I have been here too long. This was on the books.

There is not a single other law enforcement agency in the United States, when they come upon an open field and in plain view see something that gives them probable cause to believe there is a violation of the law—they go and do it. The only agency of the Federal Government that cannot is the INS. That is where we are. At least let us be realistic about what we have done. We retain it. That is the way it is. Move on to the next item of business.

But let us be totally candid. And let us not have anybody with their own opinion; let us all have our own facts. That was the law before 1986.

But I just want to add—since we were talking, I think, about the minimum wage for a moment—here is the one you want to keep in mind with the minimum wage and all you have heard all day long. This is from the New York Times of April 19, 1996. It is called ''Minimum Wage: A Portrait.'' Here is the portrait as compiled by the New York Times. There are three little items of interest.

Number of times in 1993 and 1994, when Democrats controlled Congress, that President Clinton mentioned in public his advocacy of a minimum wage increase: 0.

Next little item:

Number of times the President has done so in 1995 and 1996—through March 11—when Republicans have controlled Congress: 47.

Since March 11 there have probably been 47 more. Then finally:

Number of Congressional hearings Democrats held on the minimum wage in 1993 and 1994: 0.

Pure theater.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 3730 offered by the Senator from Wyoming. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 79, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 80 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Bryan	Johnston	Rockefeller
Byrd	Lautenberg	Simpson
Chafee	Levin	Stevens
Glenn	Lieberman	Thomas
Grassley	Murkowski	Thompson
Gregg	Nunn	Thurmond
Hollings	Reid	

NAYS—79

Abraham	Baucus	Bingaman
Akaka	Bennett	Bond
Ashcroft	Biden	Boxer
Bradley	Frist	McCain
Breaux	Gorton	McConnell
Brown	Graham	Mikulski
Bumpers	Gramm	Moseley-Braun
Burns	Grams	Moynihan
Campbell	Harkin	Murray
Coats	Hatch	Nickles
Cochran	Hatfield	Pell
Cohen	Helms	Pressler
Conrad	Hutchison	Pryor
Coverdell	Inhofe	Robb
Craig	Inouye	Roth
D'Amato	Jeffords	Santorum
Daschle	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
DeWine	Kempthorne	Shelby
Dodd	Kennedy	Simon
Dole	Kerrey	Smith
Domenici	Kerry	Snowe
Dorgan	Kohl	Specter
Exon	Kyl	Warner
Faircloth	Leahy	Wellstone
Feingold	Lott	Wyden
Feinstein	Lugar	
Ford	Mack	

NOT VOTING—1

Heflin

The amendment (No. 3730) was rejected.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1996

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, this has been cleared with the Democratic leader. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 175 regarding a 1-day extension of the continuing resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 175) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996 and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the measure be considered read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, that any statements relating to the measure be included in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 175) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator GRAHAM now be recognized for up to 15 minutes for debate on the continuing resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to be recorded as voting no on the continuing resolution.

Mr. President, nearly 1 month ago, after passing the 12th continuing resolution, we are now enacting the 13th continuing resolution. At the time we passed the 12th extension of the budget for fiscal year 1995, I said it was the last one that I would support.

Mr. President, I am here to keep my word. Frankly, the lack of leadership by this Congress is a national embarrassment. It is nearly 7 months into the fiscal year 1996, and we still do not have five budgets for five of the most important agencies of the Federal Government. This is no way for the world's largest economic entity to manage its resources.

It is almost as if the Congress has become addicted to this form of Band-Aid budgeting. When you think about it, there is a correlation between a drug addict's action and those of this Congress. We began this process on September 30, 1995, when we passed the first continuing resolution.

I analogize that action on September 30, 1995, as a casual, occasional user of marijuana. As we have proceeded over the days, weeks, and months since then, we have continued to become more and more addicted to this approach, to this avoidance of difficult decisions, to the willingness to say we failed to do it today so we will put it off until tomorrow.

Today, Mr. President, we are mainline injecting heroin as we sell ourselves: ''Oh, we only need one more day and we will be able to resolve this impasse.'' We have heard that ''one more day'' so many times. I remember distinctly when we voted on the 12th continuing resolution that the leadership of the appropriations process in the House of Representatives said they were so close to reaching a final resolution that would have carried us through the balance of the fiscal year and avoided the necessity of the 12th continuing resolution, and that failing that small increment to close on a final agreement, now we were going to have to use the period made available by the Easter-Passover recess. That certainly would be a period of time in which we could come to closure on this matter.

We failed again. Now, again, we are taking the heroin of a temporary extension of a budget that is more than a year old as a means of avoiding difficult decisions. We are acting, also, Mr. President, like the drug addict who is in a state of denial. We are denying that our failure to reach decisions was having serious effects on Americans. I believe that clearly our actions are having serious effects. They are not just the serious effects on the faceless bureaucrats under which we often wish to assign our failures to act.

The fact is that the Band-Aid approach to budgeting has broad ramifications. Just last month when we voted on the 12th continuing resolution, I used examples that have been

brought to my attention from my State of Florida. As an example, the Salvation Army in Fort Myers, FL, when I last discussed this case a month ago, I explained that the Salvation Army used funds which were provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency to promote food and housing to the homeless.

In February 1996, the Salvation Army received its first installment for the fiscal year. In a normal year, that first installment would have been made available in October 1995. This is anything but a normal year. The Salvation Army was expecting they would receive their final allotment of Federal funds in early March. True to form, these funds have not yet been provided. There is only one thing consistent about this year, and that is total inconsistency.

On April 10, I visited the Florida State Legislature in its session. The question that many members of the legislature asked me is: When are you going to make up your mind? The less charitable members of the legislature asked the question: Have you lost your mind? Here is our State legislature, trying to prepare a budget for the fourth largest State in the Nation, with many of their important decisions based on a partnership with the Federal Government in health, education, job training, and many other areas. Yet, they do not know what their Federal partner's policy, what the Federal partner's commitment will be to that program halfway through the fiscal year.

Mr. President, we have had almost a month to work out this appropriations bill. When I was speaking to the legislature, I apologized for the fact we were so negligent in performing our work. I gave them hopeful assurances that we would soon end this too long impasse. Again, today, for the 13th time we are passing a continuing resolution putting off the decisions, putting off the commitment to shape up and get sober, put it off until another day, until we need another injection.

Mr. President, this continuing resolution is passed by a voice vote. This Congress has reasserted its addiction and that it cannot be expected to go cold turkey. The 13th continuing resolution will pass with one less vote than the 12th, and I hope if we have a 14th, I hope it will pass with substantially fewer votes than the 13th, and finally we will end this process of procrastination, delay, indecision, and pass the consequences on to the American people.

We cannot deny that this Congress is addicted to Band-Aid budgeting and that there are not serious ramifications to these actions. We must stop this cycle of dependency and face up to the difficult decisions which are ours.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent to be recorded as voting ''no'' on the continuing resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The RECORD will so indicate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for up to 10 minutes as if in morning business.

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

CHANGING OF THE PALESTINIAN CHARTER

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the action by the PLO today changing its charter and eliminating the provision calling for the destruction of Israel should put all Palestinian terrorists on notice that terrorism and the destruction of Israel is no longer the order of the day as far as the PLO is concerned.

This was a vote of 10 to 1; some 500 voted in favor of changing the PLO charter, some 54 voted against, a vote of 10 to 1 by the Palestinian national authority saying that the charter ought to be changed. No longer is it the PLO position that Israel ought to be destroyed. That ought to have a significant effect on changing the attitude of the terrorists who are trying to destroy Israel and trying to destroy the peace process, because now technically it is the Palestinian Parliament in exile which has called for the dropping of that language. It is the Palestinian National Council which voted 504 in favor of amending the 32-year-old charter, 54 against, and 4 abstaining saying that no longer is it the PLO policy to seek to destroy Israel.

You have at the present time Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist organizations carrying on a reign of terror, of bloodshed, killing, an effort to destroy Israel and an effort to defeat the peace process. But with this action today by the PLO officially formally changing the charter, eliminating the call for the destruction of Israel, it is now evident that terrorism is out of step with the dominant Palestinian view. That ought to be followed, and every Palestinian who seeks to destroy Israel, every terrorist who seeks to destroy Israel, knows now that it is the official position, led by Chairman Yasser Arafat, that that idea has changed, that idea is passe, that idea is gone, and that the emphasis by responsible Palestinian leaders is to promote the peace process and to end terrorism.

With action by the U.S. Congress in 1994 in adopting the amendment put forward by Senator SHELBY and myself, which conditions U.S. aid on the change in the charter and more active action on the part of the PLO in combating terrorism, at least the first part has now been fulfilled.

The issue of the Mideast peace process has been tortuous. There have been so many developments since Israel emerged as a state in 1949. The enmity which has existed for thousands of years has meant senseless killing, terrorism against women and children as well as men in Israel, Hezbollah firing rockets into northern Israel, prompting the justified retaliation by Israel as a matter of national self-defense.

That killing and those terrorist activities ought now to stop in view of this official declaration by the Palestinian leaders that no longer does the charter of the PLO call for the destruction of Israel.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the activities by Secretary of State Christopher will reach fruition. It is not an easy matter. The press is full of reports about how President Assad of Syria is keeping Secretary Christopher cooling his heels while President Assad talks to others or President Assad is otherwise busy. It is not an easy matter to negotiate in the Mideast. I compliment Secretary of State Christopher, and I compliment the President on the accomplishments which have been made.

The Mideast has been a particular point of interest to me. I made my first trip to Israel back in 1964. I traveled there again as a private citizen in 1969, again in 1978, again in 1980, and after being elected to the Senate traveled there considerably. I have had the opportunity to visit Damascus on many occasions. I made my first trip there in 1984.

As long as the Secretary of State has cooled his heels, this Senator cooled his heels a lot longer. I returned there in 1988 after the Soviets had advised the Syrians they were no longer going to finance Syrian military operations, and in 1988 President Assad was prepared to see ARLEN SPECTER; I had a meeting of 4 hours and 35 minutes, and I have made many trips back and have had an opportunity to gain some understanding as to the negotiating process in the Mideast.

I suggest that the attitude of the Syrians has changed considerably in the 12 years which have intervened since my first trip to Damascus in 1984 and today, 1996. When I first had an opportunity to talk to President Assad, the idea of negotiations with Israel was totally out of the question. We have seen problems that the United States has had in Lebanon with the killing of so many of our marines, and we have seen grave difficulties in Lebanon in 1982 with Israeli action there. I believe that a cease-fire can be attained there, and I believe the peace process can be promoted.

We had the historic activity of President Sadat of Egypt in the first breakthrough back in 1978 and 1979. We have since seen the peace process with an Israeli-Jordanian peace agreement. We