

1996, the CEO's of 53 of America's most prominent chemical companies bluntly stated: "Our industry's status as the world's preferred supplier of chemical products may be jeopardized if the United States does not ratify the convention." The American chemical industry would be marked as unreliable and unjustly associated with chemical weapons proliferation. If the resolution of ratification of the CWC were to be defeated, it would cost the U.S. chemical industry significant portion of its \$60 billion export business—many in the industry have agreed on an estimate of \$600 million a year—and result in the loss of thousands of good-paying American jobs.

Under the terms of the CWC, some 2,000 U.S. industry facilities—not companies—will be affected by the treaty. Of that group, some 1,800 will be asked to fill out brief data declaration forms and the remaining 200 are likely to undergo inspections. Assertions that the neighborhood "Mom and Pop" dry cleaners, cosmetics firms, and breweries will be involved in this are wildly inaccurate.

In addition, although the industry's representatives explained patiently to Senators that the CWC's onsite verification and inspection procedures will not violate a U.S. company's constitutional protection against undue search or seizure, there is included in the 28 agreed conditions condition 28 that requires the United States to obtain a criminal search warrant in the case of any challenge inspection of a U.S. facility to which the facility does not give its consent, and to obtain an administrative search warrant from a U.S. magistrate judge in the case of any routine inspection of a U.S. facility to which the facility does not give its consent.

The U.S. chemical industry led by the Chemical Manufacturers Association, the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, and the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America have repeatedly and unequivocally requested that the Senate approve the resolution of ratification and pass its associated implementing legislation. Industry's support of this treaty should not be questioned, it should be applauded.

It's surprising to see nonindustry people shouting industry concern when the industry itself was intimately involved in developing the convention and the proposed implementation legislation and is urging the Senate to approve the resolution of ratification. The CEO's or other senior executives of seven major chemical firms with significant operations in my home State of Massachusetts are among those who have repeatedly urged the Senate to approve the resolution of ratification. Frankly, in my judgment, the statements of these executives concerning the effects this convention will have on their businesses are more credible than the contradictory statements of the opponents of the CWC.

Also among the arguments against the convention used by its critics is the assertion that the CWC will cost the American taxpayers too much money. On the contrary, the U.S. share of the CWC's monitoring and inspection regime, approximately \$20 million annually, is far less than the \$75 million annual cost to store America's chemical weapons. This \$20 million of support for the international inspection agency is minuscule in comparison to the amounts we spend for U.S. defenses. This is a small price to pay to institute and maintain an international mechanism that will dramatically reduce the chemical weapons threat that faces U.S. service men and women and establish an international norm for national behavior which is so apparently in the interests of this Nation and, indeed, all the world's people. And, lest the estimates of the costs of U.S. participation prove to be low, included in the 28 agreed conditions is a condition that limits the U.S. annual contribution to no more than \$25 million a year, to be adjusted every third year based on changes in the Consumer Price Index.

The United States led the international community throughout the negotiation of the Chemical Weapons Convention. Three administrations—two Republican and one Democratic—have labored to develop and place before the Senate a carefully crafted instrument that will increase the safety and security of U.S. citizens and armed forces and will do so at very reasonable costs to taxpayers, companies that make and use legitimate chemicals, and American consumers. Former Presidents Ford, Carter, and Bush have spoken out strongly in favor of ratification. Today 1996 Republican Presidential nominee and former Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole announced his support for the CWC coupled with the 28 conditions to which bipartisan agreement has been secured.

Rarely does one see a situation in which it is more important to apply the admonition that we would be wise not to let the perfect become the enemy of the good. Perfect security against chemical weapons is unattainable. I have great hopes that wise Senators will not permit a group of Senators who will not be satisfied by the greatest achievable increase in our security, and many of whom have a basic objection to any international arms control treaty to scuttle a carefully engineered agreement that our military leaders, our intelligence community senior executives, former Presidents of both parties, President Clinton, and 1996 Presidential nominee Dole agree will make all Americans and, indeed, the entire world safer and more secure from chemical weapons.

In closing, I want to commend those who have labored diligently to bring the Senate to this point. Former Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman RICHARD LUGAR, with the assistance of his able staff, has done yeoman service and again demonstrated

his capacity as a leader and statesman. Senator JOE BIDEN, the ranking Democratic member of the Foreign Relations Committee, has labored, also with the help of his staff, to bring this treaty before the Senate. Senator CARL LEVIN, ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee, and Senate Democratic Leader TOM DASCHLE, each knowledgeable and dedicated, have made considerable contributions to this effort and to the debate. Majority Leader TRENT LOTT's leadership has permitted negotiation of 28 conditions designed to reassure those who in good faith had questions and concerns about various aspects of the treaty. I compliment and thank all of them.

Mr. President the compelling logic of this convention and the breadth and depth of support for it should produce an overwhelming vote to approve the resolution of ratification. I have great hope that the Senate will demonstrate its ability by taking this important step of ratifying this treaty. I urge my colleagues to vote for the resolution.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, under the new rules governing access to the floor, that Scott Bunton of my staff, be permitted access to the Senate floor as long as the Chemical Weapons Convention is being debated.

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

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I now invite the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] to take the floor to make whatever comments he may require.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. President.

First of all, let me say that there have been a lot of charges made back and forth. And certainly I don't question the sincerity of any Senators who have spoken on the floor, nor any positions they have taken, nor do I question their motives. They clearly think that they are right and that I am wrong. I think I am right. And the right position is not to ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts talked about "lulling" people into a false sense of security. There is a very interesting editorial in the Wall Street Journal on that subject—that people are going to believe that something is going to be done with this, that it is going to eliminate or dramatically reduce chemical weapons. We have testimony from very distinguished, well-known, former Secretaries of Defense—four of them—who say that this, in fact, could increase the proliferation of chemical weapons around the world, and particularly in the area of rogue nations.

Let me just address one other thing because my beloved friend, Bob Dole,

came out and changed the position that he had previously had. I certainly don't question his sincerity. But in his letter he said that the conditions or the concerns that he had previously had been met.

I happened to stumble onto the letter that was dated September 11, 1996, from Bob Dole to TRENT LOTT. I will read the last of one paragraph. He says, "I have three concerns. First, effective verification. Do we have confidence that our intelligence will detect violations? Second, real reductions. In this case down to zero."

He is putting an expectation of reducing the use of chemical weapons "down to zero."

"Third, that it will truly be a global treaty."

Mr. President, none of these three have been met—not one of these three conditions; certainly on verification. There is not one person who has stepped onto the floor of this Senate and said that this is a verifiable treaty. Nobody claims that it is. It is not verifiable. People who give us their word that they are not going to do it. That is fine. We can believe their word. Are we going to believe countries who have not lived up to their other treaties? Certainly not.

In the case of real reductions, "down to zero"—getting one to say there are going to be any real reductions. Certainly not down to zero. Nobody has made that statement.

And will it be truly global? We have talked about the countries that are not a part of this treaty. And there are countries that are not like we are. We are talking about people who murder their own grandchildren, we are talking about Iraq, Syria, Libya, North Korea. So obviously, it is not a global treaty in any sense of the term.

In verifiability, it is kind of interesting. After the Persian Gulf war we set up a very meticulous system of verification within the United Nations that gave the inspectors from the United Nations far greater authority than the inspectors would have under this treaty. Yet we find out that in the midst of all of this that Iraq is making chemical weapons as we speak. If you can't do it with the information that they have, and the ability that they have from the United Nations, certainly it is not something that can happen under this treaty.

I have another concern. Mr. President, it is not just those who have not signed or who have not ratified the treaty. I look at some of the countries that have signed and they may or may not ratify. The distinguished Senator from Arizona, Senator KYL, earlier said that 99 percent of the known chemical weapons are in three countries: United States, China, and Russia. And not one of those countries has ratified this treaty. I doubt very seriously that they are going to ratify this treaty.

So we have all of these conditions that we are talking about that assume that, No. 1, those who are signatories

to this treaty are going to ratify it; and, No. 2, the ones that ratify it will do what they have said they will do.

I think it is kind of interesting when you look at Russia, for example. I am not singling them out other than the fact that we have had more treaties with Russia. We have the 1990 Biological Weapons Destruction Treaty; the ABM Treaty that goes all the way back to the 1970's; we have the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, START I; the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty, the CFE treaty; and the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty. In each one of these cases, the country involved—this country being Russia—has not lived up to the provisions of the treaty. In other words, they ratify a treaty. They are a signatory. Then they ratify, go through that elaborate process, and then they turn around and don't live up to it. They have been found in noncompliance by our State Department—this country—in each one of these five.

You have to ask the question: If Russia ratified five treaties and did not comply with any of the five, why would we expect that they would ratify this and not live up to it? One of the conditions that we have is that the Russians will ratify the treaty prior to the time that we would do it. People are saying oh, no, Russia will ratify but only if we do. I would like to remind my friends in this body that I was one of, I think, three Senators who voted against the START II Treaty and they used the same argument at that time. They said you have to ratify this thing, you have to ratify it before Russia because Russia is not going to ratify it if we do not ratify it. This is 2 years later, and they still have not ratified it. So we are still waiting.

So why will you expect if 2 years ago we passed the START II Treaty—and I think the Senator from North Carolina and I were two of the four votes that were against it—they said they were going to ratify after we did, and they didn't do it—why would they necessarily do it?

This global thing is very significant because here we talk about those who have signed the treaty and those who have ratified the treaty and, quite frankly, I do not care if a lot of those who have to ratify this treaty ratify it. I am not at all concerned about Canada, Costa Rica, the Fiji Islands, Switzerland, Togo, Singapore, Iceland. They are not threats to this country, but there are threats out there.

And a minute ago, someone, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, quoted James Woolsey, former CIA Director. It is also James Woolsey who said we know there are somewhere in excess of 25 nations that currently have weapons of mass destruction, either biological, chemical, or nuclear and are working on the vehicle means to deliver those weapons. And so if these countries have them, these are not countries that we are friendly with or think like we do.

I have said on the Senate floor several times in the past that I look back sometimes wistfully to the days of the cold war, Mr. President, when they had two superpowers, the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America. We had an intelligence system that was pretty well informed. We pretty much knew what they had, and they pretty much knew what we had. Even though they were a threat to this Nation, certainly they were a threat and a quantity that could be measured and we could anticipate. Now we have countries like Iraq, and we have people, as I said before, who murder their own grandchildren and we are talking about the Qadhafis, Hafez Assads and those individuals who, I think, are a far greater threat in terms of what is available in technology out there with weapons of mass destruction including what we are addressing today, and that is chemical weapons. So the threat is a very real threat that is out there.

I understand from some of my close friends, Republican friends, that there are some of these conditions that they could either take or leave and are not as concerned about whether Russia ratifies the treaty in advance; they are not really concerned about whether there are no inspectors from terrorist countries. I can't really understand that, but they are concerned understandably about article X. And while everyone has put their own interpretation on article X, and instead of putting an interpretation on it let me just read. I hope that all of America could hear the exact wording of this treaty that we are being asked to endorse and to ratify. Section 3 of article X says:

Each State party undertakes to facilitate and shall have the right to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information concerning means of protection against chemical weapons.

Wait a minute now. We are talking about they would be able to look at what our defenses against chemical weapons are, not just what we have, what our technology is, how they might be able to copy our technology.

Moving on to section 5, it says:

The technical secretariat shall establish—Incidentally, Mr. President, does it bother you, that technical secretariat? I always wondered what happened to sovereignty in this country. We have a group sitting over there someplace; we are not sure who they are going to be, but they are called the technical secretariat—

Not later than 180 days after entry into force of this convention and maintain for the use of any requesting State party a data bank containing freely available information concerning various means of protection against chemical weapons as well as such information as may be provided by State parties.

Now, I look at this as a sovereignty issue again, because I do not know who these people are, but I do know this, that we have a lot of chemical companies in this country that have not been talked about very much. You talk about the CMA. That is, as I understand it, 192 chemical companies. They

are the large ones, but there are somewhere between, it is estimated, 3 and 8,000 companies that would be affected by this treaty. Not all of them are chemical companies but about half of them, so you may be looking at 192 large chemical companies and maybe 4,000 small chemical companies and maybe it would be to their advantage to have very stringent requirements like this that would be a lot easier for large companies to stand behind than small companies.

Finally, Mr. President, I have so much respect for the three former Secretaries of Defense who testified before Senator HELMS' committee, James Schlesinger, Don Rumsfeld, and Cap Weinberger. In fact, I have talked to each one of them, along with Dick Cheney, who would have been there to testify, but he was unable to make that schedule. But he has sent a letter that has been quoted from several times. These individuals all say essentially the same thing. They say that we are being asked to ratify a treaty that is not verifiable, that is not global, that does not have any effect on those countries that are considered to be our enemies, our adversaries out there. And they are out there, Mr. President, and also even those who say they will ratify and comply have demonstrated over and over again, such as Russia, that they have not complied with previous treaties.

By the way, speaking of Russia, it was interesting; last week in *Janes Defense News*, I read that the Russians had developed a type of chemical weapon, and they have developed it out of precursors that are not under this treaty. In other words, there are three precursors that they are using that they can develop these weapons with. So they would not be covered by this. I think maybe that is just a coincidence. Maybe there are other countries out there also that are saying all right, if this Chemical Weapons Convention goes in and we intend to comply with the provisions of it, which they probably are not, what can we do to build chemical weapons without using those precursor chemicals? And they are already doing it.

I would like to share lastly something that all four of these former Secretaries of Defense have said. They have said that there is a very good chance being a party to this treaty and ratifying this treaty could increase the proliferation of chemical weapons as opposed to reducing them. I would read one paragraph out of Dick Cheney's letter, and I do not think anyone is more respected than Dick Cheney in these areas.

Indeed, some aspects of the present convention, notably its obligation to share with potential adversaries like Iran chemical manufacturing technology that can be used for military purposes and chemical defensive equipment, threaten to make this accord worse than having no treaty at all. In my judgment, the treaty's article X and XI amount to a formula for greatly accelerating the proliferation of chemical warfare capabilities around the globe.

So I would just say, Mr. President, that there has been a lot of lobbying going on, and I know the President's been very busy. I do not know what kind of deals have been made, but I do know that this is not something that is in the best security interests of the United States. I do sit on the Senate Armed Services Committee. I am the chairman of the readiness subcommittee. We are very much concerned about our State of readiness in terms of how to defend against chemical warfare. We deal with this subject every day. I am on the Intelligence Committee. We talk about this. But none of us on those two committees know about this as people such as Dick Cheney. I agree with them. We cannot afford to take a chance on a flawed treaty that could have the effect of increasing the proliferation of chemical weapons.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require to thank the Senator for his comment. He is right on target.

I have been around this place quite a while, and I have seen Senators come and go but there is one situation that is endemic to the trade. A lot of Senators can be frightened about threats of 30-second television commercials 2 years hence or 4 years hence. But let me tell you something, every kind of television known to man has been used against me about practically every vote I have cast and I am still here. So I have a little policy. I started it the first time I was sworn in. I stood over there five times now taking an oath to uphold the Constitution and to do my best to defend the best interests of this country just as the Senator has and just as the Senator has talked about.

Now, the media have with one or two rare exceptions totally ignored the appearance of the three former Secretaries of Defense who came before the Foreign Relations Committee. And one of them read the letter that the Senator has just alluded to written by Dick Cheney. I wish all Americans could have heard these three gentlemen and read the letter by Cheney because they would understand that no matter about the 30-second commercials, no matter about the news media—I have had it all thrown at me. You can come to my office and look at the wall and see all the cartoons. Every cartoon that they run I put it up on the wall to remind me that the media do not count if you stand on principles and do what you think is right.

Now, I have an idea satisfactory to myself that a lot of Senators wish they could vote against this treaty but they are wondering about the next election. I think they better stop and wonder about the next generation.

I thank the Senator for the fine remarks that he made. I admire the Senator very much.

Mr. INOUE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HELMS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the people of Oregon have firsthand knowledge of the dangers of chemical weapons. Stored at the chemical weapons depot at Umatilla in the eastern part of my State are millions of pounds of chemical weapons. Mustard gas and nerve gas sit in concrete bunkers, a constant reminder of the need for action.

We see and hear constant news reports about the dangers facing children in eastern Oregon every day those weapons sit in those stockpiles.

There is no place in a civilized society for terror weapons like these, and it is not right to have stockpiles of these weapons that put our children at risk. Passing the Chemical Weapons Convention is the most important vote in this Congress for a safer future for our children. This is a time in my view for the United States to lead rather than to retreat. When Presidents Reagan and Bush negotiated this treaty, they fully understood that U.S. leadership was needed to complete it. They knew that full U.S. participation was essential for its work.

Not only will failure to ratify this convention put us in the position of being followers on the world's stage but the provisions built into this treaty to isolate and in fact economically punish those nations which refuse to ratify the treaty are going to apply to the United States if the Senate does not ratify this treaty.

In my State, we believe that we prosper from trade, cultural and other exchanges with the rest of the world and that there would be a threat if we failed to ratify this treaty.

If the Senate allows America to become an outlaw nation, the effects would be felt by every farmer, software engineer, timber worker and fisherman who sell the fruits of their labor overseas.

I would like to for just a brief few minutes review the arguments against this treaty. Some say that it represents a loss of sovereignty, but there is no greater threat to our sovereignty than to run away from our role as a world leader. Some say that this treaty would open our essential industries to espionage, but there is no question that the American chemical companies were consulted on this treaty. They worked closely on the key verification issues and there is enormous support, enormous support among those in the chemical industry to approve this treaty.

Finally, there are those who say verification is unworkable because rogue nations will refuse to ratify it. But the fact is that ratification of the treaty gives our country new access to information about the chemical weapons programs of other nations. If we are denied access to this vital intelligence, then we will be forced to spend even more on our own intelligence to track the chemical weapons threat.

The world is watching the Senate now, watching the greatest nation on Earth and hoping that we will lead the way to ridding our planet of these poisons. I urge my colleagues to join across party lines and approve this treaty, because when it is approved, our world will be a safer place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

MR. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI pertaining to the introduction of S. 633 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that Peter Lyons, a legislative fellow working in my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for today and the remainder of the debate on this issue.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I believe it is crucial to American leadership and to the security of our men and women in the Armed Forces and, indeed, to all of us in America, that the Senate provide its advice and consent to the ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention so that the United States can join it as an original party.

The security of our men and women in the Armed Forces who someday may face the threat of chemicals, the security of our people who constantly face the threat of terrorists and terrorist states that try to get their hands on chemical weapons, all demand that the Senate join as an original party to this convention and ratify this treaty. To ratify it and to make it real, we have to do so without accepting any of the killer amendments that would render this ratification vote useless.

I say this, and I reached this conclusion as a member of the Armed Services Committee who has listened to our military leaders testify before us, who has read the testimony of these leaders who have said that the ratification of this convention is unequivocally in our national security interest because it will reduce the risk of our military forces encountering chemical weapons on a future battlefield.

In 1985, President Reagan signed a law which has resulted in our unilaterally destroying our stockpile of chemical weapons. This process will be completed in 2004. The destruction of our chemical weapons will take place, whether or not the United States ratifies the convention. We are destroying our chemical weapons. We are doing so because we decided they are no longer militarily useful and they are too expensive to maintain and we have all the capability we need to deter attack and to respond to attack. So that

President Reagan, in 1985, proposed and the Congress accepted his proposal that we destroy our chemical weapons. What this convention will do will be to require other nations to do what we are already doing, and that is going to reduce the risk of chemical attacks against our troops and our Nation.

General Shalikashvili, the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs, has had a great deal to say about this treaty. This is what he wrote on April 8. He said that:

The ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention by as many nations as possible is in the best interests of the Armed Forces of the United States. The combination [he wrote] of the nonproliferation and disarmament aspects of the convention greatly reduces the likelihood that U.S. forces may encounter chemical weapons in a regional conflict. The protection of the young men and women in our forces, should they have to go in harm's way in the future, is strengthened, not diminished, by the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Then he went on to say:

We do not need chemical weapons to provide an effective deterrent or to deliver an effective response.

When the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, every member—every single member of the Joint Chiefs, and every combatant commander have reached the same conclusion, that the ratification of this treaty is in our national security interests and will reduce the likelihood of our men and women ever facing chemicals in combat, it seems to me we should listen. When they tell us that we are already unilaterally destroying our stockpile of chemical weapons and that what we are doing by joining this convention is being in a position where we will be able to help reduce the risk that others will obtain chemical weapons, we should listen. And when they tell us that they know that this is not perfectly verifiable but that this will reduce the chances that chemical weapons will fall in hands of terrorist states or terrorist organizations or individuals—when our top military leaders tell us that, we should listen.

They have acknowledged what everyone has acknowledged. There is no way to perfectly verify a chemical weapons convention. But what they have also told us is that following their analysis of this treaty, that because of the intense inspection regime which is provided for here, that we will be able to reduce the risk that any militarily significant amount of chemicals will fall into the hands of an opponent or a future opponent. It is not a matter of perfection, they tell us. It is a matter of improving our current position. That sounds like a security bargain to them and it ought to sound like a security bargain to us. Our senior military leaders have a unique perspective on what makes our military stronger or more secure. And they have agreed. They have agreed that this treaty is good for our security. All the Chiefs of Staff, as I have said, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the combatant commanders have urged that we ratify this treaty.

This is the way General Shalikashvili made that point. He said, "I fully support early ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention and I reflect the views of the Joint Chiefs and the combatant commanders."

The previous Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Powell, spoke very forcefully on this issue just last week. He was addressing the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee on April 17 during a hearing on gulf war illness, but he said this relative to the convention on chemical weapons:

I think one of the greatest things we can do over the next 2 weeks is to pass the Chemical Weapons Convention treaty. This is a good treaty. It serves our national interest. That is why it was negotiated beginning in Ronald Reagan's term, and I helped participate [The "I," here, being Colin Powell]—I helped participate in those negotiations as National Security Adviser, and that is why we signed it in the administration of President Bush. And I participated in the development of the treaty during those days as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and I supported the treaty then and I support it now.

Then General Powell went on to say the following:

There are some uncertainties associated with the treaty and there are some criticisms of the treaty. I think those criticisms can be answered and dealt with. But we should not overlook the simple fact that, with the treaty, the United States joins over 160 nations in saying to the world that chemical weapons will not be used, will not be made, will not be developed, will not be produced, and we will not share the technology associated with chemical weapons with other nations who are inclined to use them inside or outside the confines of this treaty.

Then he went on to say the following:

Not to participate in this treaty, for us to reject the treaty that we designed, we signed, for us to reject that treaty now because there are rogue states outside that treaty is the equivalent of saying we should not have joined NATO because Russia was not a part of NATO. It's exactly because there are these rogue states that we should join with an alliance of over 160 nations to make a clear international statement that these are rogue nations.

And he concludes:

Not signing the treaty does not make them no longer rogue nations. So I think this is a fine treaty and it is one of the things the Senate can do to start to get a better handle on the use of these weapons of mass destruction and especially chemical weapons.

Mr. President, Secretary Cohen addressed the Chemical Weapons Convention at great length before the Armed Services Committee.

I ask the Chair whether or not I have used up the 10 minutes that I allotted myself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my Chair. I will just yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. LEVIN. Now, Secretary Cohen, our former colleague Bill Cohen, has testified before the Armed Services Committee on this subject. He has filed