yiddish proverb, to dance at two weddings at the same time, and to be talking about deficit reduction while you are also in a bidding war to cut taxes yet further.

I believe the Senator from South Carolina was trying to speak directly to that contradiction.

Then we have \$1.481 trillion of cuts before us. The question that the people in Minnesota and people around the country deserve an answer to is: Where are we going to be making the cuts? Who is going to be asked to sacrifice? Is it going to be by some standard of fairness? What is its impact going to be on people in Minnesota and around the Nation?

So far, Mr. President—and I would say this to my colleague from Arkansas who has been really trying to push hard for defense and other cuts to be made according to some standard of fairness—so far, what the Senator from North Dakota has called the Republican credibility gap really sort of just stares you in the face, because all we have heard so far from Republican proposals is that there will be \$277 billion of cuts. Not as in tax cuts, but budget cuts.

So on the one hand we have \$1.481 trillion of budget cuts that have to be made to have a balanced budget in the year 2002 and so far the only thing we have had listed is \$277 billion.

Mr. President, that is one huge credibility gap. That is \$1.200 trillion to go.

Mr. President, given this credibility gap, it is in this context and knowing that we would be involved in this historic debate that, from the very beginning of this 104th Congress, I have tried to push forward on the idea of accountability.

Mr. President, what I worry about is simple. Given a bidding war to cut taxes, given a bidding war not to decrease the Pentagon's budget but to increase the budget, understanding full well that Social Security is not going to be a part of this plan and is taken off the table, understanding that interest that we have to pay on debts can't go unpaid, then it is crystal clear to me that there are only a relatively few other areas where cuts can take place.

Mr. President, my concern is that the deficit reduction that will take place and the way in which we will meet a balanced budget deadline, if in fact we pass this balanced budget amendment, will be to make the cuts according to the path of least resistance; that is to say, ask some of the citizens in this country to tighten their belt who are least able to tighten their belt.

Mr. President, I came to the floor early on in the session and I had an amendment on the unfunded mandates bill. It was a sense-of-the-Senate amendment that we in the U.S. Senate would go on record that we would not pass any legislation, make any cuts that would increase homelessness or hunger among children. I could not get a majority vote. It was defeated on essentially a party-line vote. I want people in the country to know that. I could not get a majority vote.

Then I had another amendment that said if we are going to talk about accountability, we ought to have a child

impact analysis. When we pass legislation out of committee, if there is a report that accompanies that legislation, there ought to be a child impact statement. Mr. President, I could not get a majority vote for that.

Then I came to the floor several weeks ago and offered a motion very similar to the amendment that our leader, Senator DASCHLE, has presented, which is now before us.

This amendment came straight from our State of Minnesota, where the Minnesota State Senate unanimously, and the House of Representatives, I think, three votes short of a unanimous vote, signed by the Governor January 20, sent a resolution here. I took the wording of that resolution and brought it to the floor of the Senate as an amendment which essentially said that if we pass a balanced budget amendment, before we send that amendment to the States, we should present to the States a detailed analysis of the impact of this amendment on our States.

Where will the cuts take place? What is the budget over the next 7 years? How will it shape the lives of the people we represent? Will this become some shell game where a State like Minnesota sees cuts, and then is required to raise taxes to make up the difference?

Under the balanced budget amendment, there will be cuts in higher education, in K-12 education, child nutrition programs, early childhood development programs, veterans programs, agriculture programs, health care programs, and others on which regular middle-class Minnesotans depend. No question about it. In fact, they would have to cut them 30 percent across the board to reach this target, given the parameters that have been set.

By the way, Mr. President, nowhere in the Contract With America, and not once in the debate that has taken place in the Senate from those who have been pushing so far for a balanced budget amendment, have I heard any analysis of all of the benefits of the tax loopholes and deductions that go to large corporations and large financial institutions in America. We will cut child nutrition programs; school lunch and school breakfast; women, infants, and children's programs, but we will not cut subsidies for oil companies.

Mr. President, this is the reason there is such resistance to this right-to-know amendment. I raise the question again on the floor of the Senate: What is it that we do not want the people in our States to know? Were the Minnesota Legislature, Democrats and Republicans alike, and the Governor correct in saying before they send the balanced budget amendment, please present an analysis of the cuts that will be ahead, and how it will affect our States so we know what we will have to pick up through an income tax or sales tax or property tax? And we are not willing to do that. That goes against the very essence of accountability.