

were used when Disney World was being built in the 1970's. They were used on the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System in the 1970's and 1980's.

These agreements have also been used on Federal projects for decades. In the late 1940's, the agreements were used regularly for construction at atomic energy facilities.

And the agreements continued to be used today. Across the country, nuclear sites are being decontaminated and decommissioned. The Department of Energy has entered into project labor agreements at the Oak Ridge facility in Tennessee; the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory in Idaho; the Savannah River site in South Carolina; the Fernald facility in Ohio; the Hanford/Richland site in Washington State; and the Lawrence Livermore facility in California—just to name a few.

The agreements are also being used by State governments. In the Boston Harbor cleanup, for example, the State of Massachusetts required contractors to comply with such labor agreements for the duration of the work. That was a very large project, which is taking years to complete. The labor agreement is helping to ensure that the project is carried out efficiently and safely.

According to an October 4, 1996, letter from the manager of industrial relations on that project, the Boston Harbor cleanup was originally projected to cost \$6.1 billion. Now, the estimated total cost of the project is \$3.4 billion. Accident rates are significantly lower than for projects of similar size and duration. And, during the nearly 7½ years that the project has been underway, "there have been approximately 20 million craft hours worked without lost time due to strike or lock-out." Anti-union contractors challenged the requirement in the Boston Harbor case, and in 1993 the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously upheld the State's ability to issue the requirement.

Other States have taken the same approach. In January 1997, Governor Pataki of New York issued an Executive order strikingly similar to that under consideration by the President. Governor Pataki's order directed that "Each state agency shall establish procedures to consider, in its proprietary capacity, the utilization of one or more project labor agreements with respect to individual public construction projects." The Governors of New Jersey and Nevada have recently issued similar orders.

Despite the very clear advantages that such agreements can provide, the proponents of this bill that has been introduced this afternoon, contend that Government agencies should not enter into them because they deny nonunion contractors and workers the opportunity to bid and work on federally funded projects. This is false. Nonunion contractors are completely free to bid on projects subject to project labor agreements—and many do. In the Bos-

ton Harbor cleanup, for example, 40 percent of the subcontractors are non-union firms.

Nor is it true that project labor agreements restrict jobs only to labor union members. No such agreement requires that an individual join the union to be referred for a job. In fact, the National Labor Relations Act forbids unions from discriminating against nonmembers when making job referrals.

Obviously, some of our Republican colleagues disagree strongly with such labor agreements. Many of us support them as sensible Federal contracting policy and needed protection for working families.

At the very least, the Federal Government should not be denied the opportunity to gain the substantial benefits and savings that such agreements can supply, and that is why I hope that legislation introduced to prohibit those agreements will not be favorably considered by the Senate.

RENEWING THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN PEACE PROCESS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, our indefatigable negotiator with responsibility for mediating the outstanding, difficult issues between the Israeli Government and the Palestinian authorities is back at work in the Middle East. The peace process was derailed by the intemperate action by the government led by Prime Minister Netanyahu, in supporting new Israeli settlements in Jerusalem. There appears little doubt that, regardless of the failings of Mr. Arafat to fully restrain Palestinian reactions to this action, the Israeli leader bears very heavy responsibility to undo the mischief which brought that elaborate tango of negotiations and actions called the peace process crashing down.

Now we read of an unfolding, unprecedented scandal centered around that same Prime Minister. I have no judgment to make on that, but I hope that, as I have said before on this floor, Mr. Netanyahu will rise above the pressures on him, particularly from his right wing, and face history squarely. It is up to him to make the crucial moves that will halt the settlement construction, and take a courageous step. I call upon him, again, to do this, for the sake of the people of Israel and the Palestinians.

It is important that the Clinton administration continue to take the position that the settlement construction must be halted. Ambassador Ross is reported today to be pressing the Prime Minister to do so. The United States has an important stake in this matter. As the strongest ally and the best friend that Israel ever had, or will have, it is surely not too much to expect some consideration of the U.S. position on this matter on the part of Mr. Netanyahu. He surely cannot expect to continue stonewalling the United States on this critical matter. I, for

one, felt he should not have come to the United States to meet extensively with our President with nothing in mind to offer apparently. That is not what a good ally or a good friend does. He certainly cannot expect us to stand by while he gives an American President—our President—no more than a hello and goodbye on such a critical matter, and also then still expects the United States to provide our annual supplement of over \$3 billion in American tax dollars to Israel without batting an eye—\$3 billion. I wonder if the American people are aware of that, every year.

This is a crucial period for the Likud government. I hope that it will see that support from the American people cannot continue to be in the form of a blank check no matter what that government does to stall or derail the process of making peace with the Palestinians. It does not do the Israeli people any good whatsoever for the message to go to them that whatever happens is essentially fine with the United States Government. We need to be consistent, both in Washington and in New York. The Clinton administration needs to take this into consideration, as well. We cannot take one position, against the settlements construction, here in Washington, and water it down by not endorsing the same policy embodied in Security Council resolutions. That is speaking out of both sides of our mouth. That is speaking with a forked tongue. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to speak in one voice with the administration, and I urge the administration to be completely consistent, not inconsistent, because inconsistency creates confusion. It sends the wrong message. Make it clear that we will continue to act in good faith as a mediator and as an ally of Israel, but we expect the Israeli Government to step up to the plate and make the kind of moves that will be necessary to breathe new vigor and new life into the process of peacemaking, which is so critical to the people of Israel, to the Palestinians, to the United States and to our allies.

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

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

FAIRNESS IN FEDERAL CONTRACTING

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to address a very real threat to the economic well being of our Nation. I speak, of course, of the anticipated issuance by President Clinton, of an Executive order that would likely lead to the exclusion of nonunion contractors from Federal construction. I also wish to express my strong support for S. 606,