

something that can be gleaned from a briefing book. It must come from, as Plato might have said, the examined life. For Senator COHEN, the examined life is the only life worth living, and this philosophy is reflected in his public service.

Indeed, one might say that when it comes to values like honesty, integrity, and fairness, BILL COHEN helped write the book.

In the Senate, Senator COHEN has been there to defend the defenseless. He has been a compassionate pragmatist who believes, as I do, that we can balance the budget and still have room for humanity. As Woodrow Wilson once said, "The firm basis of government is justice not pity," and in that spirit BILL COHEN believes that we should help give people a hand up, not a hand out. And with boundless optimism and in the best Republican tradition, he believes in the power and potential of the individual. BILL said it best in a speech he gave on the Senate floor: "Is there anything more un-American than to deny a human being the chance to be the best he or she can be?"

Indeed, there is a common thread that runs through BILL COHEN'S career in government. In 1963, Martin Luther King, Jr., wrote, "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." It is upon that fundamental principal that Senator COHEN has based his work, and the yardstick against which he measures our quality of life—and Government—in America.

In a passionate speech he gave in the wake of the 1992 Los Angeles riots, BILL was typically eloquent and straightforward when he said: "If we expect people to be guided by the rule of law and the hand of justice, then justice must be done. * * * We who hold positions of honor and responsibility as lawmakers have an absolute duty to see to it that laws we pass are carried out with fairness and with complete impartiality."

Senator COHEN has been a tireless champion for justice, whether for seniors, minorities, women, and even the U.S. Government. In fact, especially the U.S. Government. BILL believes in the system—and he does not take lightly to that system being tarnished by corruption, waste, or special privileges. He was there to champion lobbying reform; he was there to ensure that criminal wrongdoing by public servants would not be tolerated; and he was there to strengthen the code of ethics for all who are entrusted with the public good.

BILL has also long been a respected and expert voice on intelligence and defense issues. As chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower and as former chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, BILL'S leadership role at a key time in history laid the groundwork for many of the successes we enjoy today—from keeping communism at bay, to helping bring about the end of the cold war.

Throughout it all, the political battles, the tough votes, the late-night

sessions, BILL COHEN never forgot where he came from. Since 1969, when he was first elected to public office as the mayor of Bangor, ME people have put their trust in BILL COHEN. He has never failed that trust. He has never failed to honor us with his service and he has never failed to make us all proud to call him Senator. I have certainly been proud to call him Senator, even senior Senator, but I feel even more privileged to be able to call him my friend.

BILL set the standard in modern Maine politics for all of us to follow. Indeed, if we ever had any hope of being successful, we had to follow it. And his advice and wise guidance over the years has been invaluable to me. I will forever appreciate the kindness he has shown. He has been a colleague, a mentor, and an inspiration, and I will miss him.

Mr. President, as Senator COHEN is about to embark on an exciting and fulfilling new journey, I wish him nothing but the best. But know this: This institution, his State, and this country, will miss him dearly because he has been, as an editorial once said, "as close to the ideal definition of a public servant as one can get."

DEPARTING SENATORS

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I also would like to add my sentiments about the number of individuals who are departing the Senate on both sides of the aisle, all of whom have contributed greatly to this country and to their States and brought us great honor, all of whom have reflected the ideals the American people rightfully expect from their elected officials. I know it is going to be a great loss to this institution, to lose the kind of individuals who have represented what, I think, is the best of what is in America, and the best of what their States have represented.

I wish them all well. I am certainly sorry to see them all go. But I want to say they have certainly served their State and their country with honor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business, with a 5-minute limit on speeches.

SYRIAN TROOP MOVEMENTS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, like most Americans, I have watched the events of the past several days in the

Middle East with great concern. Through a series of miscalculations, the fragile peace process, which so many of us support and were hoping would be successful, seems to have been threatened by renewed violence.

As a strong supporter of Israel, I hope a reopening of the constructive dialog has been achieved in the White House in the past 24 or 36 hours. And I hope as well that both Israel and Palestinian leaders will renew their commitment to peace.

As they attempt to resolve their immediate differences, I urge Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat to act in good faith and with restraint, although I have to say, after having had a lengthy meeting with Mr. Arafat just a few weeks ago on the Gaza, I did not observe much restraint.

So often, dramatic events in one district of the world draw attention from some of the other things that are going on. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the concern that I have over other things that are taking place in that region of the world. I wish to call to my colleague's attention, current actions being taken by Syria, actions which may prove to be an even greater threat to the security of Israel and the stability of the Middle East.

A very dangerous game is being played by Syrian President Hafez Assad on the Golan Heights. For the past month, Syria has been conducting a series of troop movements along Israel's northern border, which will enable Syria to quickly launch an attack on Israel. Syria has redeployed up to 12,000 troops from in and around Beirut to within striking distance of the Golan Heights. This is the first significant manipulation of military forces since the Madrid Conference convened 5 years ago to initiate the peace process.

Only by standing on the edge of the Golan, which I have done many times, and I am sure the Senator presiding has also, can you get the full impact of the strategic significance of the Golan.

The Syrian troop movements is just the latest in a series of destabilizing actions by Assad. Despite repeated invitations for Prime Minister Netanyahu, Assad has refused to renew peace talks with Israel. Syria still harbors some 10 anti-Israel terrorist organizations in Damascus. Syria also supports the anti-Turkish, anti-Jordanian terrorists, and let's not forget Syria's destabilization of Lebanon with over 40,000 Syrian troops supporting Hezbollah terrorists.

Mr. President, the Syrian troop movements are additionally menacing in light of a serious surprise attack on Israel during the observance of Yom Kippur, the Jewish day of atonement in 1973.

In 1973, Syrian commando units were used to attack Israeli positions on Mt. Hermon during Yom Kippur, the day of fasting prayer and introspection, which was observed in Israel just last Monday. Syrian troop movements could force a dangerous escalation by virtue

of the implied threat to Israel of their forward positions.

In the most recent redeployment, which took place just last week, special forces were moved to forward positions on the Syrian side of Mt. Hermon. These movements are most disturbing and significantly change the military picture. It was a similar force which captured an Israeli outpost on Mt. Hermon in 1973. They were only dislodged after heavy loss of life.

Mr. President, an editorial published in a recent Near East report outlines the threat to Israel of these recent Syrian actions.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

TRouBLING SYRIAN TROOP MOVEMENTS

For several weeks, Syrian troops have been moving from the Beirut area to Lebanon's Bekaa Valley, close to Israeli positions on the Golan Heights. The New York Times (Sept. 18) said Israel and the U.S. are particularly concerned about the movement of crack Syrian commandos near Israeli listening posts on Mount Hermon, given that the 1973 Yom Kippur War began with a Syrian commando attack on Mount Hermon.

In its September 18 lead story, Ha'aretz reports that an intelligence assessment (presented in recent days to Prime Minister Netanyahu against the background of the troop movements) says that, while there are no signs indicating an immediate outbreak of hostilities, "the probability of war with Syria is no longer low." (In recent years, IDF intelligence assessments have said there is "a low probability" of such a war.)

The biggest military advantage Syria could gain from the latest troop movement would be a reduction in the time needed to move from a defensive to an attacking posture. "The main concern is not that the Syrians will try to attack the Galilee, but will try a quick capture of some key point, like Mt. Hermon. This evaluation is based largely on the nature of the Syrian forces sighted in the area: special commando units trained to engage in swift raids," wrote Ha'aretz intelligence expert Yossi Melman (Sep. 18).

While the Syrian movements are troubling, their significance should not be exaggerated. Israel and Syria have reportedly exchanged "pacifying messages" aimed at heading off a confrontation. Foreign Minister David Levy and U.S. Ambassador to Lebanon Richard Jones are said to be involved in calming things.

"I don't see anything particularly alarming in the redeployment," Jones said, adding that a military confrontation between Syria and Israel "seems pretty far-fetched" (Reuters, Sep. 17).

Prime Minister Netanyahu told the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee: "Syria's intention is evidently to put psychological pressure on Israel and its new government. And, when pressure is applied to you, the main thing is don't get pressured."

Syria's bullying tactics come at a particularly inopportune time—just as Washington and Jerusalem have been working tirelessly to arrive at a new formula for resuming Israeli-Syrian talks. Damascus would do well to jettison the questionable threats and troop movements in favor of re-engaging in serious negotiations with Israel.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, if I can address one other subject very briefly since we are coming to the end of this session. I noticed an article in the current Reader's Digest. I happen to be one who has such respect for the Reader's Digest.

I was involved with a story 2 years ago with them. It took them 9 months to write the story. Everything is authenticated and documented in a way I don't know any other publication would equal. They were talking about ballistic missiles that increasingly will be used by hostile states and is a real serious problem.

We have stood on the floor of this Senate over and over and over again to try to address this problem, to make the people of America aware that we are probably in a more threatened position today than we have been in this country's history. They point out some things I had not thought about, putting it in proper context.

They said there are five reasons why the Nation must take steps to defend itself:

First, the ballistic missiles are proliferating. More than 20 nations are in the ballistic missile club, as they call it. Others are knocking on the door. This is something we have been saying over and over again. In fact, it has been 2 years since the former CIA Director, the first one under President Clinton, said that we know of somewhere between 25 and 30 nations that currently either have developed, or are in the final stages of developing, weapons of mass destruction, either biological, chemical, or nuclear.

This former CIA Director identifies five nations—Libya, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and North Korea—whose aggressive programs to arm missiles with nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons could threaten the United States.

The second thing they talk about is that missile range and accuracy are increasing rapidly. I suggest, Mr. President, that the reason for this is partly our fault because of what we have done in satellite technology.

I had occasion to become the first Member of Congress to fly a small airplane around the world a couple of years ago. I used that satellite technology. I never lost the satellite all the way around the world. Because of that, there is no way of guarding against other uses, and that means, through our global positioning system, other nations have incredible accuracy, and this is something that has to be taken into consideration.

The third point is warheads of mass destruction are within reach of many new missile powers.

We were shocked when we found out and discovered at the end of the gulf war that Saddam Hussein had a huge biochemical arsenal. Hundreds of tons were destroyed by the U.N. observers. We have no way of knowing where else in the world this could be happening.

The fourth point is, defense against ballistic missile attack is a practical

reality. It is for political, not technological, reasons that the U.S. Government has chosen not to build a missile defense. I think that is very significant.

We not long ago debated the START II Treaty and we did, in fact, approve that from this body. I think I was the first one, the only one, who voted against it until later in the vote when three others joined. My argument was we were going back to accepting the confinements and restrictions that were imposed upon us in the 1972 ABM Treaty, which at that time didn't make sense to me, but it made more sense than it does today, because that was a bilateral treaty with a country that no longer exists, which says, "If you don't defend yourself, we will agree not to defend ourselves," therefore, that is a policy that offers some security.

I never really believed it did. However, it is now pointed out by more and more people that that policy was flawed initially and certainly is not one that today makes any sense. In fact, it was Dr. Henry Kissinger, who was the architect of the ABM Treaty in 1972, who said, "It is nuts to make a virtue out of your vulnerability."

So that is our posture today, where we are. The last thing they said is the longer we wait, the less time we may have.

We had an NIA estimate not too long ago, a national intelligence estimate, that many of us felt was flawed in many ways. I think it told the President what the President wanted to hear. It came to the conclusion that there is no threat out there for the next 15 years. I think there are many problems with this. First of all, they talk about the continental United States. I agreed with James Woolsey the other day when he said the last time he checked, Hawaii and Alaska were part of the United States.

The article also points out that it fails to mention that both Russia and China have ICBM's right now that have the capability of reaching the United States, along with the weapons of mass destruction.

I remember President Clinton saying in the House Chamber during his State of the Union Message that there is not a single Russian missile pointed at America's children. The head of the Russian strategic missile forces told CBS news on "60 Minutes" that his ICBM's could be retargeted in a matter of minutes. I think it is a great disservice to the American people for the President to try to imply that the threat is not out there.

Mr. President, many of the people in the intelligence community throughout the world have said that the United States of America is facing a greater threat today than we have faced since the Revolutionary War. I am deeply distressed that the President has been able to convince many of the American people that the threat is not out there, and I intend, certainly during this recess, to do all I can to be, if nothing