

the burden. The achievement of peace in the region is not a question of cash. But the vast disparity between monetary commitments in Eastern Europe and West Africa is telling; reflective perhaps of a basic unwillingness on the part of wealthier nations to meet Africans halfway in their efforts to build peace.

Last fall, Catholic Relief Services and other humanitarian organizations in Liberia warned the United States and European governments that if the peace process in Liberia was not supported, it would unravel. U.N. Secretary General Boutros-Boutros Ghali and Ghanaian President Jerry Rawlings noted at the time that the annual U.N. budget for Liberia would last only five days in the former Yugoslavia.

Without the support needed to foster a peaceful transition, war returned quickly. Disagreements that a well-established democracy would weather easily turned into life-and-death struggles. The resulting horror is an example of a fledgling government's inability to solve its problems. But tragically, it is also an example of our vacillation, of our reluctance to provide the sort of support and companionship that could have seen Liberians through the dark but hopeful days of an early peace.

In Liberia, thousands of teenage fighters have not only been denied formal education during the years of mayhem, but in fact have never learned how to be members of society; they know only how to kill. These boy soldiers, having grown up killing, realized as the Abuja agreement dissolved that there would be no alternative to war; there would be no chance to learn a way to make a living without a gun, or even to develop into normal human beings. Already robbed of the luxury of human emotion, they would also be denied the opportunity to leave behind the violent life they had always known.

By January, the peace was undone, and today Monrovia burns. The people of the United States and the members of the Security Council must ready themselves to pacify Liberia and reconstruct the country from the ground up, again. As Americans, we cannot throw up our hands and walk away. Why not? Because Liberians are not all warlords. They are farmers and merchants, women and children; they are our brothers and sisters. And they need our support.●

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE W. JENKINS, JR.

● Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, my colleague, Senator CONNIE MACK, and I join in a special tribute to one of the great business leaders of this century and a pioneer entrepreneur in food retailing: Mr. George W. Jenkins, Jr.

After a full and rewarding life, George Jenkins died peacefully in his sleep in Lakeland, FL, on April 8, 1996. He was 88.

Today, we salute the memory of this outstanding person, who personified the economic expansion of Florida in the 20th Century and the commitment to excellence in commerce.

On the eve of the Great Depression, George Jenkins invested funds he had been saving to buy a car in the first Publix grocery store. That was 1930. Since then, Publix has evolved into one of the largest supermarket operations in the Nation, with more than 500 stores in Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina, and annual sales exceeding \$9 billion.

Publix employees affectionately referred to their founder as "Mr.

George." Consumer Reports, in 1993, rated Publix tops in America in customer service.

In most endeavors, the positive assessment of one's peers is perhaps the highest accolade. To say that George Jenkins' peers respected him would amount to understatement; they revered him as a genius in food retailing.

George Jenkins will long be remembered for his business leadership, but also for his generosity and love of family. His philanthropy for United Way, the Boy Scouts of America, and other beneficiaries touched countless lives.

Florida is a better place and America is a stronger nation because George Jenkins shared his special talents and his giving spirit through much of this century.●

THE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM BILL

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I voted for the illegal immigration reform bill before the Senate yesterday. The final bill is a much more balanced approach than what was first proposed in committee. Importantly, the illegal immigration reform bill deals only with illegal immigration, and expanding deeming for legally sponsored immigrants.

I supported dealing with illegal immigration separately from legal immigration because of my concern that if the two issues were dealt with together, as first proposed, legal immigration would be swept up in very different issues surrounding illegal immigration.

The illegal immigration bill sets necessary and clear limits while continuing America's history of being a nation of immigrants.

In recent years, illegal immigration has become an issue of serious legislative and national security concern. The bombing of the World Trade Center in New York City by undocumented aliens led the Clinton administration and various Members of Congress to propose legislation reforming the immigration process in the United States, particularly political asylum.

This illegal immigration bill deals with stopping illegal immigration on two fronts—at our borders by keeping illegal aliens out in the first place, and within our borders for those who have entered the United States legally but are now here illegally.

It improves the controlling and policing of our borders from illegal entry by increasing border patrol and INS inspectors. It also addresses the magnet of jobs and public assistance that has attracted illegal immigrants to the United States by authorizing a series of pilot projects to verify eligibility for employment in the United States and for receiving public assistance and by establishing a program to develop tamper proof birth certificates and driver's licenses to reduce their vulnerability to forgery.

This bill also increases the number of border patrol agents by 4,700 over 5

years. It adds 300 full-time INS investigators over 3 years to enforce alien smuggling and employment laws.

It also deals with the fact that half of all illegal aliens in the United States came here legally—they then overstayed their visas and are now here illegally. We can't eliminate the problem of illegal immigration only by policing our borders. We must also find ways to keep people from coming here legally as tourists or students and not leaving. The bill deals with this in a number of ways, but its major thrust is clamping down on the magnets that attract illegal aliens in the first place by eliminating access to U.S. jobs and taxpayer supported benefits.

In order to block illegal aliens from working and receiving public assistance employers and administrators of public assistance need to have a reliable way to know who is eligible to work or to receive benefits and who isn't. It has been illegal since 1986 to hire illegal aliens, but far too many are working and taking jobs from American citizens and legal permanent residents. The relative ease of access to U.S. jobs is what is drawing illegal aliens to the United States. The main reason the current system is not working as it should is because we don't have an accurate or forgery-proof way to verify employment eligibility.

This bill attempts to address this issue. It simplifies the existing cumbersome employment verification system by reducing the number of acceptable documents that can be used by employers to verify a person's eligibility to work. It lays the groundwork to develop a new verification system for employment and public assistance eligibility. The INS is directed to conduct several local and regional pilot projects to demonstrate the feasibility of alternative systems for verifying eligibility. The pilot programs can last from 4 to 7 years in an effort to find a workable system. Congress must approve any permanent program.

The bill language specifically takes steps to protect privacy and guard against anti discrimination. It also contains language to protect privacy and criteria to reduce the burden and cost to business.

The verification system aims to eliminate counterfeit documents by requiring that any document required for verification must be tamper resistant. However, the legislation makes clear that this document may not be required as a national identification card. Importantly, employers are not liable if they hire a person in good faith who is later found to have been ineligible.

The bill reinforces and strengthens current U.S. immigration law requirements that immigrants be self-supporting and that they not become a public charge. Legal immigrants are accepted into the United States under the condition that their sponsors, not the taxpayer, will be responsible for them. This bill holds them to that promise. It

requires sponsors of immigrants to take greater responsibility for those they bring into the United States by making the affidavit of support which they sign a legally binding document.

The bill also counts the sponsor's income as part of the immigrant's income for purposes of determining eligibility for public assistance, a process known as deeming for an expanded range of public assistance programs. I believe this provision is in line with immigrants' pledge of self-sufficiency and that they will not become a public charge. By expanding the number of programs that require deeming, we are holding immigrants to their commitment and requiring their sponsors, not the Government, take responsibility for them. I supported a Simon amendment that would have eliminated retroactive deeming requirements in the bill. I believe in deeming requirements to assure that sponsors and the legal immigrants that they sponsor meet the responsibilities they have promised to meet, but I think it's unfair to apply new rules after the fact to those who are already here. Unfortunately, that amendment was defeated.

I voted for a Kennedy amendment that would have excluded pregnant women, children and veterans from deeming requirements for Medicaid. Unfortunately, that amendment was also defeated.

Under the bill, illegal immigrants, who have broken U.S. laws and have no legal right to be here, are prohibited from using any Federal, State, or local benefit, with minor exceptions related to public health interests.

Mr. President, in conclusion, it is time we dealt firmly and directly with illegal immigration. This bill, while not perfect, makes a good effort to put in place the procedures and resources necessary to reduce illegal immigration. •

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported favorably, by a 13 to 5 vote, the resolution of ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention [CWC]. I applaud the committee's action and the leadership of Senators LUGAR, PELL, KASSEBAUM, KERRY, and BIDEN, not to mention the hard work of the committee staff, to advance this major arms control treaty. I hope that floor consideration can be scheduled as early as possible. While I realize that there may be difficulties on the floor, this treaty is of such importance that it would be an abrogation of our responsibility, when it is out of committee and ready to go, not to provide advice and consent before the end of this Congress.

I note that Majority Leader DOLE stated on December 7 of last year that it was his intention that the Senate would consider the Convention in a reasonable time period once the Convention is on the Executive Calendar.

Well, the Chemical Weapons Convention is now on the calendar, and the reasonable time clock is ticking.

As all major arms control treaties must be, the CWC is a bipartisan measure. It was negotiated during the Reagan administration, signed by President Bush, and submitted to the Senate by President Clinton. It was approved by a strong bipartisan majority of the Foreign Relations Committee. It is endorsed by arms control advocates and the Chemical Manufacturers Association. Some critics of the CWC have sought to blame the Democrats for failing to ratify the Convention when they controlled the Senate. Yes, the Senate should have acted on the CWC in 1994, but that fact does not provide a reason not to act in 1996. The sooner we can ratify the Convention, the sooner we can eliminate these horrible weapons.

While U.S. accession to the treaty is not a legal requirement for the treaty to enter into force, it has become a practical requirement. The case of the CWC is yet another example of the continued primacy of U.S. leadership in international politics. Ratification by 65 countries is necessary for the CWC to enter into force. Currently, only 49 have done so, and it has become clear that many are waiting for U.S. ratification. Why? For one, because the United States maintains one of the two largest stockpiles of chemical weapons. But more fundamentally, because nations continue to look to the United States for leadership in matters of great international import. President George Bush wrote in 1994: "United States leadership is required once again to bring this historic agreement into force." This remains true today. Prompt action is our responsibility.

Critics of the CWC, and there appear to be few, argue that U.S. security is harmed by our approval of a treaty that binds us to destroy a class of weapons we currently possess, while citing that certain "rogue" states have not signed the treaty and raising questions over Russian compliance. They argue that, by proceeding to eliminate its chemical weapons stockpile under the CWC, the United States is depriving itself of a deterrent capability against any state that maintains some CW capacity. However, deterrence is based on the ability to respond in kind, and that assumes that chemical weapons are a legitimate instrument of warfare for the U.S. military.

The fundamental basis behind the CWC, however, is that chemical weapons are not legitimate for war-fighting. This consensus goes back to World War I, where the invidious use of mustard gas prompted the 1925 Geneva Protocol to prohibit the use of chemical warfare agents. More recently, the Iraqi attacks on the Kurds in 1988 and the Sarin gas attack on the Tokyo subway last year have reminded the international community of the terror of chemical weapons. Try as we might to stigmatize chemical weapons through other means, there can be no sub-

stitute for, in the words of President Bush's National Security Advisor Gen. Brent Scowcroft, "the clear international norms against chemical weapons, the legal framework, and the challenge inspections embodied in the Chemical Weapons Convention."

A chemical weapons deterrent capability for the United States is not only unnecessary, it is inconceivable. If U.S. troops or territory were subject to a chemical attack, our military has ample means to respond in conventional ways, if a military response were deemed appropriate. Defense Secretary William Perry testified last month to the Foreign Relations Committee that "we have an effective range of capabilities to protect against, to deter, or to retaliate against the use of chemical weapons * * *". JCS Chairman Gen. John Shalikashvili testified in 1994 that "while forgoing the ability to retaliate in kind, the U.S. military retains the wherewithal to deter and defend against a chemical attack." Additionally, I doubt that many Americans would feel comfortable with having a military that is prepared to wage gas attacks on foreign populations. In essence, how could we ask the world to make illegal these weapons, if we reserve the right to their legitimate use?

There are a number of other criticisms of the CWC to address, and I hope to do so at a later time. Simply put, the CWC will improve our national security by establishing the legal basis, the timetable and the verification regime necessary to ban chemical weapons. I am pleased that the Foreign Relations Committee has finally reported out the Convention, and I hope that we can proceed to give our advice and consent as soon as possible. •

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BUDGET

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, just to follow up very briefly on what the majority leader said, the Wall Street Journal earlier this week pointed out that the tax increases in 1993 had the effect of costing jobs and economic growth in this country. Two economists, William Beach and Scott Hodge, at the Heritage Foundation, used the very reputable econometric model, the Washington University macro model, to try to figure out what happened as a result of that 1993 budget deal. They calculated it reduced private sector jobs by 1.2 million. We lost \$208 billion in output, or the equivalent of \$2,100 per family. What is worse, they found out the tax increases did not reduce the deficit as much as predicted because tax increases change behavior and not all the taxes were generated. Only about 56 cents of additional deficit reduction came for every \$1 of new taxes. So that did not work very well.

Now the majority leader has talked about how we need to get the budget in balance by cutting spending. I wanted to share very briefly today with my colleagues something that went on in