

mention of his wife Eleanor. When President Roosevelt was struck with polio, Eleanor Roosevelt represented him in places that he could not reach. She toured the country and reported back to her husband on what she had heard. She was one of his closest and most trusted advisers.

While not an adviser, the Roosevelt's dog, Fala, provided companionship for the President in very difficult times. It was reported that the President was rarely seen without the dog trailing close behind. Even the Roosevelt dog was not immune from political attacks, however. Following one such attack, Roosevelt remarked, "Well, of course, I don't resent attacks, and my family doesn't resent attacks, but Fala does resent them—his Scotch soul was furious. * * * He has not been the same dog since."

Roosevelt was elected President in 1932 at the depth of the Great Depression and he died while serving as President in April 1945, shortly before the surrender of Germany in World War II. During those years, the world underwent a tidal change, which touched the lives of everyone then and since. It is the ultimate testament to President Roosevelt that he was reelected an unprecedented three times during such a turbulent era, proving both his effectiveness and immense popularity.

In fighting the Depression, he was able to use the Federal Government as an effective tool in getting people working again. Through the U.S. victory in World War II, Roosevelt positioned the United States in a leadership position in world affairs that has lasted for over 50 years. We continue to reap the benefits of his leadership today.

Yesterday, October 1, 1996, marked the first day of Franklin Delano Roosevelt History Month. During the next month, the life and times of Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt will be celebrated across the country through symposia, exhibitions, and documentaries. I encourage everyone to take part in observing the contributions FDR made to our Nation.●

THE REMARKABLE SAGA OF SIGMUND NISSENBAUM

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to share with my colleagues the inspiring story of Sigmund Nissenbaum of Warsaw, Poland, which was brought to my attention by a group of distinguished American Rabbis—headed by Grand Rabbi Shmuel Teitelbaum and Rabbi Hertz Frankel of Brooklyn—who recently returned from Poland where they helped rededicate three historic Jewish cemeteries which had been almost completely destroyed by 50 years of neglect and vandalism.

Sigmund Nissenbaum, a survivor of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising, has devoted his life to keeping alive and protecting the one-glorious Jewish heritage of Poland. For almost 1,000 years before 1939, Poland had the world's

largest Jewish population. The vast majority of Poland's 3 million Jews were killed by the Nazis, and most of the survivors were driven into exile by the post-war Communist regime. During these trying days, Sigmund Nissenbaum—often almost singlehandedly—battled against overwhelming odds to protect Poland's Jewish cemeteries.

The collapse of the Communist government in 1989 allowed Mr. Nissenbaum to solicit support for his endeavors from Jews residing in the United States and Israel, leading to the creation of the Nissenbaum Foundation. For the past 7 years, this foundation has institutionalized the life work of Sigmund Nissenbaum, erecting memorials to the victims of the Holocaust in several Polish cities and restoring over a dozen historic cemeteries.

Rabbi Hertz Frankel reports that he has:

... personally observed Mr. Nissenbaum gathering skeletons from cemeteries which had been trampled by hooligans. His compassion, care and conscience are an inspiration to Jews throughout the world, and to Polish non-Jews as well. The current Polish government and Catholic Church leaders have noted his historic role in helping to restore a measure of dignity to the final resting place of so many of his people.

I know I speak for the entire Senate when I congratulate Sigmund Nissenbaum, who recently celebrated his 70th birthday, and wish him many more years of success in his life's sacred work.●

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, last week marked the 35th anniversary of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, whose purpose is to reduce threats to the United States through arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament. It is the only agency of its kind in the U.S. Government, or, in fact, the world.

This is a bittersweet anniversary for the agency. On the one hand, it just has witnessed the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in New York. ACDA was at the forefront of advocating and negotiating this treaty, which represents an historic achievement by banning all nuclear explosions worldwide.

On the other hand, however, arms control efforts have just been dealt a great setback by virtue of the Senate's decision not to take up the Chemical Weapons Convention this year. I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong support for the Chemical Weapons Convention [CWC] and my concern over the delay in giving advice and consent to its ratification.

The Chemical Weapons Convention is an unprecedented international agreement designed to eliminate an entire class of weapons of mass destruction. Unlike earlier protocols which prohibit only the use of chemical weapons, this Convention aims at stopping their pro-

duction, transfer, and storage by providing incentives to participation, verification of compliance, and penalties for violation. It now has been signed by 160 countries and ratified by 64. The United States is the only G-7 country not to have ratified it. All of our major trading partners have done so. And many of the countries whose adherence is most important will not ratify it if the United States does not.

The CWC has been before the Senate for consideration for nearly 3 years now. During that period, Senators from every relevant committee have had ample opportunity to examine the convention and to address the issues that have been raised in connection with it. The Foreign Relations Committee, for example, has held 8 public hearings and 1 closed hearing, with 31 separate witnesses, along with numerous briefings in open and closed session, since the spring of 1994. The Armed Services Committee has held three hearings on the military implications of the treaty, and additional hearings have been held in the Intelligence Committee, the Governmental Affairs Committee, and, more recently, the Judiciary Committee. On April 25, 1996, the Foreign Relations Committee reported a bipartisan resolution of ratification, addressing all the major issues that were raised during the course of consideration of the convention.

This treaty will not make the threat of chemical weapons automatically disappear from the face of the earth. But it will constrain the proliferation of chemical weapons, it will establish international norms and standards against them, and it will make it harder for rogue regimes and terrorists to gain access to them. It will deter covert chemical weapons programs by making them much more difficult and expensive—legally, morally, and financially—to maintain. There is currently no legal regime prohibiting the development, production, storage, and transfer of chemical weapons, and therefore no legal basis on which to challenge chemical weapons programs.

I believe there are three major reasons why this treaty will serve American interests, and why a failure to ratify it could have devastating repercussions.

First, the CWC requires others to join us in doing something we already plan to do. As a matter of U.S. policy we have already decided to destroy our current stockpile of chemical weapons. There is a provision in law, first signed by President Reagan, that we eliminate our chemical weapons by the year 2004. We are going to do that regardless of what happens with this treaty, because we think that is a wise thing to do. The leaders of our military services have agreed that we can effectively deter the use of chemical weapons without threatening retaliation in kind. In short, we don't need chemical weapons and we don't want them.

The value of this treaty is that it brings along many other countries in

agreeing to do the same thing. So rather than taking a unilateral action, we will be establishing a basis for others to take similar action. As Lt. Gen. Wesley Clark, Director of Strategic Plans and Policy in the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, told the Foreign Relations Committee:

The convention's imposition of an internationally recognizable obligation to destroy all chemical weapons essentially places all other CW capable state parties on an equal footing with the United States. Because of the convention's trade restrictions and provisions, proliferators outside the convention will find it increasingly more difficult to acquire the chemical precursors essential to building a chemical weapons stockpile.

Similarly, Stanley Weiss, chairman of Business Executives for National Security, wrote in the *Washington Times*:

Without the treaty, the United States can only act unilaterally against nations like China, believed to be assisting Iran to develop chemical weapons. With the CWC in force, those countries who do business with rogue nations run the risk of being cut from nearly every trading nation on the planet.

The second major reason this treaty is in our interests is because it will provide us with better information about what other countries are doing in the area of chemical weapons. We know that the verification regime in this treaty is not perfect. There will probably be countries or agencies that will cheat on this agreement, and there are others who may not sign it. But if we are party to the treaty, we will have an opportunity to investigate and inspect potential violations. We will have access to information about what those countries are doing. In fact, Secretary of Defense Perry argued:

...while we recognize that detecting illicit production of small quantities of CW will be extremely difficult, we also recognize that would be even more difficult without a CWC. In fact, the CWC verification regime, through its declaration, routine inspection, fact-finding, consultation and challenge inspections, should prove effective in providing a wealth of information on possible CW programs that simply would not be available without the convention.

Likewise, then-CIA Director James Woolsey noted that "We will know more about the state of chemical warfare preparations in the world with the treaty than we would know without it."

The point is that we are going to have to monitor potential violations in either case. Regardless of whether there is a treaty or not, regardless of whether we ratify it or not, our intelligence agencies will need to collect information about chemical weapons production and possession by other countries. But if we participate in the Convention, we will have more avenues to learn about those violations, and we will have an opportunity that we otherwise would not have to conduct challenge inspections.

Moreover, any violations that are discovered will be made known to the world and receive universal condemnation. The treaty in effect creates an international mechanism for identifying

and exposing violators. As Secretary of State Christopher pointed out to the Foreign Relations Committee, "By ratifying the Convention, we will add the force and weight of the entire international community to our efforts to assure the destruction of Russian chemical stocks. Our action will also spur other nations such as China to ratify and join the regime." An op-ed by Amy Smithson in the *Baltimore Sun* last year noted that "the Senate's consent to ratification of the CWC would help open Russian storage sites to international scrutiny, allowing inspectors to inventory and secure these weapons. If the Senate ratifies the treaty, which will ban the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons, pressure will increase for Russia to do the same."

Third, a failure to ratify would put U.S. interests at a distinct disadvantage. If the CWC enters into force without us, then U.S. chemical manufacturers will immediately find themselves under economic sanctions. They will immediately have to obtain end-user certificates for the sale of certain chemicals abroad, and after 3 years they will not be able to export them at all. Indeed, a letter signed by the CEO's of 53 of the largest chemical firms in the country warns as follows:

Our industry's status as the world's preferred supplier of chemical products may be jeopardized if the U.S. does not ratify the Convention. If the Senate does not vote in favor of the CWC, we stand to lose hundreds of millions of dollars in overseas sales, putting at risk thousands of good-paying American jobs.

So the consequences of not approving the treaty will be very considerable both on U.S. industry and for our overall national interests. Unfortunately, this appears to be a situation in which partisan political considerations have played an important role. On this point, I ask that three editorials, from the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, and the *Baltimore Sun*, be inserted in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks.

Some of the arguments that have been made against this treaty are very difficult to follow. On the one hand, opponents have argued that it does not allow anytime, anywhere inspections, and thus that some violations might go undetected. But it was the Bush administration that decided, as a matter of protecting U.S. national interests, that we did not want to have anytime, anywhere inspections because that would jeopardize our trade secrets and national security, and possibly violate constitutional rights. So it was the United States, under a Republican administration, that decided not to include unrestricted inspections.

On the other hand, opponents contend that the treaty is too intrusive and allows international investigators too much latitude in inspecting U.S. facilities. I find this argument surprising when the chemical manufacturers themselves are strongly supporting

this treaty. In the letter that I cited earlier, the CEO's state:

Our industry participated in negotiating the agreement and in U.S. and international implementation efforts. The treaty contains substantial protections for confidential business information (CBI). We know, because industry helped to draft the CBI provisions. Chemical companies also helped test the draft CWC reporting system, and we tested the on-site inspection procedures that will help verify compliance with the treaty. In short, our industry has thoroughly examined and tested this Convention. We have concluded that the benefits of the CWC far outweigh the costs.

How can it be argued that the inspections regime is too rigorous, and at the very same time that it is not rigorous enough? Both the Bush administration and the Clinton administration, after thorough review, have concluded that the balance obtained in this treaty is fair and reasonable. As former President Bush wrote in a letter to Senators PELL and LUGAR in July 1994:

The United States worked hard to ensure that the Convention could be effectively verified. At the same time, we sought the means to protect both United States security interests and commercial capabilities. I am convinced that the Convention we signed served both objectives, effectively banning chemical weapons without creating an unnecessary burden on legitimate activities.

Mr. President, this is a Convention that was negotiated and signed by Republican administrations and has received broad bipartisan support. We have heard testimony from the Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs of Staff about the importance of this treaty to U.S. national interests. Gen. John Shalikashvili testified that "from a military perspective, the Chemical Weapons Convention is clearly in our national interest." Secretary of Defense William J. Perry, along with Attorney General Janet Reno, wrote in a recent op-ed for the *Washington Post*:

The case for ratification is compelling on both military and law enforcement grounds. . . . Destroying existing chemical weapons and preventing potential enemies from obtaining them will unmistakably strengthen America's defense, which is why both Presidents Reagan and Bush, together with America's military leaders, have strongly supported the conclusion of such a treaty. . . . By moving forward on the Chemical Weapons Convention, the United States also will greatly improve its law enforcement capabilities for investigating and prosecuting those who plan chemical-weapons attacks. . . . To increase the battlefield safety of our troops and fight terror here and around the globe, the Senate should ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention now.

I think it is unfortunate that the treaty has been deferred until next year. Here we had an opportunity to move forward on an agreement that clearly would promote American interests, increase American security, and preserve American leadership. I regret that was not done, and I urge that it be taken up promptly in the next Congress.

The articles follow:

[From the *Washington Post*, Sept. 15, 1996]

TREATY TURNABOUT

For the better part of a decade Sen. Robert Dole was a part of the legion of Republicans,

including Ronald Reagan, George Bush, James Baker, Brent Scowcroft, Colin Powell and Richard Lugar, who supported writing a treaty to outlaw poison gas. Last week, on the eve of a Senate vote on ratification, Mr. Dole indicated that he had changed his mind and joined the opposition to the treaty of his former Senate colleagues Trent Lott, Jesse Helms, Jon Kyl and others.

It is hard to believe the political campaign had nothing to do with the candidate's flip-flop, although Mr. Dole does cite reasons. He suggests he had reservations about the treaty's coverage—the rogue states that are its prime target will surely reject it—and about its enforceability, which under the best of circumstances will not be foolproof. Others who are not running for office have also cited these views, but we think there are strong arguments against them. The treaty does not immediately reach the rogues, but it does create a legal and political framework in which they can be better isolated and pursued. The implicit opposition alternative of a treaty with full coverage simply does not exist. Again, enforcement will not be total under this treaty, but here is a case where the best is the enemy of the good. Enforcement will be better than it is without a treaty, and practice can make it better still.

Mr. Dole cites the situation of American chemical companies which, he believes, would suffer under unacceptably intrusive inspection obligations. But the companies themselves have greeted the treaty as a welcome and bearable liberation of their exports from the onus of contributing to rogue chemical stocks. The former majority leader seems unaware that the "unilateral chemical disarmament" that he now opposes was begun by President Reagan. The American military does not want a weapon that is irrelevant to deterrence and more dangerous to handle than any conceivable battlefield benefit warrants.

The treaty has been pulled, not killed. In other political circumstances, it can be sent back up to the Senate. But meanwhile, the ratifications of other states will bring it into effect. As a result, the American government will be frozen out of the treaty's initial application—this can only warm the poison gas crowd—and the American chemical industry will risk a cutoff of tens of billions of dollars in exports. We don't believe that's in the United States' national interest or Mr. Dole's, for that matter.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 15, 1996]

MR. DOLE BUMPS A GOOD TREATY

It is not uncommon for election-year politics to contaminate Congressional lawmaking, but a vitally important international treaty should not be cynically sacrificed for political advantage. That is what happened last week when Bob Dole reached back into the Senate to block the expected approval of an agreement banning the development, production, stockpiling, sale and use of chemical weapons.

In so doing, Mr. Dole derailed a treaty negotiated by the Administrations of his Republican brethren Ronald Reagan and George Bush, and supported by Republicans and Democrats. Though Mr. Dole offered many policy objections, the real point was to pick a fight with President Clinton and deny him the afterglow of a diplomatic achievement.

As the Senate vote approached last week, Mr. Dole, who had not previously opposed the agreement, chimed in with a letter to the majority leader, Trent Lott, urging that approval be withheld until the accord had been accepted by virtually every other country in the world and there was assurance that even the smallest violations could be detected. Fearing they could no longer count

on the 67 votes needed for approval, treaty sponsors pulled the measure, dooming it in this Congress. It can be brought back for a vote next year.

No treaty can absolutely prevent terrorists and other outlaws from smuggling small quantities of chemical weapons. But the Chemical Weapons Convention, already signed by 160 nations and ratified by 63, could make it much harder for countries like Iraq, or criminals like the group that unleashed lethal sarin gas in the Tokyo subway last year, to obtain toxic chemicals or their ingredients.

American military leaders, responsible politicians of both parties and the American chemical industry all favor the treaty.

The convention, including its verification system and severe restrictions on chemical purchases from countries that have not ratified, is now likely to go into effect without the United States, potentially costing the American chemical industry billions of dollars in lost exports.

Mr. Dole complained that the convention imposed intrusive paperwork on American industry and risked the trade secrets of American chemical manufacturers. But the agreement's inspection and paperwork provisions were negotiated in close cooperation with the chemical industry.

The United States is already destroying most of its own chemical weapons arsenal, and current Pentagon doctrine excludes the use of these weapons even in response to a chemical attack.

Mr. Dole's new scorched-earth strategy in Congress was not limited to the chemical weapons treaty. To insure that the President cannot claim credit for enactment of an immigration bill this year, Mr. Dole is now pressing to give states the right to deny a public education to the children of illegal immigrants. He knows that provision would lead either to defeat the bill in the Senate or to a Clinton veto.

At least this particular maneuver would do little harm since the immigration bill is filled with other unacceptable provisions. But imperiling the Chemical Weapons Convention is trifling with the national interest. It is a measure of his desperation that Mr. Dole would seek to stir his becalmed campaign by blocking such an important and beneficial treaty.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Sept. 14, 1996]

DOLE'S RE-ENTRY INTO SENATE AFFAIRS

So great is the Republican impulse to deny President Clinton bill-signing ceremonies before the November election that his opponent, Bob Dole, has slipped into a negative posture that strikes us as dumb politics. Acting somewhat as Senate majority leader in absentia, Citizen Dole has used his influence with some former colleagues to ditch two key pieces of legislation—a wide-ranging reform of immigration laws and ratification of a Chemical Weapons Convention crafted during the Bush administration.

Both measures are believed to have fairly wide public support. Both are now in coma due to poison pill amendments prescribed by Mr. Dole. One can only hope that after election passions wane, wiser counsels will prevail.

The roadblock on immigration reform is due to a Dole-backed amendment that would allow states to deny public schooling to children of illegal immigrants. "I can't believe they are doing this," lamented Sen. Alan Simpson, R-Wyo., an ally of the GOP nominee for president.

The treaty dealing with poison gas was put on the back burner after the Clinton administration spurned killer amendments that would have prevented its implementation

until Iraq, Libya and North Korea ratify it, thus giving these rogue states veto power. Another Republican, Sen. Richard Lugar of Indiana, said the whole process has been "politicized" in ways harmful to U.S. foreign policy.

The Chemical Manufacturers Association, fearful of setbacks in international trade, complained that treaty opponents have "disfigured and distorted [it] beyond recognition." But hard-line unilateralists, such as Sens. Jesse Helms and Jon Kyl, contend that international controls under the convention would add to the costs of small chemical companies.

It is a shame that a treaty aimed at reducing stockpiles of mustard gas, nerve agents and other deadly chemicals has fallen victim to U.S. domestic politics. This country was its foremost advocate, not least because an estimated 30,000 tons of Russian chemical weapons are vulnerable to theft and misuse by terrorists and pariah governments. Now Moscow can continue to abstain. Now the votes of only a handful of foreign nations can put the treaty into effect without U.S. participation.

Just as the U.S. needs to control immigration, so it needs to play a leading role in policing a treaty that would ban manufacture as well as use of chemical weaponry. Once the election is over, both issues require resurrection.●

INTERNATIONAL FAMILY PLANNING ASSISTANCE

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Senate version of the Foreign Operations bill included my amendment to provide \$410 million for international family planning assistance, an increase of \$54 million above last year's level. That amendment also deleted a House provision which would have penalized private organizations that use their own funds for abortions, even where abortion is legal.

This is the remaining issue to be decided in the conference on this bill, and it is now in the hands of the White House and the House and Senate leadership. I appreciate the White House's support for my position. This is an issue of critical importance to the welfare of hundreds of millions of women around the world, especially in poor countries where family planning services are often lacking or inadequate.

Last year, after going back and forth with the House several times on this same issue, the House sent us a provision that resulted in a drastic cut in funding for family planning. Chairman HATFIELD, who has consistently voted pro-life, opposed that provision, as did I, because it cut family planning services to millions of women with the inevitable result that there would be an increase in unwanted pregnancies and abortions.

But the House recessed immediately after, and in order to avoid another Government shutdown the Senate reluctantly acquiesced in the House provision. I, and I know others feel likewise, do not want to see a repeat of that fiasco.

This year, the House included a provision which not only continues the one-third cut in funding for family