

Mr. SIMON. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. CRAIG. I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. SIMON. I commend the Senator for his comments. If the demands of those of us who favor a balanced budget amendment spell out how we do it, they are always making speeches how you can balance the budget without a constitutional amendment. It seems to me that it is incumbent on them to spell this out also. Is that being unrealistic?

Mr. CRAIG. Well, to my colleague from the other side, and one of the primary sponsors of the balanced budget amendment, it would not be unrealistic. But what is realistic to talk about is the very thing that all of us know who focus on the balanced budget amendment. And how we get there by the year 2002 is a simple matter—although complicated and very tough to do—of reducing the growth rate of Federal budgets from about 5 percent to about 3 percent. When the American public hears that, they say to a Senator SIMON of Illinois or a Senator CRAIG of Idaho, that sounds immensely reasonable. While it may be tough to do, it is a heck of a lot more reasonable to understand that is the kind of approach we are talking about. Then, apparently, the game plan, or the threat, there is the impending damage that could come from that kind of language that would suggest we have to cut \$1.3 trillion from budgets. What we could also say is that if we do not have a balanced budget amendment, by the year 2002 the Federal budget will be \$1.3 trillion larger, or that the Federal deficit will be \$500 or \$600 billion annually, or that the Federal debt will be \$6 or \$7 trillion, or that interest on the debt will be \$400 billion annualized.

That is not at all what they are talking about. Instead of talking about the kind of positive things that can grow and emanate from a balanced budget, they are talking about all of the negatives.

The American public knows exactly what we are saying and they are saying very clearly back to us: Do not get weak-kneed. Balance the Federal budget. Produce the mechanism that will result in that and give us a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that will force the kind of fiscal discipline that this Congress has failed to respond to for now over three decades.

Mr. President, this 104th Congress is considering a historic and remarkable balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Some partisan sparring broke out over the last few days. That's unfortunate.

Democrats have been asking Republicans, "Where's your plan?" specifically showing how to balance the budget by 2002?

Let us stay focused on the central issue. Which do we want: Balanced budgets or the status quo? Which do we want: An issue? Or passage of the balanced budget amendment? We know which is better for the country.

Let us remember what has brought us to this point: \$4.7 trillion Federal debt; annual deficits now in the \$160 billion range; and deficits projected to shoot toward \$400 billion after the turn of the century.

Let us stay above partisanship. Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle sincerely support the balanced budget amendment but also are demanding to know specific budget cuts. I sympathize with your frustration; but don't be distracted.

Do not be fooled by a partisan tactics on the part of balanced budget amendment opponents to simply kill this amendment at any cost. Do not fall into that some old trap of trying to score a partisan point today at the cost of our children's economic well-being tomorrow. That is exactly the kind of shortsighted trade-off we're trying to stop by passing the balanced budget amendment.

The balanced budget amendment began as a bipartisan effort. Let us keep it that way.

Where are the specific cuts? There are literally hundreds of plans out there; there's no one way to balance the budget. What's lacking is some mechanism to force a consensus. There may be 100 plans in the Senate for balancing the budget, but not one of them will get 51 votes until we remove the easy alternative of borrow-and-spend.

Lessons of History: We have had the specific plans before us in the past. The way Congress has treated them demonstrates why we need to the balanced budget amendment. In the past, one/both Houses defeated numerous deficit-reduction plans full of specifics. Most recently, and in a bipartisan effort: Kerrey-Brown rescission/entitlement reform package (1994) (Penny-Kasich in the House, 1993).

"Draconian" budget cuts required? Contrary to what's being said, we know the direction we have to go, and how to get there. For example: "Glide Path" Plan: Federal spending is increasing now at about 5 percent, or about \$75 billion per year. Simply trimming that growth in spending to 3.1 percent would balance the budget in fiscal year 2002. For those concerned about Social Security: We can trim the growth of non-Social Security spending to 2.4 percent and still balance the budget by 2002. This will require discipline, but it is a far cry from the doom and gloom scenario being portrayed by many opponents.

Name every budget cut in advance? Opponents of this proposal want it both ways. First they say, show them how we would cut the budget. Next they say balancing the budget by 2002 would be too painful.

But this tactic proves our point: The budget won't be balanced without passing the BBA first. Democrats want our plan, but where has the Democrat plan been? President Clinton did not propose a path to a balanced budget—current projections show deficits going way up after 1995.

Bad Policy, putting the cart before the horse: When people decide they want to be healthier and live longer, they don't plan every meal and every workout for the next year. First they commit to do whatever is necessary. Then they pick the specific diet and exercise plan. The high failure rate for dieters illustrates our point that external enforcement is necessary. Specifying all the cuts before we even commit to balancing the budget condemns us to failure before we start.

Will the BBA work or won't it? Opponents cannot have it both ways: First, they say it is a fig leaf to cover budget failures in previous Congresses, that it's an empty promise; then they talk in terms of "slash and burn" to scare the interest groups into active opposition; I think they really do fear this amendment will work and are not willing to share the responsibilities.

Mr. President, I yield back to the Senator from Texas, and I thank her for sharing with me some of her time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mrs. HUTCHISON pertaining to the introduction of S. 191 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], is recognized to speak for up to 20 minutes.

#### A MESSAGE TO THE JAPANESE PRIME MINISTER

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, as I and a number of my colleagues spoke on the Senate floor this past Friday, we pointed out that a terrible injustice has been done to thousands of workers in my State of Iowa, Illinois, and in Ohio. It is an action that has ramifications not only for the other workers throughout our country, but for international relations as well.

Mr. President, I just want to say that if there are people at the Japanese Embassy here in Washington who have their sets tuned in to the proceedings in the Senate, I ask them to turn the volume up and pay close attention to what I am about to say. I believe I am joined by my colleague, Senator SIMON, from Illinois, we have a message for the Japanese Prime Minister who is in Washington today, meeting with the President of the United States. We have a very strong message for the Japanese Prime Minister. I hope that the people of the Japanese Embassy will turn their sets up and start to pay attention right now because this message is for the Japanese Prime Minister.

The Bridgestone-Firestone Corp. is a Japanese-owned company. It announced it would permanently replace

over 2,000 of its employees currently involved in a legal strike over proposed major cuts in worker pay and benefits and over a worsening of working conditions.

After earlier being hopeful that this lengthy strike would be successfully resolved through good-faith negotiations by both sides, it now appears that Bridgestone/Firestone has been acting in bad faith. This is irresponsible corporate behavior and it harms the United States of America.

We take the floor again to address this issue because as we speak President Clinton is meeting with Japanese Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama, and I hope this message gets to the Prime Minister. Our President is meeting with him to discuss a number of important economic and international relations issues. We must improve our relations with Japan. Japan is an economic leader, and an ally of ours. Friendship and positive relations between our two nations is in the best interests of both countries and the entire world.

Mr. President, nothing does more to undermine positive relations and good will between our nations than acts like that taken by Bridgestone/Firestone. Here is a company that is profitable, whose workers have made it profitable by reaching record levels of productivity. Then they go and knock thousands of workers out of their livelihoods because Bridgestone/Firestone is not willing to abide by the same contract signed by their two largest American competitors.

I want Prime Minister Murayama and his government to know how destructive these actions are, how it rips apart families and communities. These workers have given the best years of their lives to this company. They are highly productive, diligent, hard-working individuals. They took contract concessions when times were tough and the company needed them to remain in operation. Now that times are better, workers just want fair treatment from the company.

Mr. Prime Minister, these are workers like Sherrie Wallace who recently wrote me after she and her husband lost their jobs. Let me just read from this letter from Sherrie Wallace, a worker at Firestone:

When Bridgestone came to each of us asking for help because we were not doing as well as the company needed to do, we all did our best. They asked me for one more tire every day, and to stay out on the floor and forgo my cleanup time. Not only did I respond, so did each and every member of the URW. Not only did I give them the one more tire per day they asked for, I gave them three times what they asked for. Our production levels soared. We threw ourselves into our company believing that we all must succeed together in order to create a better way of life for all. The membership joined committees and we became involved and we gave them our hearts. We began to believe this company was different. We gave them our input to create a better working environment. To increase productivity we began to meet our production levels. We were proud of

our company and our union. Together, we did make a difference. It is these things that make me wonder why does Bridgestone now demand such unreasonable demands?

In return for their increased productivity, workers are being asked to take a 30-percent cut in the introductory wage, cutting out four holidays, bunching up all their holidays at Christmas time, cuts in pay rates for work on Saturdays and Sundays.

I asked my staff, Mr. President, to compare what the workers in Japan were getting in Bridgestone Corp., compared to workers in America. I think you will find this pretty startling. In Japan Bridgestone union employees average annual wage is \$52,500 a year, for the Bridgestone union employees in America, their average wages are \$37,045 a year. The average monthly hours in Japan? One hundred fifty-two hours. In the United States? One hundred ninety-eight hours. Not only are our workers working more, they are getting paid less. Now, what the company says they want them to do is two shifts a day, 12 hours on, 12 hours off. They want them to work a crazy quilt work schedule. They would work three 12-hour days, then have 2 days off; then 2, 12-hour days, have three days off; then they work two 12-hour days, have 2 days off. Try to map out a schedule for your family life on that. It would be worse than the U.S. Senate. Workers would not know when they would have days off during the year.

In Japan, same company, same employees have three shifts, eight hours a day, and they rotate those shifts. The company says no, what is fair in Japan is not fair for our workers in America.

So, Mr. President, workers increase their productivity tremendously at this company. All the statistics show it. At Goodyear Tire & Rubber, they had a contract dispute last year, they settled it, setting the contract pattern for the rubber industry in this country and they moved ahead. Now what Bridgestone-Firestone is doing is saying they can beat their major competitors in America by squeezing their workers a little harder. Well, I do not think any company ought to gain a competitive advantage at the expense of its workers.

The United Rubber Workers have offered proposals through the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the company refused to negotiate. This refusal is a refusal of the basic tenant of labor-management relations of collective bargaining.

How much time do I have remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Senator has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I will take a couple more minutes, but let me yield to my colleague from Illinois because I know his workers in Illinois are facing the same kind of situation as ours are in Des Moines, IA.

Mr. President, I yield at least 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Iowa. I thank him for his leadership on this.

When he mentioned the States that are affected, he should have included Oklahoma, which is the State of the Presiding Officer. The Japanese Prime Minister is here today to create good will for his country, and I hope he has a very good visit. However, it is appropriate that we let the Japanese Prime Minister know right now here and clearly, that one of the Japanese-owned corporations in this country is creating ill-will in this country, and is not doing any good for United States-Japanese relations.

In addition to the comments of my colleague from Iowa, I would point out that the Secretary of Labor asked to meet with the chief executive of the Bridgestone-Firestone Co. here in the United States.

He refused to meet with the Secretary of Labor to talk about this. I have a wire service story in which Secretary Reich is quoted as saying:

I consider this outrageous, quite frankly. Japanese companies in this country have a sterling record of social responsibility, in general.

And I think that is correct. Most Japanese corporations in this country have an excellent record. This company is refusing even to meet with the Secretary of Labor. I have never heard of an American corporation or a corporation in this country refusing to sit down with the Secretary of Labor.

The company said:

\*\*\* it would be happy to send Charles Ramsey, its chief negotiator—

Only they are not negotiating. to meet with—

The Secretary of Labor.

That is like sending an errand boy. The Secretary of Labor ought to be able to sit down with the person who is making the decision.

This is only the third time, I am told, since the early 1930's when a major corporation—and that includes major corporations in the United States of America, with the air traffic controllers being one of the three—this is the third time we have had a permanent replacement of strikers of this magnitude.

Our whole tradition is against it. It is very interesting that this Japanese-owned corporation cannot do in Japan what they are doing in Oklahoma and Illinois and Iowa and Ohio and Indiana. It would be illegal for them to do it in Japan, and they are doing it here, contrary to our traditions. It is illegal to do it in Canada or all of Western Europe, except for Great Britain.

I think that the company is making a great mistake. I have been around public life for a while—I am 66 years old. I have observed a little, and I have noted when this pendulum swings too far to one side, pretty soon

the pendulum is going to swing too far to the other side, and that is the danger in labor/management relations in this country. It is a danger for Bridgestone/Firestone.

I heard my colleague from Iowa say the other day that he would not buy any Firestone tires. Believe me, I am certainly not going to buy any Firestone tires, and I think there are going to be a lot of people in the United States who are going to feel the same way.

The sensible thing is to sit down and negotiate. I have, Mr. President, over the years been involved in some labor/management negotiations. Sometimes it gets tough, but getting people together around a table, sooner or later—a little bit like a conference committee between the House and the Senate—sooner or later you get something worked out. That is what Bridgestone/Firestone should do, not dismiss 2,300 employees. They ought to sit down and try to work things out. That is the American tradition.

I note that the Wall Street Journal, in an article about the chief executive of Bridgestone, refers to him as a bulldog, that he is a born gambler. Well, he is gambling with something that is very important. He is gambling with his company's future. He is gambling with labor/management relations in this country. He is gambling with the lives of 2,300 workers and their families. I hope common sense prevails, and I hope the Japanese Prime Minister gets the message that we who have spoken on the floor of the Senate have nothing but good will toward Japan. I respect that country. I might add, I grew up in the State of Oregon—something I do not stress in the State of Illinois—but I grew up in the State of Oregon. My father was a Lutheran minister and, in 1942, stood up when Japanese-Americans were taken away from the west coast. That was my first real experience in civil rights. I was 13 years old then. I remember the hostility that my father received on that occasion.

I do not want to sour United States-Japan relations. I want an improved relationship. I think the Japanese Prime Minister would be wise to get a message to the chief executive of Bridgestone: sit down and try to iron this thing out.

I yield back my time to my colleague. And, again, I thank him for his leadership on this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six and a half minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Illinois, again, for his strong support for trying to inject some sanity and some reasonableness into these negotiations to try to settle this strike at Bridgestone/Firestone.

I want to say to my friends, whether they are watching in the Japanese Embassy, or to Prime Minister Murayama, I want to echo what Senator SIMON said. The vast majority of Japanese companies operating in this country operate in a highly responsible, effective, compassionate manner with their workers. I have seen many of them and, in many cases, the workers are happier there than perhaps they are at other companies that are not Japanese.

I do not want to cast Bridgestone's actions as something true of every Japanese company. That is not true. Senator SIMON is right on the mark with that. For some reason, this seems to be some kind of a rogue company. But it is always that bad apple that can spoil the barrel, and that is what Bridgestone/Firestone is going to do. They are going to color with their insensitive, outrageous behavior all the other fine Japanese corporations that are doing a good job in this country. I would hate to see that happen. I know the Senator from Illinois would hate to see that happen, too.

That is the message, I think, that we want the Japanese Prime Minister to take back with him. It is not just this one company and you can ignore it. This will have ramifications over and beyond just that one company.

Mr. President, I read from the letter from Sherrie Wallace who worked at Firestone 33 years. Her husband also worked there. Let me read one final paragraph. I will not read the whole letter. She said:

You see, we are one of those families that both husband and wife work at Bridgestone/Firestone in Des Moines, IA. We both have lost our jobs, our benefits and our livelihood. We have had days and nights of no sleep, wondering where our life is heading. Trying to keep the "American Dream" alive with dignity, conviction to stand up for what you believe in and hope.

Please hear our plead for help. \* \* \* Over 25,000 employees, spouses and children will be affected by this one \* \* \* incident.

So, Mr. President, I hope that the Japanese Prime Minister will heed this.

As I pointed out last year, Goodyear Tire and Rubber reached an agreement with its workers, and they were chosen to set the pattern for the industry. Well, they did. Now Bridgestone/Firestone has come in and said they want to break that pattern.

One can understand if, in fact, the workers are not productive, but as Sherrie Wallace pointed out in her letter, they have become highly productive. In fact, in March 1994, workers at Bridgestone/Firestone U.S. reached a new high of 80.5 pounds per man-hour and set an all-time record for pounds warehoused, and the company boasts that it did it with 600 fewer workers.

So it is not a problem of either they are not making money or that the workers are not productive. Just the opposite is true.

What Bridgestone/Firestone is saying effectively is that their workers are no more than pieces of machinery, to be

used, depreciated and then thrown out on the trash heap without any concern for their families or years of service.

But there is an option, and let this be the final warning to Bridgestone/Firestone. I will read a letter to the editor of the Des Moines Register by a farmer by the name of Joe Weisshaar:

A quick inventory tells me that my tractors, trucks, wagons, combine and cars roll on more than 140 tires. My vow to Bridgestone/Firestone is that if this strike is not settled within 30 days, I will never buy another tire made by them.

That is just one farmer's view from the State of Iowa.

I guess that ought to be the message sent to Bridgestone/Firestone. Our consumers have a choice, and if we have to and if Bridgestone/Firestone will not settle this in a decent manner, if they will not sit down, if they will not even speak to the Secretary of Labor, then maybe what the people of this country ought to do is just start rolling along another brand of tires. And Bridgestone-Firestone ought to know that we have that option.

So, Mr. President, I urge the Japanese Prime Minister to take the message we are sending back to the head of Bridgestone/Firestone, urge him to reconsider his unfortunate decision, and to reopen in good faith negotiations with their workers. It would not only be in the best interests of the workers and their families and communities, but also the relations between our nations and the good will that is so important to maintain.

Mr. President, I yield back whatever time I have. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. 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. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

#### UNFUNDED MANDATES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we will soon in this Chamber turn to unfunded mandates bill, which is a piece of legislation that has been worked on by the Governmental Affairs Committee and by many Members of this Chamber. I wanted today to say a few words about that legislation to try to indicate why I support generally the subject, why I have worked on it in the Governmental Affairs Committee, and why I think it is important that we pass the legislation, but also why I think at the same time we ought to talk about all dimensions of this issue and why I intend to offer several amendments to it.

First of all, it is absolutely true that it has been far too easy for Members of