

by your contributions to the Burned Churches Fund. It is just another indication of why I feel so strongly about the men and women who make International Paper's team so extraordinary."

One aspect of this story is perhaps even more extraordinary: International Paper did not publicize its donation—no corporate news conference, no announcement, not even a press release. Dillon apparently did not want the donation to be seen as a bid for publicity.

The article you are reading would never have been written if the author had not happened to hear about the donation from a Presbyterian minister who has a friend working at the National Council of Churches. When Sky contacted International Paper headquarters, the publicity staff—professionals who are paid well to make sure Dillon and the company look good—agreed to provide copies of Dillon's notes to his company's work force but rebuffed a request to interview the CEO for this article as "not necessary."

Dozens of black congregations across the South, meanwhile, are eager to sing the praises of International Paper. "Oh, good!" Shirley Hines exclaimed when told that Sky was running a story about the International Paper donation. Hines, in charge of the rebuilding committee at Greater Mount Zion Tabernacle Church in Portsmouth, Virginia, says the congregation did not know if the church could be rebuilt after it burned in May 1995; the estimated cost of \$340,000 was just too much.

International Paper's donation last autumn of wood, doors, wall paneling and other building supplies, however, took care of three-quarters of the cost of materials and let the congregation celebrate Christmas in its new, rededicated church. "International Paper told us to tell them what we needed. We faxed in a list, and in less than a week it was here. It was unbelievable," Hines says. "If not for International Paper, this church would have had to wait two or three years to reopen, if it ever did."

Hines recalled the dreary day when she, her pastor and several other church members waited in the rain for the first lumber delivery. When the big truck pulled up, she says, they laughed and shouted and cried and danced in the rain, snapping pictures of the forklift unloading the first pallets of wood that would become their new church.

"It made us realize that God is real," she says, "and He is still in the blessing business."•

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD STATEMENT HONORING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARREN KIWANIS CLUB

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to salute the Kiwanis Club of Warren, MI, for its 40 years of service to the Warren community.

In 1957, a group of concerned businesspeople, professionals, and citizens formed the Kiwanis Club of Warren to help meet the needs in their community which were not being addressed by government or charities. Since its beginning, the Warren Kiwanis has provided numerous services to people in need, including persons with disabilities, senior citizens, and people requiring medical care. The Warren Kiwanis donated a bus to the Salvation Army, funded a fitness trail at a local park for disabled people, and

have helped to pay for thousands of operations, utility bills, and ramps for people with disabilities.

The recent Presidents' Summit on Volunteerism drew the Nation's attention to the importance of giving back to our communities. The people of Warren, like those in so many communities throughout the country, are truly fortunate to dedicated Kiwanis Club members as their neighbors.

I hope my colleagues will join me in expressing congratulations and gratitude to the Kiwanis Club of Warren for their 40 years of good works.●

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET MACARTHUR

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Margaret MacArthur. Margaret has been selected to appear at the John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts on May 1, 1997. She will be appearing as the sole representative of Vermont in an annual celebration which will host artists from across the Nation.

Margaret represents the very best of Vermont. Her talent and hard work have been recognized time and time again. In 1985, she was selected by the New England Art Biennial as a New England living art treasure.

Margaret's repertoire consists almost exclusively of Vermont and other New England folk songs. She embodies the spirit of our Green Mountain State and has successfully shared its heritage, through music, with people throughout the country. Once again, I would like to extend my best wishes and congratulations to Margaret MacArthur.

Mr. President, I ask the following article from the Brattleboro Reformer be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Brattleboro Reformer, Dec. 6, 1996]

LOCAL FOLK ARTIST TO PERFORM AT KENNEDY CENTER

(By Jared Bazzzy)

MARLBORO.—Folk singer Margaret MacArthur has been selected to appear at the John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts in Washington, D.C., this spring, as part of the Vermont State Day celebration.

U.S. Sen. James M. Jeffords, R-Vt., picked MacArthur to be the lone performer representing the Green Mountain State.

Jeffords, who chairs the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities, said Thursday, "Margaret represents what's best about Vermont's history and culture," adding, "This is a wonderful opportunity for visitors from across the nation to hear a true Vermont artist share our heritage."

MacArthur said she was invited a few weeks ago, just after she returned from performing at the Folk Song Society in Washington, D.C.

"But I've never sung at the Kennedy Center for gosh sakes. It's pretty exciting," she said in a telephone interview from her home in Marlboro.

The Kennedy Center annually celebrates all 50 states with a performance by a local artist from each one. MacArthur will perform May 1, 1997.

Accompanying herself at different times on guitar, dulcimer and harp-zither, Mac-

Arthur's repertoire consists almost exclusively of Vermont and New England folk songs. She was raised in the Ozarks of Missouri and moved to Vermont in 1948. She spends winters in Arizona. Therefore, she also sings many songs from Missouri, nearby Kentucky and Arizona.

She said that she will certainly take along her harp-zither, which was given to her by the family of Rawsonville farmer Merle Landsman after it was found in his barn.

She said she will perform songs from a collection of 7,000 Vermont songs compiled by Helen Hartness Flanders. Flanders was the wife of the late Sen. Ralph Flanders, and MacArthur enjoys the connection between their lives in Washington D.C. and her performance at the Kennedy Center.

"This will give me a good opportunity to honor her and her collection," she said.

The New England Art Biennial, panel from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, chose MacArthur in 1985 as a "New England living art treasure." Her recording career spans to the early 1960s, when she recorded "Folksongs of Vermont" on Folkways records. She has since recorded eight more albums, including several with members of her family, who also live in Marlboro.

Recent local performance ventures included the Brattleboro Museum and Art Center, as part of a series on farming in Vermont.

She is currently completing her 10th recording, which is being produced at Sound Design in Brattleboro and is entitled "Them Stars."

MacArthur believes it was her work as artist-in-residence in schools throughout the state that brought her to Jeffords' attention. As a visiting artist, she had children set local folk tales to music which culminated two years ago with the production of "Vermont Heritage Songs."•

CHILDREN'S HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PROVIDES SECURITY [CHIPS] ACT

• Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I'm pleased to be an original cosponsor of the Children's Health Insurance Provides Security [CHIPS] Act because I support expanding access to health care for children who lack coverage today, and because I believe this bill is both flexible and targeted to children in families least likely to have employer-based coverage and least able to purchase health insurance on their own.

It is my hope that States will find the enhanced Federal Medicaid match included in this bill to be a valuable tool to assist many vulnerable families, particularly families moving from welfare to work. Far too many welfare recipients will, at least initially, move from dependency into hourly jobs with little pay and few, if any, benefits. Children should not lose their health care because their parents work.●

HONORING THE CENTRAL/DELPHI FIRST TEAM

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the achievements of a remarkable group from my home State of Michigan. A team of students from Pontiac Central High School and engineers from Delphi Interior and Lighting Systems won two national

awards at the prestigious FIRST [For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology] competition held April 10-12 in Orlando, FL.

The Central/Delphi team received the tournament trophy as a finalist in the robotics competition, and the team also won the competition's highest honor, the Chairman's Award, given to the most comprehensive school-corporate partnership program among the 155 competitors. As Chairman's Award winners, the team will be honored by President Clinton at a Rose Garden reception.

The Central/Delphi FIRST team helps to open young minds to science, mathematics, and technology. Pontiac Central students also have an opportunity to work at Delphi during the summer, which helps them continue learning outside of school and gain valuable on-the-job training. The innovative CADET program, an extension of Central/Delphi FIRST, uses unique activities to promote the fun of math, science and technology to students at seven elementary and junior high schools. As the presenter of the Chairman's Award said, "The judges believe that this team has turned many children on to science and math. Through their strong partnership, FIRST became the avenue for an entire school of talented students to reach personal success."

The success of the Central/Delphi team and the FIRST program in general is a powerful example of what educators and corporations can do to improve opportunities for our young men and women. I commend Delphi Interior and Lighting for their commitment to education. I am proud of the talented students who achieved so much at this prestigious competition. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the young men and women of Pontiac Central High School and the employees of Delphi Interior and Lighting for their achievements at the sixth annual FIRST competition.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

• Mr. KYL. Mr. President, everyone agrees that ridding the world of chemical weapons is a noble and worthy goal to pursue. These are weapons that no nation should have in its stockpile—and that includes the United States. By law, the U.S. stockpile will be destroyed whether or not the Chemical Weapons Convention [CWC] is ever ratified by the Senate. Opponents of the Convention support that action.

Notwithstanding agreement on the goals of the CWC, we do not believe that this treaty can ever achieve the goals. It will not accomplish its objective of being global, verifiable, and effective ban on these weapons. Moreover, because of deficiencies in the treaty—which, by its terms, adopting parties must ratify wholesale without amendment—we believe the United States is better off without the CWC than with it. As a result, we could not

support ratification absent certain certifications by the President prior to deposit of our instrument of ratification.

Faced with the fact that the treaty is largely unverifiable, some ratification supporters argue that no treaty is 100 percent verifiable, and that, while not perfect, the CWC is better than nothing, especially since chemical weapons are so morally objectionable. Proponents further assert that the CWC is needed because it establishes an international norm that stigmatizes these weapons; that the CWC will bring us some intelligence we do not now have regarding the possession and manufacture of these weapons; and that it will provide trade benefits to U.S. chemical companies. Finally, they argue that we need to be a party to the treaty to protect our interests as details of implementation are worked out by the various parties.

For the sake of argument, even assuming that these relatively modest benefits claimed for the treaty would in fact materialize, we believe these claimed benefits do not outweigh the costs.

Opponents are convinced that the costs of ratifying the CWC outweigh the advanced benefits in several important respects, including the following: First, it would create a United Nations-style bureaucracy, 25 percent of the cost of which must be paid for by U.S. taxpayers. Second, it would put American businesses under a financially burdensome, security-compromising, and quite possibly unconstitutional inspection regime. Third, it would exacerbate the chemical threat we face by undermining existing multilateral trade restrictions, sanctions, and embargoes the United States has placed on rogue countries like Iran and Cuba. Fourth, it would require information sharing that signatory nations, if so inclined, could use to advance their chemical weapons programs. Fifth, the convention would give the Nation with the largest CW stockpile—Russia—an excuse to abrogate the Bilateral Destruction Agreement [BDA] it entered into with the United States to destroy chemical weapons. And this is not hypothetical speculation—there are growing indications Russia does not intend to comply with the BDA, which is much more restrictive than the CWC. Sixth, the prospect of ratification would create—there are already signs that it is creating—a false sense of security that encourages the United States to let its guard down on defending against the use of chemical weapons against American troops. Seventh, it degrades the value of treaties and moral statements because all nations understand it is unenforceable.

The CWC represents hope over reality. It makes people feel good to say they have done something about a class of weapons we all abhor. But signing this piece of paper is not going to solve the problem—and that's the problem. Hard problems can't be wished away with naive hopes and tough talk

in the form of yet another international agreement, no matter how many other nations have signed on.

If the United States is to make a unique moral statement as proponents urge, we shouldn't be stampeded into ratifying this treaty "because other nations have." The United States passed on joining the League of Nations even though, as with the CWC, it had promoted the League in the beginning and many other nations had decided to join it. Too often the international community has pronounced itself greatly pleased at solving the latest crisis with yet another treaty like the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 which outlawed war as an instrument of national policy. And too often, as here, disappointment has followed because of the disconnect between the good intentions and the hard reality. To the argument that we will look bad because it was our idea in the first place, opponents say that real respect is rooted in responsible, honest positions; and that U.S. leadership in taking a different approach will be rewarded in the long term.

It is not possible to ban the manufacture and possession of chemical weapons, and we should not delude ourselves into thinking it is possible. What we can do is back up our demand that no one use chemical weapons, with international cooperation based on the will to punish violators so severely that use is deterred. That too is not easy; but, as the use of nuclear weapons has been deterred, so too can the use of chemical weapons be deterred if we have the will.

THE CWC IS NOT GLOBAL

The original goal of the CWC was that it would ban the manufacture and use of chemical weapons by all the nations of the world. Unfortunately, the countries with chemical weapons that we are most concerned about—Iraq, Libya, Syria, and North Korea—have not yet signed the CWC, let alone ratified it. Pakistan, Iran, and Russia also have chemical weapons programs; while they have signed the agreement, they may not ratify. So, the nations that pose the most serious threat may never fall under the CWC's strictures.

Nor is the CWC global in terms of the chemical substances it covers. While it prohibits the possession of many dangerous chemicals, two that it does not prohibit were employed with deadly effect in World War I: phosgene and hydrogen cyanide. But they are too widely used for commercial purposes to be banned, which speaks volumes about this treaty's impracticability.

Nor does the CWC control as many dangerous chemicals as does an export control regime currently employed by 29 industrialized countries. The Australia Group regime already controls trade in 54 chemicals that could be used to develop chemical weapons. Of the 54 chemicals subject to the Group's export controls, 20 are not covered by