

Syria represents perhaps the last great obstacle to regional peace. The Syrian mandate for a single, complete Israeli withdrawal from the Golan Heights has resulted in a year and a half impasse in Syria-Israel negotiations. Arbitrary demands for withdrawal as a condition of cooperation cannot be viewed as a good faith effort to achieve peace. Without a doubt, Israel is correct to insist upon a comprehensive peace agreement with iron-clad security arrangements before it begins any pullback from the strategically vital Golan Heights. Israel should not be asked to risk the security of her people in return merely for the possibility of better relations with Syria.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that Secretary Christopher's latest round of shuttle diplomacy with Israel and Syria results in a renewal of the peace process. Clearly, Secretary Christopher needs to convey to the Syrian government that real concessions must be made in order for the Syrians to demonstrate they are serious about peace. The United States cannot agree to turn a blind eye to Syria's drug trade in exchange for cooperation in the peace process. Rather, Syria must take the initiative to stop being a safe-haven for terrorists and drug lords. That kind of action represents a genuine commitment to the peace-making process. Paper pledges and handshakes do not suffice.

Some have suggested that the recent peace talks are just cause for the United States to scale back its financial commitments with Israel. I disagree. The United States can best support the fragile peace process by continuing its investment in Israel's economic and military strength. The financial assistance we provide each year is in our national interest. Without it, Israel would be unable to deter potential threats and would fall victim to regional extremists. An economically vigorous Israel is the single most important element to sustain any peace agreement with her neighbors. For the past forty-six years, we have refused to manipulate Israel by bartering economic assistance for political influence. We have continually voted to avoid jeopardizing Israel's stability, at the bequest of our constituencies and our consciences. That course of action has put us on the path to peace. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to pursue our present course rather than consider options that have the potential of debilitating our sole democratic ally in the region during this delicate transition.

Eleven years ago, Congress endorsed the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem—a symbolic recognition of Jerusalem as the true capital of the State of Israel. It is time to call upon the United States government to begin the formal process of recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's capital city. To be sure, the acknowledgement of Jerusalem as the political center of Israel would not alienate the religious rights of Arabs

or Christians. As Prime Minister Rabin recently stated before the Knesset, "[Jerusalem] has been * * * and forever will be the capital of the Jewish people." By clarifying our position now, instead of during sensitive "final status" negotiations, the United States would expedite the peace process. In doing so, we would represent the American people, assist our ally, and help preclude any existing false hopes among Palestinians.

Mr. President, though I no longer sit as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I will continue to monitor closely the events in the Middle East. Very few current foreign policy issues bear greater relevance to this nation than the security of the people of Israel. We must stand side by side with Israel's democratically elected leadership in the struggle for lasting peace. As the world's sole superpower, we must be unrelenting in our support of our allies, especially Israel who bravely stands alone as the Middle East's sole democracy. It is the responsibility of the United States to foster the peace process, and not to undermine our ally's regional goals during this time of transition. We must work to see the day when the people of Israel can turn to all its neighbors in the Middle East and say "Shalom Aleichem"—"Peace be with you."

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES!

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as of the close of business on yesterday, Thursday, March 9, the Federal debt stood at \$4,846,101,629,353.21. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,395.89 as his or her share of that debt.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business is closed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCIS- SIONS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 889, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Bumpers amendment No. 330, to restrict the obligation or expenditure of funds on the NASA/Russian Cooperative MIR program.

Kassebaum amendment No. 331 (to committee amendment beginning on page 1, line 3), to limit funding of an Executive order

that would prohibit Federal contractors from hiring permanent replacements for striking workers.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 331

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, which is the KASSEBAUM amendment.

I would like to make one brief point. Later I will probably speak on some other points. But in 1935 when Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act, section 13 stated:

Nothing in this act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede, or in any way diminish, the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right.

Then in 1938 in the Mackay radio case, the Supreme Court interpreted that as permitting permanent striker replacement. But that really did not happen in our country to any great extent and has not happened up until very recently. By tradition, we have worked things out, and we have avoided what most Western industrialized countries have outlawed. But the point I want to make is that in the discussion on the floor of the Senate, it has been assumed that the President's Executive order is as sweeping as our proposal last year on prohibiting permanent striker replacement. It is nowhere near as sweeping. It gives no additional powers to the National Labor Relations Board.

Let me just read two pertinent sections. This is the President's Executive order.

It is the policy of the Executive Branch in procuring goods and services that, to ensure the economical and efficient administration and completion of Federal Government contracts, contracting agencies shall not contract with employers that permanently replace lawfully striking employees. All discretion under this Executive order shall be exercised consistent with this policy.

Then section 4(a):

"When the Secretary determines that a contractor has permanently replaced lawfully striking employees, the Secretary may"—no mandate—"may debar the contractor thereby making the contractor ineligible to receive government contracts."

It is much more restrictive than the legislation that we had before us last year that a majority of the Senate voted for but because of our filibuster rules we were unable to pass.

I will hold off saying anything further at this point, Mr. President. I will have some further comments before long.

I see my colleague, the new Senator from Oklahoma, here. I believe he wishes to speak.

So I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is amendment No. 331 offered by the Senator from Kansas to the committee amendment on page 1, line 3 of the bill.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have been very disturbed during the debate on the defense supplemental appropriations. I just wanted to make a couple of comments not directly addressing the KASSEBAUM amendment but the appropriations itself.

I really believe this is one of the few times that I can stand here and say I do not know for sure how I am going to vote on this. I am a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. When I was in the House of Representatives, I was a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

I find that we are in a way endorsing what I refer to as a flawed foreign policy when we come up in our forces to have supplemental appropriations to pay for various maneuvers and various missions that our military has pursued while we clearly disagree with those. As an example, I would suggest that, if the President had come to Congress, or to the Senate, and said is it going to cost \$17 million to send troops to Rwanda, we probably would say "no" and we would not have to incur these costs.

The same thing would be true in Somalia—recognizing that in Somalia we originally sent them in December, under a previous administration, however. I think they were sent over for a humanitarian mission not to exceed—I believe it was—90 days initially. Then after that, each quarter we would have resolutions in order to try to bring the troops back home. That ended up costing \$17 million.

If the President had come to Congress and asked Congress to appropriate \$312 million to send troops to Bosnia without a well-defined mission there, certainly not having anything to do with our Nation's events, without having anything to do with our Nation's security, I suggest we would have said "no." The same thing is true; \$367 million to Cuba, and then there is Haiti. This appropriation is going to have \$595 million to support what nobody really knows we are doing in Haiti. I can assure you, Mr. President, that if the President had come to Congress and said we are going to ask you for \$595 million so we can send troops into Haiti to help them with problems they are having, it would have been rejected. So here we come along later and are forced to do it.

I hesitated in voting against it, Mr. President, because it is not the military's fault. It is not their policy. They did not decide to go into Haiti. It was not their idea to go to Somalia, Bosnia, or Rwanda. If we do not do this, they are going to be forced into taking it out of their personnel accounts, their operation accounts, R&D accounts. And there are no spare dollars right now in any of those accounts. In fact, we are operating under a budget in this fiscal year that is comparable to the budget we had in 1980 when we could not afford spare parts.

So I have sat in these meetings and talked to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as the Chief of Staff in the various services. I listened to them about the problems they have right now with their budget, in trying to keep America strong. I cannot conscientiously say take it out of our R&D budget just because I disagreed with the missions for which this money is being spent.

So, Mr. President, I wanted to get on record that I am very disturbed with the system. I hope we can establish some type of a system where those of us who are going to be asked to appropriate the money to pay for these missions will have some voice in making the decisions as to what we are doing with our armed services.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, if I may get back to mundane things that we talk about here, amendments—and it is good, not simply as a tribute to the Chaplain but it is good for us to pull ourselves back and remind each other there are things more important than these amendments we vote on, and we too easily forget.

Mr. President, let me comment again on the amendment that is before the Senate. It is very easy to forget we are talking about people, real people who are struggling for a living when we talk about people who go on strike.

I just have been going through some testimony given a couple of years ago by people who were struggling. I just this morning was with Senator KENNEDY, who held an informal session with a number of people who spoke on the need for a minimum wage. Two people I remember particularly. One is—and I believe I have his name correctly—David Dow, who has two children, a daughter 2, a son 1. He and his wife went 1 year to college. Then their first child was coming along so they had to quit.

They are struggling on the minimum wage. They cannot afford health insurance. They are paying \$75 a month for their student loan, making that payment on the minimum wage. And he just told about the struggle he is going through.

These are real people we deal with when we are talking about a minimum wage. It is not some theoretical thing.

There was a small employer there who said he would like to pay the minimum wage if everybody else had to raise their minimum wage so we would all be on the same level.

We are talking about—and here they are judgment calls; I recognize that, but we are talking about trying to maintain some sense of balance in our society. I think that is what is needed in this area of permanent striker replacement. All the other Western industrialized nations, with the exception of Great Britain, Singapore, and Hong Kong, outlaw permanent striker replacement. Italy, Greece, France, Germany, Portugal, Spain, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland—I am sure I

am forgetting a few—Japan, all of them outlaw permanent striker replacement, and they do it for a very solid reason, that there is an imbalance. I say this as a former employer who was in business myself. There is an imbalance. Obviously, it is a struggle for a small business person. It was not easy for me in business. But as an employer I am at an advantage over somebody who is just struggling to pay a mortgage and to get by.

And so we had built into our structure certain things that give some power to the employees. While we have not outlawed it as a result of the Mackay Radio decision in the Supreme Court of 1938, with only three exceptions in large businesses we have exercised self-restraint and avoided having permanent striker replacements.

I think it is important that continue. I have been working with both sides in the Caterpillar strike in Illinois. Let me add I have great respect for Don Feits, the chief executive officer of Caterpillar, and Owen Biever, the president of the United Automobile Workers.

My feelings are, if we just turned this whole thing over to the two of them, we would get it worked out. But if at Caterpillar you were to have permanent striker replacements, in a community like Peoria, it would just tear that town apart. It just would not be good. I think virtually everyone recognizes that. While that is a more volatile situation because of the concentration of employees of one company, I think we have to recognize we have to have balance, and that means, among other things, labor and management working together more than we have traditionally done. Germany has something they call *mitbestimmung* where an officer of the union is on the board of the corporation, but when that corporation talks about what they might offer to the unions in terms of concessions when they go to a contract, that union representative absents himself. But that way the unions get a chance to understand the problems of management and management gets to understand the problems of the unions.

It is also important they work together and get together for a cup of coffee, a beer, whatever, and just talk things over informally. Do not wait until you get to contract time. But occasionally we have situations that get to the extreme, and I do not think we should let that extreme go to the point of having permanent striker replacements. I think that puts things out of kilter. I do not think we should be in a situation where we want to encourage it.

The President's Executive order does one thing and one thing only. It says if we are going to buy supplies, we will not buy them from people who have permanent striker replacements, or at least we have that option. That is up to the Secretary of Labor.

My hope is that we will not adopt the Kassebaum amendment. My hope is,

frankly, that the President, if that should be part of this bill, even though he needs this emergency supplemental appropriation, would veto it and say give me a clean bill on what we need in the Defense Department. I know that postpones things for the Defense Department, and I know they would not be happy about it, but the better answer is for us not to accept the Kassebaum amendment and to move ahead and maintain this important balance between labor and management that we need in this Nation.

Mr. President, if no one else seeks the floor, I question the presence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business for no longer than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is recognized.

THE DAY-TO-DAY ACTIVITIES OF CONGRESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I have before me at this moment the National Journal's Congressional Daily. It is a report of the activities of Congress on a daily basis, referring to what committees are doing both in the House and the Senate and also reporting on the executive branch of Government. It is one of those documents that many of us often refer to as an accurate accounting of the day-to-day activities of the U.S. Congress.

I thought it was appropriate to bring before us at this time. A week ago, we finalized debate and voted on a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution. At that time, we failed to get the necessary 67 votes by 1 vote. Immediately following that, we saw a precipitous drop in the value of the dollar on world currency markets, which actually continued through most of this week, only to be abated by Alan Greenspan coming to Capitol Hill and talking to a House committee on the need for congressional action as it relates to deficit reduction. That seemed to, at least for a time, level out the decline of the dollar.

One of the things that has concerned me—and I see the Senator from Illinois on the floor at this moment, who was one of the major leaders in the balanced budget amendment issue—and has concerned the Senator from Illinois for so long is the inability of Congress to manage the deficit. And even though there have been many tries made over the last several years, it was this inability that brought me, several years ago, to the conclusion that only a con-

stitutional amendment to balance the budget would change this scenario.

I am not going to speak of the intentions of this President, but I will only say that this President, since he came to office, convinced this Congress that with a major tax increase in what was called a deficit reduction package, that he could reduce the deficit, he could control the out-of-control Federal budget.

Yet, this year we saw this President bring to the Hill a budget that is not reflective of a declining deficit. In fact, most assume that this administration has largely given up on their ability to bring the deficit near balance and that it is now moving up again. The reason I thought it was appropriate at this moment to mention that is that, in today's Congressional Daily, it says President Clinton's fiscal 1996 budget would cause the Federal deficit to climb \$82 billion higher by the year 2000 than the administration has estimated, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

The article goes on to talk about preliminary studies or examinations which show that, by 2000, the deficit will still be in the \$276 billion-and-climbing range.

The point I want to make is very simple. Once again, it is clearly reflective that this Congress and this President cannot and have not been able to control the Federal deficit. While this President may have tried, it is obvious that, under their own budget figures, whether it is lack of an adequate estimate or whether simply a failure to make the necessary cuts, he, too, is missing a Federal budget deficit projection in his own budgets by \$82 billion.

That is a phenomenal amount of money under anyone's estimation and certainly it is by ours. If the budget were out of balance by \$82 billion, then I think the Senator from Illinois and I would say, well, that is a major and a good-faith effort. But this is the estimate of a budget that is out of balance by nearly \$300 billion, as it will be \$82 billion higher.

Those are the problems we face that I think so clearly dramatize, day after day, year after year, why we need a constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I want to join my colleague from Idaho in his efforts in this area. I would give the President a little more credit than he might in terms of what the President did in 1993. There is no question we made some progress on the deficit.

But the budget that has been submitted by the administration is illustrative of the fact that these things kind of ebb and flow. They go up and down like a roller coaster. Right now, I think the mood in Congress, after our lengthy discussion of the constitutional amendment, is we want to do something. And I think we may pass some statutory action to move us in that direction. I have no confidence, however, that statutory action this

time, any more than in the past, is going to get us there. Because while today the mood is "Let's do something about the deficit," tomorrow, who knows what the mood will be? And so we will move away from that.

So I join my colleague in believing that that is the direction in which we have to go and one of these days, I believe it will happen.

Mr. President, if no one else seeks the floor, I question the presence of a quorum.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. SIMON. I withdraw my request.
(Mr. CRAIG assumed the chair.)

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may I suggest to both of my good friends, the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Illinois, why do we not just quit talking about the balanced budget amendment and get on with balancing the budget?

The President has proposed an \$83 billion tax cut. Let us vote it down. The Republicans, in their so-called Contract With America, have urged that we have something like a \$200 billion tax cut. Let us also vote that down. Let us get out here and say that we are against any tax cuts at this time.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. No, I am not ready to yield just yet.

Let us say we are against tax cuts; just vote them both down. This is no time to talk about tax cuts while balancing the budget.

We are all concerned about budget deficits. We are concerned about passing this huge debt on to our children and grandchildren. Let us do something about it. Let us do it now.

We have heard the advertisement on TV, "Do it here. Do it now." Let us vote down both proposals for tax cuts.

Why do we not consider a tax increase? Let us increase taxes. Surely, we could sit down and, working together, could come up with a reasonable tax increase that would be calculated and directed toward reducing the deficits.

We have operated on a national credit card now for 14 years. During the 12 years of the Reagan and Bush administrations, we were on a national credit card binge: Enjoy today, pay later. Let our children and grandchildren pay for our profligacy. Live for today.

One can only cry so much over spilt milk, and it does not do any good after awhile. So why do we not just get on with balancing the budget? Let us help this President. Let us help him to balance the budget. First of all, vote his \$83-billion tax cut down.

I have been somewhat critical of the tax cut that the President has advocated. I try to be constructive about it. But I think we also ought to be critical of the more-than-\$200-billion tax cut