

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 AP- PROPRIATIONS 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 expeditate 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.