

Mr. President, in light of this tragedy let us honor the thousands of men and women in the foreign service who ask little from us, but contribute a lot. And let us pray for the speedy recovery of Mark McCloy, and for the friends and families of those who, yesterday, gave their lives in service to their country.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCIS-SIONS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will 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 expenditure 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 331

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pending is amendment No. 331, offered by the Senator from Kansas, to committee amendment beginning on page 1, line 3.

The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, if I may speak for a few moments. I spoke last night, when I offered my amendment, about what I regarded as an exceptionally important issue. I would like to go through some of those same arguments again for those who might not have been in their offices or on the floor last night.

I offered an amendment that would prevent the President's Executive order on striker replacements from taking effect. I offered the amendment because I am deeply troubled by the precedents that will be set by this Executive order.

This is not a debate about whether there should or should not be the opportunity to replace striking workers with permanent replacement workers.

As we debate this amendment, Mr. President, we will hear a great deal on both sides about the use of permanent replacements. In my view, a ban on permanent replacements will upset the fundamental balance in management-labor relations that has existed now for 60 years. We have debated this issue for

three Congresses now, and I know there are strongly held views on both sides.

That is not the only issue that is at stake here. The central issue before Members this morning is whether our national labor policy should be determined by executive fiat rather than by an act of Congress. I think this is an enormously important question, Mr. President, because it really does set a precedent that we should consider carefully.

By limiting the rights of Federal contractors to hire permanent replacements, the President has, in effect, overturned 60 years of Federal labor law with the stroke of a pen. I am not a constitutional scholar. But I do know that it is the President's role to enforce the laws, not to make them. By issuing this Executive order, the President has, in my view, overstepped his bounds.

For the first time, to my knowledge, the President has issued an Executive order that contravenes current law. The order will effectively prohibit one group, Federal contractors, from taking action that every other company is legally permitted to do under current law.

Regardless of what one thinks about the merits of the striker replacement issue, we should all be concerned about the precedent that this order will set. For example, what if a President decided to debar Federal contractors whose workers decided to go on strike?

Mr. President, the right to strike is legal, just as the right to hire permanent replacement workers for striking workers is legal. So it could eventually affect both sides of the coin if indeed we are going to start down this slippery slope.

Supporters of the President's action should think twice about the precedent this will set for future administrations that wish to alter labor law through the Federal procurement process. We will hear in the course of this debate that this Executive order is nothing new, that such orders were issued by previous administrations. The fact is that none of those Executive orders ran contrary to established labor law.

For example, President Bush issued an Executive order to enforce the Supreme Court's Beck decision. That order merely required employers to post a notice to employees informing them of the law. Its purpose was to enforce the law as set by Congress and interpreted by the courts.

No one's rights were infringed. No congressional policy was violated. No new rights were established. No existing rights were taken away. By contrast, this new Executive order overturns a legal right that has existed for 60 years and undermines the existing framework of our Federal labor law which Congress, for decades, has declined to change.

Mr. President, we all have sympathy for the situations occurring in plants today where there have been long ongoing strikes. We have sympathy for the

hardships striking workers face. But I am a strong supporter of the collective bargaining process. If indeed we tie one hand behind our back, whether it is for strikers or for employers, we have harmed the collective bargaining process.

I urge my colleagues to look at the fine print of this Executive order. It sets out a new and unprecedented enforcement and regulatory scheme, all without the slightest input of Congress. The Executive order gives the Secretary of Labor the power to determine violations of the order, a power which Congress in similar circumstances has delegated to the National Labor Relations Board.

In addition, the Executive order gives the Secretary of Labor authority to write new regulations on who will be subject to the order. Not only does the Executive order circumvent Congress by making a new law, it also creates more new regulations.

According to the Washington Post today, at least part of the administration's motivation for issuing the Executive order stems from recent strikes such as Bridgestone/Firestone Co. We can all appreciate the emotions and upheavals that occur in any labor dispute. They are troubling to each and every one of us whether it occurs in our State or not. Just weeks ago the Senate overwhelmingly rejected a sense-of-the-Senate resolution urging intervention in the Bridgestone dispute.

Here again, the administration has chosen to go around Congress by this Executive order. Many on both sides feel quite strongly about the issue of striker replacements. I believe existing law provides an appropriate balance between the interests of management and labor. But we will also hear from those who oppose this amendment because they believe that using striker replacements is inherently unfair.

That issue will be debated, I am sure, at another time. We have done so in the past. Mr. President, that misses the point. Regardless of what we believe about striker replacements, it is up to Congress and not the President to set our national labor policy through legislation. We should not relinquish that authority by permitting this Executive order to stand.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I strongly support the amendment being offered by the Labor and Human Resources Committee Chairwoman, Senator KASSEBAUM, which would prohibit funding for the implementation of the President's Executive order which was signed yesterday.

What does that Executive order do? It bars Federal contractors from hiring permanent replacement workers during an economic strike. A similar prohibition has already been included in the FEMA supplemental appropriation bill which is pending in the House.

In the event of a finding that permanent replacement workers are used in