

The critics like to say that this treaty imposes too many burdens on business. They say that opening our plants to inspections will mean forfeit our most important trade secrets. It is a good story, if it were true, but it is not.

Yes, the Convention does open our plants to inspection. But it also offers state-of-the-art protections for confidential business information. This treaty will not reveal our secrets.

Indeed, it will protect them. We know, because we helped develop the inspection system. Then we put the system to the test over and over again. We learned what works and what does not. We found the gaps, and we believe that we have plugged them.

Mr. Chairman, let me cut to the bottom line. The benefits of this inspection system far outweigh the costs. The rewards outweigh the risks. The treaty may not provide an iron-clad guarantee that chemical weapons will not ever again be a threat, but it does have teeth. It will provide a real deterrent. It is the best available option.

The Convention strikes a balance. It is tough, but it is fair. It is intrusive, but it is not stifling. It asks a lot, but in return, it offers a significant reduction in the threat of chemical weapons.

Mr. President, I find the points raised by industry and the issue of U.S. involvement in activities that really are at the heart of our national interests to constitute in themselves compelling reasons for us to be very, very careful before giving any serious thought to a turning down of this treaty. Today and over the next several days, I'm sure that Senators will be bombarded with arguments for and against this treaty. I would like to draw my fellow Senators attention to a very thoughtful analysis provided the committee by Dr. Brad Roberts this year. Dr. Roberts, who has spent a considerable time assessing issues related to the treaty, spoke in full recognition of some of the concerns that have been raised. He said:

In sum then, the CWC certainly is not perfect, and anybody who has told you it is, is blowing smoke. The relevant question for this committee, though, is simply: Is it good enough? Is the treaty in the national interest?

If you believe, as I do, that it is better to narrow the proliferation threat, than to let it spiral out of control, which is where it is headed, that the only chemical weapons that matter to the United States are those that pose real military threats, that it is better to share verification and compliance tasks and to have on-site access, than to go it alone on these matters, that it is better to add relatively modest regulatory burdens to industry than to jeopardize its long-term competitiveness, that it is better to create more tools to deal with the proliferation threat of the post-Cold War than to have fewer, and if you agree that it is better to share the burden of managing this problem than to saddle the United States alone, then support the CWC.

It is not perfect, but it is largely up to us to define and manage its risks through our military programs, our anti-chemical protection systems, our own national verification capabilities, a task that is far easier than coping with the risks of a world of much broader chemical and perhaps biological proliferation, and the difficult challenges that would result to U.S. interests, capabilities, and leadership.

Mr. President, I know my fellow Senators will weigh this treaty very care-

fully before deciding how they wish to vote. I deeply believe that a positive vote is the correct one for our national interests. I hope very much that most of my fellow Senators will reach the same conclusion.

STRENGTH FROM DIVERSITY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most insightful address on religious tolerance and freedom delivered by Radm James R. Stark, president of the Naval War College, at Touro Synagogue in Newport, RI on August 25.

Admiral Stark has had a distinguished career, serving our Nation with great dedication and a strong commitment to the enduring principles upon which our country was founded. His address exemplified the principles of George Washington now memorialized today on the 30-cent stamp issued in August 1982 to commemorate the Touro Synagogue: "To bigotry no sanctions. To persecution no assistance." These same words were in George Washington's letter to Moses Seixas and the Touro Synagogue community.

Let me share Admiral Stark's concluding remarks:

Today, we have the opportunity to rejoice in the success of the Touro congregation to be treated like any other citizens, and to celebrate in the wisdom of George Washington and the other founding fathers, who realized that our diversity did not have to breed hate and suspicion and discrimination, that our "unlikeness" did not prevent us from being good citizens in a society of mutual trust, and respect, and consideration. Rather than being a weakness, America's diversity has become our strength.

I ask unanimous consent that Admiral Stark's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF RADM. J.R. STARK, USN

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'm so pleased to see you all here. I want to start out by saying how honored I am to be addressing you today.

When Governor Sundlun asked me to speak a few weeks ago, I leaped at the opportunity—first, because I've been interested in Touro Synagogue since I was first stationed in Newport back in the '60's. And second, because we're here to commemorate an event which is of such importance, that it resonates still today across the length and breadth of America.

That event was an exchange of letters between the warden of Touro Synagogue and President George Washington over 200 years ago. Some may say, what's the big deal? What's so important about an exchange of letters? They're not even legal documents. They're just a couple of pieces of paper, written by people long dead—people who hadn't a clue about life in the last 20th century, people who never imagined the airplane, or the internet, or MTV. Even their language seems stilted and old-fashioned—and the issue of religious freedom really doesn't appear to be especially relevant today, does it? So what?

But we know better, don't we. Those letters had an impact that went far beyond the little community of 18th century Newport.

But, you know, this celebration is about more than just letters. It's about 200 years of history, and a very special, almost unique series of events that redirected that history which took place here in the days when the United States of America were still young and searching for what this new concept called democracy really meant.

Several years ago, I was in command of a Navy cruiser on its way from California to the Persian Gulf. It was a long trip—it took us six weeks to sail halfway around the world. And as we neared the end of our voyage, we stopped for fuel in the ancient port of Cochin, on the southwest coast of India. In the course of my visit, I was able to do some sightseeing. I came across a Catholic church, nearly 500 years old, where the Portuguese explorer Vasco da Gama was buried in 1524, soon after "discovering" India. But I also visited another building nearly twice as old. It was the Jewish synagogue, which had been founded in first century A.D. by Jews fleeing Jerusalem after the destruction of the Second Temple—Herod's temple—by the Romans. To me, it was a tangible illustration of how long and how far the Jewish people have been forced to wander in their search for a decent life.

Interestingly, history tells us that—except for their periodic revolts in Judea—Jews fared well under the Roman empire. They were merchants and craftsmen who were welcomed wherever they settled. And by the end of the Roman era, strong Jewish communities had sprung up all around the Mediterranean. Even after the fall of Rome, Jewish settlements continued to spread—first into Western Europe, and then, after the 12th century, into the East.

But as time went by, the attitudes of their hosts changed. The hard work, the education, the cohesion, and especially the success of those Jewish communities created jealousy and resentment. Jews who had been welcomed because they brought needed skills and built the local economy gradually changed from being neighbors to being outsiders, tolerated when necessary and persecuted when it became convenient.

More and more restrictions were placed on Jews. As commerce and skilled trades expanded during the Middle Ages, the guild system was used to exclude Jews from a growing number of vocations. They were prohibited from owning land. They were restricted from universities. They were required to live in certain urban districts—the ghettos.

Rather than being the mainstay of regional and international commerce, as they had been for centuries, in many areas the only jobs open to Jews were as itinerant craftsmen or as moneylenders to all levels of society.

But success in finance and the emerging business of banking and credit carried its own dangers. When local businessmen made poor decisions—or kings had to borrow money to finance everything from wars to jewelry—they became more and more indebted to the very people they had forced into being their bankers.

And when it came time to repay those debts, it was a lot easier to spread rumors of witchcraft and secret rites, launch a wave of pogroms, expropriate Jewish businesses, cancel the debts, and then expel the Jews.

And that's exactly what happened over and over during the Middle Ages. In 1290, Edward the First of England solved his debt problems by expelling the Jews. They were to remain barred from England for the next 350 years, until the time of Oliver Cromwell. A hundred years later, in 1394, they were expelled again, this time from France. A similar fate befell the Jews of Spain in 1492, and those of Portugal in 1497. Some were forcibly

converted. Others were killed for refusing to abandon their faith. Many of the original Jewish community here in Newport—the people who founded Touro Synagogue—were the descendants of those same Sephardic Jews who had been driven from the Iberian Peninsula 150 years earlier.

These cycles of persecution waxed and waned for the next 500 years. Sometimes they were violent. Sometimes it was just snide remarks and not being admitted into some exclusive club.

As we all know, the culmination of all this was the Holocaust. How could it happen? Wasn't it something we should have foreseen?

Jews had lived in Germany for over a thousand years. They had built its industry. They were part of its educational system. They were skilled workers, bankers, businessmen, artists, scientists. They had fought in Germany's war right alongside the rest of their countrymen. There part of the community. They were Germans, and they thought of themselves as Germans. No wonder so many responded to the first acts of the Nazis with disbelief and a total inability to comprehend what lay in store.

And in the end, why did so many others, Germans and non-Germans alike, turn their heads from what was happening to their neighbors, or worse yet, take part in the persecutions?

Earlier this month, I read a very moving piece in the New York Times entitled "The Pogrom at Eishyshok." Some of you may have seen it. It was the chilling first person account of a man who, as 7 year old child in the fall of 1945, had witnessed the murder of his mother and infant brother in a little town—a "stetl"—in what is now Lithuania. Their attackers weren't Nazis bent on carrying out the final solution—Hitler had already been defeated. These were their neighbors, people they knew and had grown up with. At the end of his story, the author observed that "as our world shrinks and its diverse nations become more entangled with one another, it is of the utmost importance to understand that the 'dislike of the unlike' is what leads to the gas chambers and the killing fields."

"The dislike of the unlike"—the tendency of people to divide the world into "us" and "them", and then treat with suspicion or even hatred those who look different, or talk different, or have funny names, or strange customs.

Those words—"the dislike of the unlike"—perfectly capture the essence of what has plagued all mankind—not just Jews—since time immemorial.

What we see is that, again and again, people can get along for decades on the surface. But when society is placed under stress, when it's confronted by war, or famine, or plague, or economic collapse, people turn on those who aren't quite like them. They look for something or somebody to blame—and then they take out their fear and frustrations on them. For Europe's Jews, that cycle was all too familiar.

And if it could happen there, could it ever happen here? Clearly, there are a handful of people in every society, in every country, who are capable of monstrous evil, even murder on a massive, organized scale. There is no question in my mind that such people exist in America today. But the difference is, I don't see that ever happening here. We are different. And because of that difference, I don't believe American society could ever allow that handful of evil men to work their will. We wouldn't put up with it. And the reason I think that we are so special—that we are protected from that kind of evil—has a lot to do with why we are here today.

Let's be very clear. Religious freedom wasn't always the norm in colonial America.

The same colonists who had fled religious persecution in England were only too happy to impose their beliefs on others when they were in control. Fortunately, the tolerance established by Roger Williams here in Rhode Island made it a mecca for people of all faiths who sought the right to worship in peace. Huguenots and Baptists, Jews and Quakers all lived together here, worshipping God in their own ways.

One hundred-fifty years ago, the great French commentator, Alexis de Tocqueville, observed a peculiar fact—that two principles which in Europe had historically been mutually exclusive—the spirit of religion and the spirit of liberty—had somehow been combined and made mutually supportive here in America. Part of the reason for that happy fact lies right here.

When warden Moses Seixas of Touro Synagogue wrote to President George Washington to wish him well and to give thanks for a government "erected by the majesty of the people" which gave everyone—regardless of their origins—the liberty to worship in peace and enjoy equally the protections of citizenship, he started a series of events which had consequences far beyond what he could have ever imagined.

And when President Washington, in his reply, wrote of how proud we should be for having given mankind a country where "all possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship" he captured the very ideals that make America special.

And, in what I think is one of the most remarkable insights of the letter, President Washington notes that we're not talking about toleration the way it was throughout history, where one privileged group granted others some limited rights as a form of indulgence, "allowing" them to be treated fairly. No! What George Washington says is that there is no single group which holds sway over the rest of us. All of us have inherent natural rights, and the only thing required of us is that we conduct ourselves as good citizens and support the government. The government didn't just "allow" the Jews to practice their religion and conduct their business like everyone else; the President said it was their right all along—so it couldn't be taken back arbitrarily if someone in power changed his mind. That's what's so important here.

When they sought Washington's assurance of their right to practice their religion, to be free from government persecution, to be treated like all citizens of this country, the Jews of Newport were not just achieving something for themselves. They established a precedent which applied to every other religion. And a year later, that precedent was codified in the Bill of Rights as the First Amendment to the Constitution.

And look at what we've gained. Look at what that freedom from oppression has enabled America's Jewish citizens to contribute to this country during the last two centuries. Art, education, music, science, literature, religion, business—the list goes on and on. The political and community involvement of America's Jewish citizens—across the entire spectrum of issues and views—is absolutely remarkable. The philanthropy of America's Jewish community has aided those less fortunate out of all proportion to their numbers. The Jewish community has strengthened and enriched the intellectual and economic and political fabric of American life to an extraordinary degree.

Today, we have the opportunity to rejoice in the success of the Touro congregation to be treated like any other citizens, and to celebrate in the wisdom of George Washington and the other founding fathers, who realized that our diversity did not have to breed hate and suspicion and discrimination, that our

"unlikeness" did not prevent us from being good citizens in a society of mutual trust, and respect, and consideration. Rather than being a weakness, America's diversity has become our strength.

Yes, we do have much to be thankful for today. For the congregation of Touro Synagogue truly helped make America what it is—a special place where all can live in peace together.

Thank you, and shalom.

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

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

The senior Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SIMON. I thank the Presiding Officer.

DIRECT STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, although it is unusual for me to speak from a prepared text, I want to spend a little time providing my colleagues with some of the history and facts regarding an item that appeared in the Republican Party's platform last month. The issue is a successful Direct Student Loan Program which has saved students and taxpayers billions of dollars by streamlining a complicated system and enhancing competition. It is a great disappointment to me that an issue with such strong bipartisan roots has been turned into a one-line rhetorical attack on the President. That is unfair to the program, unfair to the President, and it is unfair to the Republicans who spent years promoting these reforms.

Five years ago, I teamed up with David Durenberger, then a Republican Senator from Minnesota, in proposing to shift to a direct loan program with income-based repayments for all students who desire it. We proposed using the billions saved with that proposal to restore the buying power of the Pell Grant Program, which has suffered from years of underfunding.

The loan reforms we put in our bill were not original. They were borrowed, with a few minor changes, from Representative TOM PETRI, a Republican from Wisconsin with conservative credentials, with whom you and I served, Mr. President, in the House.

My colleague, Senator AL D'AMATO, now the head of the National Republican Senatorial Committee, cosponsored the Petri plan in the Senate. Republican support for direct lending was broad. Original cosponsors of the Petri legislation included my House colleague from Illinois, JOHN PORTER, now the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that handles education, and three Members who have now joined us in this body: Senator RICK