

increase the delivery of health services in health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] were added as cosponsors of S. 375, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore the link between the maximum amount of earnings by blind individuals permitted without demonstrating ability to engage in substantial gainful activity and the exempt amount permitted in determining excess earnings under the earnings test.

S. 405

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] were added as cosponsors of S. 405, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the research credit and to allow greater opportunity to elect the alternative incremental credit.

S. 411

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for investment necessary to revitalize communities within the United States, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 19

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 19, a joint resolution to disapprove the certification of the President under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regarding foreign assistance for Mexico during fiscal year 1997.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 20, a joint resolution to disapprove the certification of the President under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regarding foreign assistance for Mexico during fiscal year 1997.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 21

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 21, a joint resolution to disapprove the certification of the President under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regarding assistance for Mexico during fiscal year 1997, and to provide for the termination of the withholding of and opposition to assistance that results from the disapproval.

SENATE RESOLUTION 19

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], the Senator

from Utah [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 19, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States opposition to the prison sentence of Tibetan ethnomusicologist Ngawang Choephel by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

SENATE EXECUTIVE RESOLUTION 62—RELATIVE TO THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

Mr. FORD submitted the following executive resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. EX. RES. 62

Resolved, That the Senate hereby expresses its intention to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention at the appropriate time after the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of the Convention, subject to the following declaration, which would be binding upon the President:

(1) CHEMICAL WEAPONS DESTRUCTION.—Prior to the deposit of the United States instrument of ratification of the Convention, the President shall certify to the Congress that all of the following conditions are satisfied:

(A) EXPLORATION OF ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGIES.—The President has agreed to explore alternative technologies for the destruction of the United States stockpile of chemical weapons in order to ensure that the United States has the safest, most effective and environmentally sound plans and programs for meeting its obligations under the Convention for the destruction of chemical weapons.

(B) CONVENTION EXTENDS DESTRUCTION DEADLINE.—The requirement in section 1412 of Public Law 99-145 (50 U.S.C. 1521) for completion of the destruction of the United States stockpile of chemical weapons by December 31, 2004 will be superseded upon the date the Convention enters into force with respect to the United States by the deadline required by the Convention of April 29, 2007.

(C) AUTHORITY TO EMPLOY A DIFFERENT DESTRUCTION TECHNOLOGY.—The requirement in Article III(1)(a)(v) of the Convention for a declaration by each State party to the Convention, not later than 30 days after the date the Convention enters into force with respect to that party, on general plans of the state party for destruction of its chemical weapons does not preclude the United States from deciding in the future to employ a technology for the destruction of chemical weapons different than that declared under that Article.

(D) PROCEDURES FOR EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.—The President will consult with Congress on whether to submit a request to the Executive Council of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons for an extension of the deadline for the destruction of chemical weapons under the Convention, as provided under part IV(A) of the Annex on Implementation and Verification to the Convention, if, as a result of the program of alternative technologies for the destruction of chemical munitions carried out under section 8065 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (as contained in Public Law 104-208), the President determines that alternatives to the incineration of chemical weapons are available that are safer and more environmentally sound but whose use would preclude the United States from meeting the deadlines of the Convention.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I rise today to submit an executive resolution

placing conditions on the Chemical Weapons Convention with respect to this Nation's Chemical Demilitarization Program.

Muhammad Ali used to say that not only could he knock 'em out, but he could pick the round. There is no doubt in my mind that when the fight's over, we will knock 'em out on the issue of alternative technologies. Unfortunately, we do not have the luxury of picking which round incineration goes down for good. That means every time we have an opportunity—or see an instance where the Army might try to bob and weave—we've got to be ready to get our punches in.

I believe the passage of the Chemical Weapons Convention could present the Army with just such an opportunity to bob and weave on searching for alternatives to incineration. Fortunately, the White House has agreed to placing additional conditions on the treaty which should stop any of the Army's attempts to duck out on their responsibility.

The head of the National Security Council, Sandy Berger, has sent me a letter agreeing to my language placing conditions on the Chemical Weapons Convention. The letter not only makes it clear to the world and to the Army the President's commitment to exploring alternatives to incineration, it further clarifies the relationship between the Chemical Weapons Convention and our Chemical Weapons Demilitarization Program. I also have a copy of a letter from the President to Secretary of Defense William Cohen reiterating his strong support for finding alternatives to incineration that are safe and environmentally sound.

Why is this language so important?

First, back in 1989, as part of the Defense authorization bill, Congress set an arbitrary deadline of 2004 for the destruction of all chemical weapons. That date conflicts with the Chemical Weapons Convention which calls for destruction 10 years from the date the treaty is signed, which would be 2007. While it should be clear to everyone involved that the treaty date supersedes the congressional mandate, we don't want to give the Army a reason to bob and weave.

Second, 30 days from signing the treaty, signatories are required to submit their plan for destruction. Because the Army is already incinerating chemical weapons in the United States and has already invested billions in this method, this is the plan they will submit 30 days after the treaty has been signed.

Under my language, this treaty requirement will not preclude the United States from going through with a different method than what is originally submitted. Without my language, we have no protection against the Army holding up the official plan as a defense against looking for alternatives.

Third, many in the Nation were very concerned the Army would see the 10-year deadline as an excuse, claiming

they simply wouldn't have the time to explore alternatives. In fact, the treaty allows any country to request a 5-year waiver. Under my language, the United States would automatically request that extension if an alternative method can be found.

The condition to the treaty states that if "the President determines that alternatives to incineration are available which are safer and more environmentally sound, but whose use would preclude the United States from meeting the Convention time lines, the President shall consult with the Congress on whether to request to the Executive Council of the OPSW for an extension of the Convention's destruction deadline."

Finally, adding this condition to the treaty is crucial to the effort to find alternative methods because last year's appropriations language not only has to be renewed every single year, but fails to address the treaty's deadline. Year after year, we're going to be faced with fighting the funding aspect out on the House and Senate floor, with no guarantee of winning.

But with my language attached to the treaty, the search for alternative methods won't be left entirely up to a yearly floor battle. That's because I will have effectively closed any loophole related to treaty deadlines that might allow the Army to avoid searching for alternative technologies.

In closing, let me say that up until this point I have withheld support for the Chemical Weapons Convention. But because I have been able to negotiate these critical protections of the exploration of safe, affordable, and environmentally sound alternatives to chemical weapons incineration. I will now put my support behind the treaty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the President to Secretary of Defense William Cohen, and a letter sent to me by the Acting Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, Sandy Berger, be included in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, February 27, 1997.

Hon. WILLIAM S. COHEN,
Secretary of Defense, Washington DC.

DEAR BILL: Since the enactment of the FY 1997 Defense Appropriations Act (P.L. 104-208) last fall, Under Secretary Kaminski has acted quickly and diligently to begin implementation of Section 8065, establishing a pilot program to identify and demonstrate alternatives to the Army's baseline incineration process for the demilitarization of assembled chemical munitions. As I stated in a letter last July to Senator Ford, who sponsored a similar provision on the FY 1997 Defense Authorization Act, I am committed to going the extra mile to explore whether there may be safer and more environmentally sound alternatives to incineration.

I would, therefore, request that Defense give this pilot program high priority in order to ensure that the United States has the best plans and programs for meeting its chemical weapons destruction requirements.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, February 27, 1997.

Hon. WENDELL H. FORD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR WENDELL: I am pleased that we have reached agreement with you on the attached Condition to the Chemical Weapons Convention CWC resolution of ratification, making clear the President's commitment to exploring alternatives to incineration for the destruction of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile and clarifying the relationship between the CWC and our chemical weapons demilitarization program.

We look forward to entering this historic treaty into force on April 29 with the U.S. as an original Party. As the President said in his State of the Union address, "Make no mistake about it, it will make our troops safer from chemical attack. It will help us to fight terrorism. We have no more important obligations, especially in the wake of what we now know about the Gulf War."

Again, we appreciate your support on this crucial issue.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL R. BERGER,
Acting Assistant to the President,
for National Security Affairs.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

FORD EXECUTIVE AMENDMENT NO. 20

(Ordered referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

Mr. FORD submitted an Executive amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Chemical Weapons Convention (Treaty Doc. No. 103-21); as follows:

CONDITION #15

CHEMICAL WEAPONS DESTRUCTION.—Prior to depositing the United States instrument of ratification, the President shall certify to the Senate that he is committed to exploring alternative technologies for the destruction of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile in order to ensure that the U.S. has the best plans and programs for meeting its chemical weapons destruction requirements. The President shall also certify that—

A. the current statutory requirement for completing destruction of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile by December 31, 2004 shall be superseded after the Convention enters into force by the CWC-mandated deadline of April 29, 2007;

B. the requirement under Article III, paragraph 1 (a)(v) of the Convention for a declaration not later than 30 days after the Convention enters into force on general plans for chemical weapons destruction does not in any way preclude the United States from deciding in the future to employ a destruction technology different than that specified in this U.S. declaration; and,

C. if, as a result of the alternative technologies program mandated in Section 8065 of the FY 1997 DOD Appropriations Bill (PL 104-208), the President determines that alternatives to incineration are available which are safer and more environmentally sound, but whose use would preclude the United States from meeting the Convention's timelines, the President shall consult with the Congress on whether to submit a request to the Executive Council of the OPCW for an

extension of the Convention's destruction deadline, as provided under Part IV (A) of the Verification Annex.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS EXPENDITURES AU- THORIZATION RESOLUTION

GLENN AMENDMENT NO. 21

Mr. GLENN proposed an amendment to the resolution, Senate Resolution 39, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Governmental Affairs; as follows:

On page 10, strike lines 17 through 20 and insert the following:

"(b) PURPOSE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The additional funds authorized by this section are for the sole purpose of conducting an investigation into illegal or improper fundraising and spending practices in the 1996 Federal election campaigns, including the following:

"(A) Foreign contributions and the effect of those contributions on the United States political system.

"(B) Conflicts of interest involving Federal office holders and employees, and the misuse of Government offices.

"(C) Failure by Federal employees to maintain and observe legal limitations relating to fundraising and official business.

"(D) The independence of the Presidential campaigns from the political activities pursued for their benefit by outside individuals or groups.

"(E) The misuse of charitable and tax exempt organizations in connection with political or fundraising activities.

"(F) Amounts given to or spent by a political party for the purpose of influencing Federal elections generally that are not subject to the limitations or reporting requirements of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) (commonly referred to as 'soft money') and the effect of soft money on the United States political system.

"(G) Promises or grants of special access in return for political contributions or favors.

"(H) The effect of independent expenditures (whether by corporations, labor unions, or otherwise) upon the current Federal campaign finance system, and the question as to whether such expenditures are truly independent.

"(I) Contributions to and expenditures by entities for the benefit or in the interest of Federal officers.

"(J) Practices described in subparagraphs (A) through (I) that occurred in previous Federal election campaigns to the extent that those practices are similar or analogous.

"(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the Committee on Governmental Affairs under the Senate Rules or section 13(d) of this resolution.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the House Subcommittee on the Constitution will hold a joint hearing on Tuesday, March 11, 1997, at 9:30 a.m. in