and, indeed, Congress had declined to enact an antidiscrimination law proposed by President Truman.

In 1964, President Johnson issued an Executive order prohibiting Federal contractors from discriminating on the basis of age. At the time, Federal law permitted such age discrimination. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 merely directed the President to study the issue.

In 1969, the Nixon administration expanded the antidiscrimination Executive order to encompass a requirement that all Federal contractors adopt affirmative action programs. This Executive order was upheld by the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

In 1978, President Carter issued an Executive order requiring all federal contractors to comply with certain guidelines limiting the amount of wage increases. The D.C. Circuit Court upheld President Carter's Executive order.

Finally, in 1992 President Bush issued an Executive order requiring unionized Federal contractors to notify their unionized employees of their right to refuse to pay union dues. The National Labor Relations Act contains no such requirement and legislation proposing this in the 101st Congress was not passed.

The economical and efficient administration and completion of Federal Government contracts requires a stable and productive labor-management environment. Strikes involving permanent replacements last seven times longer than strikes that do not involve permanent replacements.

Mr. President, my personal interest in this amendment is its impact on the most vulnerable and fastest growing segment of our work force—American women.

Over the last decade, women have assumed ever greater economic and family caretaking responsibilities. Everyone in this country should be unsettled by the fact that women and children are most likely to fall deeper into poverty and homelessness. One of three families headed by a women lives to or below the poverty line: Nearly 70 percent of all working women earned less than $20,000 a year, and 40 percent earned less than $10,000 annually. These workers need the ability to raise their standard of living in order to break the cycle of poverty and welfare dependence which many of them endure.

These women understand that they cannot bargain effectively unless they are assured that they do not risk losing their jobs permanently. They understand the serious implications of a strike. They understand, as I do, the fear of being one paycheck away from economic disaster.

Most of us have home mortgages, car payments, educational and medical needs for ourselves and our families. America's workers know striking is the option of last resort. This action is never taken lightly.

I urge my colleagues to maintain the delicate balance of collective bargaining. This Executive order shows that this great society values the individual, that it cares about women, and it recognizes those that built this Nation. Let us defeat this amendment and prove to America that Government does respect the needs of ordinary working people.

I thank the President. I yield the floor.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Senate Resolution 105, adopted April 13, 1989, as amended by Senate Resolution 280, adopted October 8, 1994, announces the appointment of the following Senators as members of the Senate Arms Control Observer Group: The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

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

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

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I send a motion to invoke cloture to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Kassebaum amendment No. 331 to the committee amendment to H.R. 889, the supplemental appropriations bill.

Trent Lott, Pete V. Domenici, Bob Packwood, Mark Hatfield, Bob Smith, Slade Gorton, Connie Mack, Judd Gregg, Bob Dole, Thad Cochran, Ted Stevens, Frank H. Murkowski, Don Nickles, John McCain, Phil Gramm, Nancy Landon Kassebaum.

MORNING BUSINESS

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT—AN ISSUE OF PRINCIPLE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, during the past several weeks I have been contacted on the subject of the constitutional amendment to balance the budget by nearly 10,000 Americans—most, but not all of them, North Dakotans. I know people felt strongly on all sides of this issue. I respect these different viewpoints, and I appreciate the opportunity to give my colleagues some information and background about why I voted as I did.

And I want to start by saying simply this: I have an unwavering commitment to balancing this Nation's budget, and that commitment is a longstanding one—dating back to the first vote I cast in favor of a constitutional amendment a dozen years ago, in 1982.

That was during my first term in Congress. Since that time I have voted for balanced budget amendments again and again. I voted ''yes'' in 1990 and in 1992, after the huge deficits created during the 1980's and early 1990's caused the Federal debt to explode to $4 trillion.

Last year I voted for it yet again. But I cast that vote with the firm assurance from the leading proponents of the amendment that Social Security trust funds would not be used to balance the budget.

This year in the Senate we cast two votes on constitutional amendments. I voted for the earlier of the two, Senator FEINSTEIN's substitute constitutional amendment to balance the budget. It was identical in every respect to the main constitutional amendment proposal offered by Senators HATCH and SIMON except for one important difference. It included a provision prohibiting use of the Social Security trust fund to balance the Federal budget. That proposal failed.

During the 2 days following that vote, I was involved in negotiations to try to get the sponsors of the Hatch-Simon amendment to modify their proposal so it would not result in raiding Social Security trust funds to balance the budget. Our negotiations were ultimately unsuccessful, and I therefore cast a ''no'' vote on that amendment.

The issue for me is one of principle—not politics. I felt it was important to stand up and fight for that principle, and that is what I did. I know the popular thing to do would have been to vote for this constitutional amendment. But if we are going to change the Constitution then we need to do that the right way. And in my mind, protecting the Social Security trust fund is the right way.

We collect Social Security taxes to fund the Social Security system with a dedicated tax out of the paychecks of workers. It is supposed to go into a trust fund. Those who would use that trust fund to balance the Federal budget, in my judgment, are involved in dishonest budgeting. And yet, that's exactly what the constitutional amendment would have done.

I know proponents protested publicly they had no intention of doing that, but in our private negotiations they admitted they could not balance the budget without Social Security trust funds. In fact, in private they said they wanted to use those funds for the next