

Against Women Act. Now this appropriations bill returns to the Senate reflecting the wishes of the House at the expense of the Senate. The COPS Program has been eliminated by the re-instatement of the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Block Grant Program, the Legal Services Corporation will receive approximately \$60 million less than the Senate had agreed upon, and the Violence Against Women Act will also receive approximately \$40 million less than what the Senate agreed upon.

As we all know, the COPS Program has proven to be successful. In one year, since the program's inception, New Mexico has received over 180 officers from the COPS Program. All parts of New Mexico have been awarded officer positions. From the Aztec Police Department in the north and Sunland Park in the South, to Quay County in the east and Laguna Pueblo in the west, all have felt the impact of this program.

The COPS Program is different from the block grant contained in the conference report because it emphasizes the concept of community policing. It gets officers out into the community preventing crimes rather than reacting to crimes once they have been committed.

Mr. President, I understand that the language in this appropriations bill would allow a community to use the block grant money to hire secretaries, buy a radar gun or buy a floodlight for a local jail. The law enforcement community is against this broad approach. The sentiment is best summed up by Donald L. Cahill, the chairman of the national legislative committee for the Fraternal Order of Police, who testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee in February on the block grant type proposal. He stated:

This broader category opens the door to using these funds for numerous purposes other than hiring police officers—such as hiring prosecutors or judges, buying equipment, lighting streets, or whatever. These are all worthwhile—but they won't arrest a single criminal.

The bottom line is to place more officers on the street and the COPS program has proven to be successful. That is why the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, and the National Troopers' Coalition support the COPS Program.

To quote Mr. Cahill again, "Police are the answer for today and prevention is the answer for tomorrow."

If the Senate agrees to fund the Violence Against Women Act at the figure contained in the conference report, the Senate is stating that this program is not as strong a priority as it was on September 29.

If given the resources, this act has the potential to demonstrate that the Federal Government can make a real difference when dealing with violence against women. Through prosecution, outreach, and education, the Federal Government has assumed the responsibility of a full partner in this cause.

In summary, our communities will suffer the direct affects of these misaligned priorities.

Mr. President, I would like to take a few additional minutes to discuss some other areas of the conference report that have led me to oppose the bill.

I want to preface my comments with a reminder to those who are earnestly committed to the future economic well-being of our Nation and our citizens. Balancing the budget is certainly a goal I support; this cause does make sense, but that goal alone is not enough to secure a robust and healthy economic future for our country. How we cut, what we cut matters a great deal. As many of you know, I have watched rather incredulously as aid to dependent children, student loans, Medicare and Medicaid, the earned income tax credit have been slashed and attacked in this Chamber as we proceed, without missing a beat, to provide nearly \$800 million on 129 military construction projects above the Pentagon's request, above what the President of the United States proposed was necessary to maintain the national security interests of the country. We are making tough decisions that affect people's lives and impact the ability of so many who are hard-working, low income Americans to keep their families together, keep food on the table, and have a chance at getting their children into colleges.

What we cut matters, and I am opposed to the decimation of our Nation's technology programs. Our firms are at a distinct disadvantage to firms in Germany, France, Israel, Japan, South Korea, and in nearly all industrialized nations when it comes to making the investments required to match what foreign government-industry partnerships provide for pre-competitive technology support. We have achieved laudable and significant results from the Technology Reinvestment Program, the Advanced Technology Program, and the Manufacturing Extension Program. While we cut programs, even eliminate some—the Office of Technology Assessment, for example, no longer exists—the Japanese Government despite its budget and economic problems is going to double its research and development expenditures by the year 2000. Our technology programs are not corporate welfare; these have been programs that have helped trigger the competitive rebound of our Nation's firms and that have helped small and medium-sized firms benefit from national technology programs and projects, that would have otherwise been the exclusive privilege of larger firms with the contacts, resources, and infrastructure to cooperate with national laboratories.

This Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill is a disturbing ideological exercise that threatens the health of our future economy. The technology programs of the Department of Commerce help to expand our economy, help Americans compete in the global

marketplace, and help to generate high-quality, high-wage jobs that our workers need. Many say that the reason that the Advanced Technology Program is being eliminated is that the projects did not earn any political ownership. This is a sad commentary on our judgment of what is important and not important as we make decisions in our budget-cutting efforts. As Leslie Helm of the Los Angeles Times wrote on November 26, 1995:

The Advanced Technology Program . . . works because projects are proposed by industry and companies are required to match government money on their own.

This is an example of how we should be leveraging the taxpayer's dollar, getting more from government investments than we otherwise would achieve. The ATP was created during the Bush administration and had strong bipartisan support, support that such a promising, successful program should have today.

I also cannot support this bill because of the sharp reduction for the National Information Infrastructure Grants Program. The NII Program assists hospitals, schools, libraries, and local governments in procuring advanced communications equipment to provide better health care, education, and local government services. The conference report eliminates funding for the GLOBE Program, which promotes knowledge of science and the environment in our schools. And although it remains anemically funded, I think that the reductions in this bill for the Manufacturing Extension Program are wrong-headed and continue the trend of undermining our Nation's best efforts in decades at partnering with industry to maintain our national technological competitiveness both in the commercial and national defense sectors.

We need to bias our spending toward those projects that produce real growth in our economy. Growth generates jobs, better incomes, and a higher standard of living for our citizens.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I must strongly oppose this bill and urge the President to veto it.●

SPEEDY SENATE RATIFICATION OF START II IS NECESSARY

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, Wednesday Senator BINGAMAN gave an important statement about the necessity to ratify START II quickly, and I would like to add my voice in support of his position.

START II will cut the number of the world's nuclear weapons in half, getting rid of nearly 4,000 deployed H-bombs in Russia and about the same number here. An overwhelming number of our citizens favor implementing this treaty, and a large number of elected officials on both sides of the aisle have expressed their support for it. Names and statements of support by Republican leaders were read by my friend from New Mexico, and I will not take time to add to this list now.

Apparently START II is being held hostage in a dispute over the consolidation of our foreign affairs agencies. I hope this is not the case.

Even worse, some groups are now calling to add certain conditions for ratifying START II. These conditions have all been discussed in bills that have now passed the Senate, and should not be attached to the ratification of a treaty. The Senate can not change START II, either we ratify it or not. Attaching political conditions on a treaty is a dangerous practice and should be avoided on procedural considerations.

Mr. President, START II should be ratified for many reasons. First, START II destroys weapons. This reduces the risk of an accidental launch. Second, every Russian weapon destroyed is a weapon we don't need to defend against. The following table shows the numbers and kinds of ICBMs that can be eliminated under START II.

I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The table follows:

INTERNATIONAL BALLISTIC MISSILES—ELIMINATED UNDER START II

Delivery system	Launchers	Warheads
SS-18	188	1,880
SS-19	170	1,020
SS-24	46	460
SLBM's		2,600
Totals	304	3,960

¹ Some SS-19's may be converted to carry only a single warhead in order to offset the cost of developing a new launcher.

² Based on limit of 1,750 submarine launched ballistic missiles. The current Russian arsenal of SLBM's is estimated at 2,350.

Source: "Bulletin of Atomic Scientists," Nuclear Notebook, September/October 1995.

Mr. HARKIN. Additionally, destroying weapons saves taxpayers' money. Just look at the current Senate Defense authorization bill. As my friend from New Mexico pointed out in the report to the Defense Authorization Act, the act "proposes a nuclear weapons manufacturing complex sized to meet a need of a hedge stockpile far above the active START II stockpile of 3500 weapons." The total cost of producing our nuclear weapons to date is about \$4 trillion. Compare that with our \$5 trillion national debt. In 1995 alone, \$12.4 billion was spent to build, operate and maintain strategic nuclear weapons. If we ratify START II we can give taxpayers the double peace dividend of higher security at lower cost.

Even if START II were fully implemented, we would have more than 3,000 deployed strategic missiles—500 warheads on missiles in silos, 1,680 warheads on submarine-launched missiles, and 1,320 on airplanes. Furthermore, an additional 4,000 nuclear weapons would remain in our stockpile. Surely, this will be more than enough atomic fire power to counter any conceivable threat to the United States.

Mr. President, Russia and other former Soviet Republics are more open than ever before. We have all seen the unprecedented pictures on television of Russian missiles and airplanes being

destroyed. This new openness will make START II even more verifiable than START I. With Russian elections this month and our own presidential election season just starting, we must act now to keep the this olive branch from withering.

In conclusion, Mr. President, we need to ratify START II quickly. It is not in the national interest to play politics over the ratification of any treaty. Russian President Yeltsin is ill and needs quick American ratification of START II to help get the Russian Parliament to ratify it. We need the security of fewer Russian warheads now. We need to stop spending so much money making our nuclear weapons now. We can use the warheads we have now to defend America. We need to ratify START II now.●

THE PASSING OF THOMAS L. WASHINGTON

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, it is with great, personal sadness that I note the passing this Tuesday, December 5 of Thomas L. Washington. Tom was a personal friend, a valued supporter, a concerned husband and father, and a dedicated leader in his community.

Tom was an avid and renowned sportsman. He exemplified all that is good about the sportsman: he was hardy and self-reliant; he also was frugal with and respectful of our great outdoors. Tom loved Michigan's wetlands and forests. He spent time in them, enjoying them and working to preserve them.

Because he loved the outdoors, Tom founded and led the Michigan United Conservation Clubs. Indeed, he built that organization into the largest single State conservancy in the Nation.

Tom was a strong, committed advocate for preserving Michigan's outdoors, and also the great outdoors of America and beyond, for all to enjoy.

He served on the board of directors of Safari Club International and the National Wildlife Federation. True sportsman that he was, he was as concerned to preserve the environment for future generations as to enjoy it for himself.

Thus he helped draft legislation creating the Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund. This fund purchases prime recreational lands for public use with royalties from oil, gas, and mineral production on State lands. In 1976 Tom was appointed a charter member of the board that administers the fund. He served on the board until his death, including several terms as chairman.

He served on a number of Michigan State committees, including the committee that wrote administrative rules for the Michigan Farmland and Open Space Preservation Act, which is central to the State's land-use program.

Tom also served on the Governor's Interim Committee on Environmental Education, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources Endangered Spe-

cies Committee, and the Governor's Interim Committee on Environmental Education. And he served as vice chairman of the Governor's Michigan Land Inventory Committee.

He was a recipient of the American Motors Conservation Award, Safari Club International's Chairman's Award, and the Miles D. Pirnie Award for his leadership in preserving wetlands and wetlands wildlife.

Part of the reason for Tom's care for the environment no doubt stemmed from the fact that he was a family man. He cared about his wife and children and wanted to pass on to them the same rights and the same opportunities that he enjoyed.

A hunter concerned to protect all our rights, he also fought for the second amendment.

Tom was elected president of NRA's board of directors in 1994 and reelected in 1995. First elected to the board of directors in 1985, Tom served as second and then first vice president prior to being elected president.

Tom worked for responsible use of our rights, working with training and informational programs along with second amendment defense.

He was a fine man, whom I personally shall miss. I extend my condolences to the Washington family.●

RATIFY THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the Chemical Weapons Convention [CWC] is a watershed agreement that will eliminate an entire class of weapons of mass destruction. Upon ratification, the CWC calls for the complete elimination of all chemical weapons within 10 years.

This landmark treaty is perhaps the most comprehensive arms control agreement ever signed. To begin with, the Chemical Weapons Convention requires all signatories to begin destruction of their chemical weapons stockpiles within 1 year of ratification, and to complete this destruction within 10 years. In addition, the CWC prohibits the production, use and distribution of this class of weapons, and provides an intrusive international monitoring organization in order to prevent the development of these weapons.

This verification allows not only for the inspection of "declared" sites, but also permits international inspectors access to any suspected undeclared facilities. Signatories do not have the right of refusal to deter inspection. Should a member nation request a "challenge inspection" of a suspected chemical facility, the nation called into question must permit the inspectors to enter the country within 12 hours. Within another 12 hours, the inspectors must have been allowed entry into the suspected warehouse. It is very unlikely that every trace of the banned chemicals could be eliminated within 24 hours.