

# LET'S DEBATE THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to add my voice to those who have spoken about the need to bring the Chemical Weapons Convention [CWC] to the Senate floor for debate at the earliest possible date. As everyone in this body knows, the U.S. Senate must ratify the CWC by April 29, 1997, in order for the United States to become an original party to the convention.

To date, 70 countries have ratified the CWC, and another 161 countries are signatories. The United States has taken a leadership role throughout the negotiations surrounding this treaty, and yet, with time running out, the Senate has not voted on the document that so many Americans have helped to craft.

Time is of the essence in this debate for several reasons. One reason is, of course, the April 29 deadline by which the U.S. Senate must ratify this treaty so that the United States may be a full participant in the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons [OPCW], the governing body that will have the responsibility for deciding the terms for the implementation of the CWC.

A second reason is the constitutional responsibility of the Senate to provide its advice and consent on all treaties signed by the President. This treaty was signed by President Bush in January 1993, and was submitted to the Senate by President Clinton in November of that year. Unfortunately, the Senate has not yet fulfilled its responsibility with respect to this treaty.

A third reason, and what I believe is one of the most important, is the need for adequate time for debate of this treaty and its implications for the United States prior to the April 29 deadline for ratification. Many have expressed concern over various provisions in the CWC. Senators should have the opportunity to debate these concerns, and the American people deserve the chance to hear them. Senators will also have the opportunity to voice their concerns during debate of the treaty's implementing legislation, which will most likely be discussed in conjunction with the treaty itself.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I have had the opportunity to participate in hearings on this issue. In all the hearings and deliberations over the efficacy of this treaty, two things have been made crystal clear: First, the CWC is not perfect, and second, the CWC is the best avenue available for beginning down the road to the eventual elimination of chemical weapons.

There are real flaws, as we all recognize, with the verifiability of the CWC. There will be cheating and evasions and attempts to obey the letter but not the spirit of the treaty. But most of the responsible players on the international stage will recognize that through the CWC the world has spoken, and firmly rejected chemical weapons.

The CWC was laboriously crafted over three decades to meet the security and economic interests of states parties. The United States was at the forefront of that effort; the treaty reflects U.S. needs and has the blessing and enthusiastic support of our defense and business communities.

Can the treaty be improved? Of course. But the CWC has a provision for amendment after it comes into force. I would hope that the United States would be again at the head of efforts to make the treaty more effective after a period to test its utility. We have the technological means and economic weight to make it so. But only if we are a party to the treaty. And to become a party to the treaty, the U.S. Senate must perform its constitutionally mandated function of debate and ratification before April 29.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that the Chemical Weapons Convention is being held hostage to other, unrelated, matters. Time is of the essence, Mr. President, and time is running out.

In closing, this treaty should be fully and carefully debated by the U.S. Senate at the earliest possible date, not at the 11 hour when the clock is ticking on our ability to ensure that the United States is an active participant in future revisions to the CWC. The American people deserve no less. •

## "ANOTHER BAD ONE"

• Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the attached editorial from the Vermont newspaper *The Time Argus*, titled "Another Bad One," and dated March 19, 1997, be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

### ANOTHER BAD ONE

The arguments against amending the U.S. Constitution over campaign financing are the same as the arguments against a balanced budget amendment or a prohibition amendment. It is a waste of effort to target specific evils by way of the Constitution.

The U.S. Senate wisely rejected a campaign finance amendment by a wide margin on Tuesday.

States which have encumbered their constitutions with numerous amendments have found their documents have become just that: encumbrances.

A constitutional amendment will not stop candidates from getting money, and it will not stop people who want to influence candidates from using their money to promote that influence. You might as well have an amendment that said: "Candidates for public office shall not spend money in their quest for the office."

Then there would be a court case to argue whether a candidate who filled his automobile gas tank while on the way to a campaign forum had "spent money in his quest" for the office.

A constitutional amendment against bank robbery would not stop the number of bank robberies that occur. There is a law against bank robbery, and in fact Congress finally got the federal government into the investigations by making it possible for the FBI to enter bank robbery cases immediately.

And something similar relating to campaign financing would be the proper course

of action, instead of an amendment to the Constitution. A congressional statute putting greater controls over campaigns would have the same effect as an amendment without the permanent encumbrance of the amendment on matters unforeseen.

In some cases the courts have ruled that specific laws limiting contribution limits infringe on free speech. It ought to be possible for a congressional statute to impose some sort of constraint on money without interfering with speech.

The huge sums spent on campaigns may very well be considered immoral, but history has given ample illustrations of the futility of trying to legislate morality. Prohibition is a relatively recent example. Did it stop people from consuming alcohol? No. In fact, it helped increase the power of law-breaking organizations geared to providing illicit substances, a baneful influence that is still with us.

The present spotlight in Washington on campaign contributions and the methods of solicitation for such funds makes it easy for people to think an amendment to the Constitution would be an appropriate response. But however tawdry such actions have been—and they certainly are tawdry—there will be no change merely by passing an amendment that says, in effect: "Thou shalt not be tawdry. Thou shalt not be greedy."

The existing amendments to the U.S. Constitution that come closest to addressing a specific subject are the 13th and 14th, which after the Civil War abolished slavery and codified equal protection under the law. But even they were not so specific that they can't be applied to races other than African-Americans, and questions of equal protection arise even today.

Efforts for a balanced budget amendment are an abdication of congressional responsibility. Efforts for an amendment on campaign financing constitute a similar abdication. •

## EXPRESSING CONCERNS ABOUT AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT BUDGET

• Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I want to express my concern with the President's proposal for the budget of the Federal Aviation Administration. We all know how important aviation is to our economy, contributing more than \$770 billion in direct and indirect benefits. In South Carolina, travel and tourism is the No. 2 industry, accounting for almost 100,000 jobs. The industry is fueled by the aviation industry.

The President has talked a lot about a bridge to the 21st century. Bridges and highway projects are critical parts of our Nation's infrastructure. But so are airports. I have an airport in almost every county of my State. We have a strong airport system, but one that needs money to rebuild and expand. The \$1 billion proposal falls far short of what is needed. It is a short-sighted approach to meeting our country's needs. It also undoes a deal that we had last year with the administration. I am certain that the new Secretary wants to make sure that our Nation's infrastructure needs are addressed, and I want to work with him on ways to meet those needs.

The President has proposed a \$1 billion airport improvement program. The airport community claims that nationwide it needs almost \$10 billion per

year. In my State alone, money for airports is critically needed for small and large projects. Without adequate funding, these airports cannot expand and cannot begin to attract new businesses. I can cite many examples of this, but one that comes to mind is the Greenville-Spartanburg Airport project. Without an AIP grant, the runway would not have been lengthened. It helped BMW decide to locate in South Carolina. Airport grants mean business opportunities.

#### YALE PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to salute five extraordinary New Yorkers who, on Monday April 7, 1997, will receive the Public Service Award of the Yale Alumni Association of Metropolitan New York [YAAMNY]. These individuals have demonstrated both extraordinary leadership and a deep commitment to public service. Each honoree brilliantly exemplifies the motto of the Empire State: Excelsior.

I thank the Chair, and I ask that the text of YAAMNY's citation of the achievements of the respective honorees be printed in the RECORD.

The Text Follows:

THE YALE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN NEW YORK, 1997 PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS, APRIL 7, 1997

#### THE HONOREES

Peter Rosen, M.F.A., 1968, has produced and directed over 50 full-length films and television programs. His subjects range from student activism at Yale in 1970 (his first film, titled *Bright College Years*) to I.M. Pei to Carnegie Hall's 100th anniversary, all of which have aired on PBS.

Kimberly Nelson, B.A., 1988, is Team Program Director at Creative Arts Workshop, which provides job and leadership training for at-risk teens. She served as a coordinator for Black Students at Yale. She began her career as a social worker at the Rheedlan Foundation, a Harlem social service agency.

Tania November, B.A., 1988, is a Manhattan Assistant District Attorney in the Office of the Special Narcotics Prosecutor. She launched her career as an intern in the same office before her senior year, and went straight to Harvard Law, where she was a teaching fellow and law tutor in the college.

Sarah Pettit, B.A., 1988, is Editor of *OUT*, America's largest circulation gay and lesbian magazine. At Yale, she ran the lesbian and gay Co-op. She also helped amend the University's non-discrimination policy to include sexual orientation as a protected category. She makes frequent television appearances.

Jenifer Hadiyia, B.A., 1995, is currently enrolled in a Masters of Public Policy and Administration program at Columbia University. She is also an intern at Planned Parenthood. A coordinator for the Women's Center while at Yale, she helped organize the 25th anniversary celebration of coeducation.●

#### TAX CUTS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the Speaker of the other body made a remarkable statement earlier this week. He argued that Congress should wait on cutting taxes, and instead make bal-

ancing the budget our highest priority. This is a significant and extremely positive development in the fight for a balanced Federal budget, and I congratulate the Speaker for making that statement in the face of significant opposition within his own party.

Mr. President, the Speaker's comments are indeed welcome. They follow the comments made this weekend by the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee [Mr. DOMENICI], who informally offered a no-tax cut, no new spending programs outline of a possible budget agreement. Mr. President, I cannot emphasize enough how important the comments of the chairman were. They came after several days of highly partisan comments on the budget, from both parties and in both houses. Often, without leadership, it is the nature of some to retreat to the security of partisan politics—an easy path that leads us further and further apart. To his great credit, Chairman DOMENICI rejected the considerable forces of partisanship, and offered an alternative path. Mr. President, his path offers us a real chance for a bipartisan budget agreement, and I want to take this occasion to commend my chairman for his courage. I am pleased to serve on the Budget Committee, and deeply honored to serve with the senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, the Speaker is of course absolutely right on the mark. As dearly as many of us would like to support tax cuts, our first priority must be to balance the budget. This is a position I took when I first ran for the Senate, and one I hold today.

Major tax cuts undercut our ability to craft a politically sustainable balanced budget plan, as was so clearly demonstrated during the 104th Congress. As I have noted before, both parties are at fault. We cannot afford either the President's tax cuts or the Congressional Republican tax cuts.

In November of 1994, I faulted the so-called Contract With America tax cuts—called the crown jewel of the Contract With America at the time. A month later, the day after the President proposed his own set of tax cuts, I took his proposal to task as well.

Mr. President, we dodged a bullet during the 104th Congress. Despite formal support for a tax cut in some form from both the White House and the majority party in Congress, we escaped without doing serious damage to the progress we made in reducing the deficit. Regretfully, we did not build significantly on the work accomplished in the 103d Congress to reduce the deficit. Though we made some modest strides, the bulk of the work that remained at the end of 1994 must still be done.

Mr. President, major tax cuts make the difficult task of enacting a balanced budget impossible. Most obviously, major tax cuts dig the hole even deeper before we begin. But major tax cuts also pose a significant and very real political problem, and the Speaker's comments about how including tax

cuts leaves a balanced budget plan open to criticism are absolutely correct. There is no painless solution to the deficit.

The fundamental premise of any plan to balance the budget rests on the willingness of the Nation to sacrifice, but we cannot expect the Nation to embrace a plan which calls for some to sacrifice while providing tax cuts for others. Such a plan would not be sustainable, as was demonstrated so clearly during the 104th Congress. We can enact a balance budget plan if that plan is seen broadly as spreading sacrifice fairly. Mr. President, no partisan plan has any hope of rallying broadbased public support.

The only way we will enact a balanced budget plan, and sustain it through the several years it will take to achieve balance, is through a truly bipartisan effort. Thanks to the leadership of Chairman DOMENICI, and with the support of the Speaker, we have a chance to build such a plan. I hope my colleagues will not squander the opportunity they have given us at some personal political cost to themselves.

I look forward to working with Chairman DOMENICI on the Budget Committee to fashion the beginning of a budget agreement. As I have indicated to him in the committee, there are several budget issues that are especially important to me, but I remain flexible on all aspects of the budget in trying to reach a bipartisan agreement. Mr. President, I applaud the Speaker for change of heart, and especially commend Chairman DOMENICI for his courage and leadership.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JACK G. JUSTUS

● Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a fellow Arkansan who is soon to retire after a long and distinguished career in Arkansas agriculture.

Jack G. Justus has devoted 44 years of service to Arkansas agriculture as a county agricultural agent and as a staff member of the Arkansas Farm Bureau. Under Jack's leadership as executive vice president for the past 15 years, the Arkansas Farm Bureau has nearly doubled in size to more than 200,000 members.

"Progressive Farmer" honored Jack Justus as its 1996 Man of the Year in Service to Agriculture. Throughout his career, Jack has served on numerous boards and commissions, including the Future Farmers of America Foundation, the 4-H Club Foundation, Arkansas State Fair, and other groups committed to the improvement of life for farm youth and the rural community.

Mr. President, on June 1, 1997, Jack Justus will retire from his administrative duties at the Farm Bureau. This native Arkansan, life-long resident, product of our State's educational system, and dedicated public servant is certainly deserving of a long and satisfying retirement.

Our State has benefited greatly from Jack Justus' stewardship and I know I