too bad we don't have some of the money which was worked out on the $203 billion settlement for the Federal Government. But I don't think that is likely either. Reducing waste, fraud, and abuse is the most lofty objective the Congress can articulate. But finding the money to achieve that is so hard.

While I have worked very closely with my distinguished colleague from Iowa, I don't really think those figures are realistic. I don't think we are going to reduce Head Start. I don't think we are going to reduce NIH. But there is a stick. It is a stick to stay within the budget limitations.

Among a great many alternatives which are undesirable, I believe the pending sense-of-the-Senate resolution is the least undesirable. So I am going to support it.

Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-five seconds.

Mr. SPECTER. Would Senator NICKLES like the last word?

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I apologize to my colleagues for going to the Finance Committee. I have just a couple of comments.

I have heard some of the discussion which said if we enact this amendment, we will have a 5-percent reduction. That is not the case. I have heard my colleagues say the Congressional Budget Office says it. Well, frankly, you get into descriptions of who is doing the scoring. If you use the administration scoring, it is not 5 percent; it is 1 percent. We use some administration scoring, OMB scoring. When we had the Gramm–Rudman-Hollings law, we used OMB scoring. They were the ones who implemented it. We use OMB scoring in a lot of the bills we have before us. If that is the case, we are $5 billion off. I don't think we have to be $5 billion off. I think we can, within the last few bills, narrow it down. We can eliminate $5 billion of growth in spending. Across the board won't be necessary, it shouldn't be necessary, if we show just a little discipline.

I know others on the other side said we can raise taxes. That may be their proposal. But it is not going to pass.

Yet I know there is lots of demand for increases in spending. We are trying to say we should have some restraint. The restraint is that we shouldn't be dipping into the Social Security surpluses. If we are going to spend Social Security surpluses, let's have an across-the-board reduction—if necessary. I hope it is not necessary. Let's do that if necessary to restrain the growth of spending, so we can ensure that 100 percent of the Social Security funds are used for debt reduction or for Social Security and not used for more Government spending in a variety of areas, whether it is defense, Labor-HHS, or you name it.

I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

I yield the floor.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute so I may respond.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma stresses the difference between OMB and the Congressional Budget Office. It is the typical preference to use the Congressional Budget Office.

I point out a letter dated October 4 sent to a senior member of our staff. It says:

> Dividing the projected deficit by the available outlays results in an across-the-board cut of 5.5 percent.

This is from the Congressional Budget Office. They are the gospel, I think, when it comes to making decisions in the Budget Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD, and I yield the floor.

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

[Memorandum of October 4, 1999]

To: Sue Nelson, [Democrat Staff—Budget Committee].

From: Janet Airis [CBO Staff].

Subject: Across-the-Board Cut to Discretionary Appropriations.

This is in response to your request of an across-the-board cut to FY 2000 discretionary appropriations. You asked us to calculate an across-the-board cut that would result in an estimated on-budget deficit for FY 2000 of zero, assuming that the current status CBO estimate (excluding ''directed scoring''), as of October 4, is enacted into law. Given your assumption, our estimate of the projected on-budget deficit is $19.2 billion. Our estimate of the outlays available to be cut is $351.7 billion. Dividing the projected deficit by the available outlays results in an across-the-board cut of 5.5%.

This calculation is preliminary and done without benefit of language. If you have any questions, please contact me at 226–2850.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, we have attempted to set this first- and second-degree amendment aside, but we cannot get consent to do that. We are now seeking unanimous consent to move to foreign operations. We are waiting for final clearance.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1692

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (S. 1692) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial birth abortions.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I object to further reading of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1650 AND H.R. 2606

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, we are trying to move this bill on Health, Health Human Services, and Education. We are seeking short time agreements so we can finish this bill by the close of business tomorrow. Senator HARKIN and I, Senator REID and Senator COVERDELL's staff, are trying to get that done. We have not been able to move ahead at the moment because we cannot get consent to set aside the pending Nickles amendment, second-degree amendment. We are going to proceed now to foreign operations. We have consent on a proposal, which I am about to make.

I ask unanimous consent the pending first- and second-degree amendments be laid aside and the Senate now proceed to the conference report to accompany the foreign operations bill and there be 1 hour for debate equally divided; the conference report should be considered read.

I further ask the votes in relation to the pending amendment and the conference report occur following the use or yielding back of the time, and the votes occur in a stacked sequence with the second vote to be 10 minutes in duration.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, it is my understanding, then, we would vote first on the foreign operations conference report or the amendment of Senator NICKLES? Which do you want to vote on first?

Mr. SPECTER. Vote first on the conference report, since we will be taking that up.

Mr. REID. No objection.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, therefore Senators may expect votes to occur perhaps as early as 11:45. We have lost about a half hour waiting for this transition, so it is my hope that although we have the unanimous consent agreement for 1 hour, we might accomplish the debate in a half hour and finish at 11:45, where we could then be expected to proceed to a vote. If the managers insist on taking the full hour,