

That is what Senator DOLE was trying to do with the Defend America Act today. That is what Senator WALLOP, who was one of the real leaders in trying to develop strategic defense initiative for years, was trying to do. We have a significant investment that this country has made, and now we have an administration that says: We do not think there will be a threat for 15 years, so let us not do anything. Or let us develop missile systems, and we will pay for three-fourths of it in Israel because, politically, that is popular.

Why is it not popular in the United States if we want to help Israel defend itself? I was in Israel prior to the Persian Gulf war, and I urged the administration to get Patriot missiles over there to shoot down the Scuds. It partially worked. But the Patriot is certainly not good enough for an ICBM. We can develop systems to shoot down incoming missiles before they get in our back yards. We should do it. If it is an investment of a couple of billion dollars, or \$4 billion, or \$31 billion over the next 14 years, that is a good investment for protecting the American people, our interests and our cities. We should do it.

Yet, unfortunately, our colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle say, no, they are going to protect President Clinton and play politics. President Clinton does not want it, so we are not going to do it. I think that is a serious, serious mistake. We should not play politics with the security of the American people and American interests. I am afraid that is what happened today. I regret that decision.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, once again I rise in support of the pending proposal to amend the U.S. Constitution to require a balanced Federal budget. The reason is quite simple. After all of the turmoil of this past year, after all of the posturing and the pandering and the promises and the Government shutdowns, Congress and the President have not come to an agreement to balance the Federal budget. Short of a constitutional requirement, I have serious doubts that the Congress and the President will do so.

Admittedly, there is some political Presidential posturing going on with this impending vote. The majority leader, who is his party's presumptive Presidential nominee, is calling up this

vote knowing full well that he does not have the necessary two-thirds majority. On the other hand, the President is proudly stating to the public that his efforts in his deficit reduction plan have resulted in reducing the annual deficit from when he took office from \$294 billion to nearly \$130 billion this year. He has invited the majority leader to the White House for further negotiations on balancing the budget.

When the majority leader leaves, I hope that the new majority leader will be extended an invitation to go to the White House and to go through negotiations and settle the differences.

In actual dollars and cents, I believe that over the 7-year period there is something in the neighborhood of \$12 trillion involved in the budget process, and the difference between the White House's and the Republican Party's position is only \$100 billion. That is less than 0.8 of 1 percent. And that difference we ought to be able to resolve, get together and work out.

However, this is a political year. We must recognize that. The Senate has just completed action on a \$1.6 trillion budget resolution proposed by the majority party which seeks to balance the budget by 2002 with a combination of tax and spending cuts. I supported a proposal submitted by the President which also called for a balanced budget and would achieve a balanced budget, but contained fewer tax cuts and less cutting of the Medicare Program. However, this proposal was not adopted.

The Senate and the House must settle their differences in regard to the budget figures, and then the Appropriations Committees must act, and a reconciliation bill must be passed. All of this must be signed by the President. It is going to be a long, hot summer here in Washington while the rest of the country simmers at our inaction.

The budget process is not easy, as we have learned from last year. It does not guarantee that the President and the Congress will enact a balanced Federal budget. We have seen this, gone through Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and other proposals which tried to achieve a balanced budget. But all of these have come up wanting. That is one of the reasons why I feel that we need the discipline which a constitutional amendment will provide.

I believe that most of my colleagues are well intentioned and want to enact balanced budgets for the benefit of generations of Americans yet to be born. Unfortunately, I have seen in my Senate career—some 18 years that I have been here—that we can often find an easy excuse for not fulfilling our commitment to deliver a balanced budget each year.

There is a way out of the thicket right now in regard to the adoption of the constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. A handful of Senators, I think as many as eight, have indicated they would vote for the constitutional amendment if a compromise can be reached with regard to the Social Security issue.

This compromise would not allow Social Security trust fund revenues to be used when calculating whether the budget is balanced. Admittedly, this will make balancing the Federal budget more difficult because the Social Security trust fund surpluses will no longer be used to mask the true size of the deficit.

A constitutional amendment will remove all doubt, regardless of whether we reach any compromise pertaining to Social Security trust funds or not. A constitutional amendment will remove all doubt, and the Federal Government will have to balance its budget. The process will still be difficult, but it will be necessary to achieve the final goal as required by this proposed amendment to the Constitution.

Amending the Constitution, in my judgment, is a last-resort method which should be utilized sparingly and only when the national interest so demands. I am often asked to cosponsor worthy proposals to amend the Constitution, but I rarely do so under the test that I have just mentioned.

The balanced budget amendment meets that test. The national interest demands that we act to allow the States the opportunity to ratify the proposed amendment. They may not do so. And if that is the case, then the will of the American people will have been spoken. Therein is the genius of our Nation's organic document. Ultimately, the sovereign power of the Government rests with the people.

These will perhaps be my last comments—or perhaps not my last comments on this, but among my last words on this great issue. Further, the first bill I introduced when I came to Congress was a bill calling for a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. I truly believe that on behalf of the generations of Americans yet unborn, this proposed amendment is necessary to prevent them from inheriting an even greater debt than they now most certainly will incur.

Politics aside, now is the time to act, once and for all.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATO ENLARGEMENT FACILITATION ACT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, earlier today I think Senator BROWN of Colorado in my behalf and in behalf of others introduced the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act.

I am certainly pleased to be joined by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, Senator BROWN—who has been a real leader on this issue—the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and a number of

other colleagues. This legislation is intended to expedite the transition to full NATO membership of emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe. This bill builds on earlier bipartisan legislation, such as the NATO Participation Act of 1994, which reflects the strong bipartisan support for the policy of enlarging the NATO alliance. NATO has expanded its membership on three occasions, each time enhancing security and stability in Europe. Bringing eligible Central and Eastern European nations into NATO will serve that same critical purpose. For nearly 4 years, the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe have sought to protect their freedom and independence by becoming members—full members—of Western institutions, especially NATO. They have repeatedly petitioned for membership. Moreover, they have seized every opportunity for such association, proving their flexibility and seriousness. They have become partners for peace, but they desire to become real members of a real alliance. The need for a more inclusive, more effective atlantic alliance that would respond to present security needs has been clear at least since violent aggression began in the former Yugoslavia—where the world witnessed the ineffective response of the United Nations, the European Community, the Western European Union, NATO, and the United States.

Since that time, it became clear that the elaborate architecture of European security developed during the cold war era was, and is, not up to the challenges of the post-cold-war world.

Meanwhile, the window of opportunity for consolidation of new freedoms, independence, and security is closing. Forging new relationships and new institutions is increasingly difficult and controversial. In my view, further delays will undermine the governments and confidence of people recently freed from the expansionist ambitions of aggressive neighbors. Yet, the Clinton administration has acted as if time were not a factor—as if there were no threats to the independence of the newly self-governing democracies.

Secretary Christopher in a recent speech stated that the administration's policy was "slow, but deliberate." I believe the administration's policy is deliberately slow. The Clinton administration has consistently avoided concrete steps toward NATO enlargement—studying and discussing, but not acting. Mr. President, this legislation is designed to facilitate NATO enlargement by providing targeted security assistance for those countries most likely to become eligible to join NATO. The NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act creates a \$60 million assistance program composed of Foreign Military Financing [FMF] loan and grant programs and the International Military Education and Training [IMET] program. This legislation declares Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic eligible for this assistance and authorizes

the President to designate others as they meet the criteria in current law.

This legislation, however, does not name countries to be NATO members. That is a decision for the alliance to take. This legislation seeks to make up for time lost due to a lack of U.S. leadership. It is also important to note that this bill is a beginning, not an endpoint. Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary will likely be the first countries in Central and Eastern Europe to join NATO—not the last. Finally, this legislation should not be interpreted as a lessening of U.S. interests in close ties with other countries in the region. The freedom and security of all of Europe's new democracies are a big concern to us.

I believe that the United States and NATO must act decisively—before the window of opportunity closes. When the Bush administration was confronted with the challenge of German reunification, Western leaders swiftly reached agreement on policy and acted resolutely to achieve it.

As with German reunification, the act of including Central and Eastern European democracies in NATO is not and cannot reasonably be seen as an affront—much less a threat—to any other country, least of all Russia. All actual and potential members of the NATO alliance share an interest in a peaceable, democratic Russia. Furthermore, the United States has a distinct national interest in a firm security relationship with Russia. Any United States Government should, and we expect, will work cooperatively with a democratic Russia for the consolidation of security in Europe—but not by denying NATO membership to Europe's new democracies.

Mr. President, NATO enlargement has enjoyed bipartisan support since the end of the cold war. I hope that all of my colleagues will support this legislation in that same bipartisan spirit.

Let me say that we also, of course, addressed in our press conference earlier today, when we were honored to have former President Lech Węsela of Poland with us, that no countries are named. It is very likely that the first three countries invited will be Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. Though we have not forgotten the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and other Central and Eastern European countries when they have complied and when they have been selected by NATO.

So my view is that we have had the good beginning. The former President of Poland was very impressed, and he feels that we may now be on the way to achieving something that has been eluding these freedom loving people for a number of years.

TRIBUTE TO HOWELL HEFLIN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it has been my practice as Senator Republican leader to pay tribute to colleagues who are retiring from the Senate.

Usually, these remarks are delivered shortly before the Senate adjourns for the year.

However, my announcement of 2 weeks ago that I will also be leaving the Senate has moved up my time schedule.

In the coming days, then, I will be devoting some of my leader time to share a few memories of those of our colleagues who will not return to this Chamber when the 105th Congress convenes next January.

Let me start with a friend of all of us, Senator HOWELL HEFLIN of Alabama.

For 18 years, HOWELL HEFLIN has represented Alabama with distinction here in the U.S. Senate. But to many here in this Chamber, and to countless Alabamans, it is not "Senator" HEFLIN, it is "judge" HEFLIN.

Prior to his arrival in the Senate, judge HEFLIN served for 6 years as chief justice of the Alabama Supreme Court, earning a reputation for fairness and common sense. It's a reputation that has continued through his service here in the Senate.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator HEFLIN has become known, in the words of the almanac of American politics, as "a careful lawyer who picks at the rules of law with the delicate touch of a watch repairman."

It took someone with that touch to successfully revise America's bankruptcy laws, as Senator HEFLIN did in 1994.

Alabama, like Kansas, is a State with a strong agriculture heritage, and I have enjoyed serving with Senator Heflin on the Agriculture Committee, and learning a great deal from him about issues ranging from peanuts to the boll weevil.

But as I reflect back on our 18-year friendship, the one incident that remains most clearly in my mind was Senator HEFLIN's vote authorizing President Bush to use force to remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. Senator HEFLIN was 1 of 11 Senate Democrats who has the courage to break with their leadership and stand with the President. History will always reflect that this was the right decision and that had the 52 to 47 vote gone differently, it would have been a tremendous blow to America's prestige.

Elizabeth and I are proud to call HOWELL and "MIKE" HEFLIN our friends, and we wish them many more years of health and happiness as they return to the state they love so much and have served so well.

TRIBUTE TO CLAIBORNE PELL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, "I am less dynamic than many," Senator CLAIBORNE PELL once said in his typical quiet manner, "But I have my own course, which I set and try to follow."

For six terms, CLAIBORNE PELL has followed that course in representing America's smallest State in terms of geography with a commitment and dedication that is anything but small.