

told the blue chip analysis, that is taking all the blue chip companies who have analyzed what the growth rate is going to be, the consensus is it is going to be about 2.9 percent per year.

I will tell you what. If we agree to their numbers, I can balance the budget and not cut Medicare and not hurt education and not make the changes I do not want to make and I can do it in 5 years.

This makes a difference. It makes a difference what numbers you pick. Like I said, it is like that rope. You tell me I have to get across a 40-foot creek with rapids and if I slip in the rapids I go over the dam, and you give me a 30-foot rope, I have a problem. You give me a 50-foot rope, I can do it. So the difference here is the length of the rope we are giving the President.

I will conclude by saying the Presiding Officer is the only Republican in the Chamber—and by the way I am not suggesting anybody else should be in the Chamber. All reasonable people are home at 10 minutes to 10 at night, and I do not know why I am doing it, because I am not sure that the four people in here, who are kind enough to be listening to me, are listening. But I would respectfully suggest the following.

The reason why a guy like me is a little bit suspect of the insistence on the CBO numbers is—I will be real blunt with you—I believe this is more than about balancing the budget. I believe this is about eliminating programs, or drastically changing programs that the Republican Party, understandably and defensibly, historically has not liked.

But it can be cloaked in balancing the budget now. Because if you give me the 30-foot rope, I have to get rid of education. I cannot pull education across that creek with me on my back. I cannot take Medicare across that creek with me on my back. I cannot take a lot of things across there—baggage that some of my friends on the Republican side, and some Democrats, do not think we should be doing anyway.

So I think what the President should do—presumptuous of me to suggest what the President should do. But, if the President called up and asked me tonight, Joe, what do you recommend about this? I would pick up the phone and I would call BOB DOLE and NEWT GINGRICH and I would say, Fellows, look, come on down. Let us have a cup of coffee. And I would promise NEWT could sit at the head of the table. I would let him sit behind my desk. And I would say, Here is the deal. Let's make a deal. Let's split the difference on the numbers, not between the private sector, but the two Government bureaucrats who said what the numbers were. Split the difference and let us split the number of years. I will take off 2, you add 1. And let's get back to work, and then let us fight about the details, which is what appropriations bills are about.

I hope we do that. I am not suggesting my particular formula, I say to the Presiding Officer. I am not so presumptuous as to say that is the only way to do it. But I do know one thing. Legislation is the art of compromise, not weakness, compromise, because we have very divergent views.

I have come to know a bit more about the Presiding Officer. He and I have divergent views on a number of issues, but I truly respect him. And I think he respects me. There is no reason why we could not work—I have to give something. You are never going to agree with my philosophy. I am never going to agree with yours, on the whole. So we have to give something.

I do not mean to paint it—I would like it if the Senator from Missouri and I could settle this, but I know neither one of us are in the position to do this. But the larger point is simple. I think it is time for us to sort of—I was going to say act like grown-ups. That implies they have not been. I think it is time to say, OK, everybody has made the point. Let us get back to work. Let us split the difference on these things. Because the truth of the matter is, if the President agreed to an 8-year balanced budget with CBO numbers, or OMB numbers, does anybody believe that means he is less committed to getting to a balanced budget? He locks himself to a balanced budget on those terms.

So the issue is not if. The issue is how. I think we could settle this quickly. I hope we will do it.

My colleagues are here. I will not do it tonight, but I was going to make a statement, and I will do it tomorrow, on a third point. That is Mr. HELMS—and I love Senator HELMS—outrageous, in my view, holding up of the START Treaty and holding up the Conventional Weapons Treaty. But I will save that for another moment. Maybe the Senator would be on the floor, because I would rather deal with him on the floor. As my colleagues know, I never say anything that references another Senator without telling him first. It is nothing derogatory, but I hope he will reconsider. We are about to lose the START Treaty, and that is the thing that eliminates all those Russian missiles that could be aimed at us again.

My colleagues are waiting to speak. I thank my colleagues and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

#### THE LAW OF THE SEA CONVENTION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, from October 23 to November 3, 1995, the United States was host to an intergovernmental conference convened under the auspices of the U.N. Environment Programme to adopt a Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land Based Sources of Marine Pollution. My colleagues know that I have long had a strong interest in the protection of the

environment, and in particular of our oceans. In fact, in 1973, legislation was enacted that I introduced to create the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs. I was pleased that the Congress and the President agreed with my strong feeling that increased cooperation with respect to the protection of our oceans be given greater focus and visibility at the State Department.

As far back as 1977 I introduced a resolution that required countries to conduct environmental impact assessments before carrying out activities that might impact the environment of another country or of a global commons area. The U.N. Environment Programme (UNEP) was to be the recipient of these impact assessments and in July 1995, I introduced Resolution 154 calling on other nations to adopt a similar approach. UNEP has retained its key role in the protection of the environment worldwide and the Washington Conference on Marine Pollution was but the latest example of its ongoing efforts to encourage all countries to cooperate in the protection of the environment.

This Conference was convened as a result of the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in June 1992. It recognized the fact that more than 80 percent of marine pollution originates from terrestrial sources and its aim was to ensure that all the Parties would coordinate their efforts in trying to reduce such sources of pollution. The two outcomes of the Conference were the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities, adopted at the end of the Conference, and the Washington Declaration, which was adopted by its high-level segment. Both the Programme of Action and the Declaration complement the legal regime set up by the Law of the Sea Convention which was signed by President Clinton and is still pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an article published in the Washington Post on November 4, 1995, which highlights the risks now weighing on our oceans and the need to take urgent action. I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

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

[See exhibit 1.]

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have always been a very strong supporter of the Law of the Sea Convention because it sets up a new Constitution for the Oceans and because it is the perfect tool to put an end to such destructive measures as ocean dumping and other forms of direct pollution. In that respect, the Law of the Sea addresses the marine sources of oceans pollution. The Washington Conference aimed to

complement this approach by addressing the impact of terrestrial, and indirect, sources of marine pollution. The Programme of Action adopted by the Conference contains a series of practical steps that governments can adopt, while the Washington Declaration provides us with a framework to further our international cooperation.

At the national level, countries can, and should, restrict negative impacts by better and stronger regulation of sewage discharges and by controlling the production and use of pesticides, fertilizers and other persistent organic pollutants that are known to cause considerable damage to marine life. At the international level, cooperation needs to be increased, with a view to imposing more stringent controls on the most dangerous of substances, such as DDT, PCBs, and other persistent organic pollutants. The Washington Declaration recognizes this by calling for the development of a global legally binding instrument for the reduction or elimination of persistent organic pollutants. At this stage, it is still unclear what form such a treaty should and will take, but it is of the utmost importance that the United States become an active participant in these negotiations.

By definition, marine pollution is a global problem, and while it cannot be solved by individual nations, we all have a responsibility to cooperate in attempting to save our oceans. The United States has always been at the forefront of similar efforts in the past and we cannot shrink from our responsibilities in these times of crisis. The Law of the Sea Convention and the Washington Programme of Action are the two vital instruments through which we can finally put an end to the excessive pollution of our oceans. This is a chance for the United States to prove that it really intends to address and solve the very important issue of marine pollution by ratifying the Law of the Sea Convention, by implementing the Programme of Action in earnest, and by becoming a leader in the negotiations of a treaty on the regulation of persistent organic pollutants.

#### EXHIBIT 1

#### EXPERTS SEEK GLOBAL TREATY ON TOXIC OCEAN POLLUTANTS

(By Gary Lee)

Alarmed by rising levels of pollution in the world's oceans, a conference of environmental experts from 102 countries yesterday called for new global controls on the use of DDT and 11 other toxic chemicals that are often discharged into waterways.

The Washington gathering, sponsored by the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), urged industrial and developing countries to negotiate a global treaty restricting the spread of a dozen persistent organic pollutants, a group of industrially produced chemicals that frequently wind up in oceans and other water supplies. Participants in the two-week meeting, which ended yesterday, approved a program of action that included the call for a treaty.

Persistent organic pollutants were targeted for more stringent international regulation because they are highly toxic, remain

in the environment for long periods and can spread thousands of miles from the point of emission, conference delegates said.

After accumulating in fish and other marine mammals, such chemicals work their way through the food chain and may eventually be consumed by people. They can cause severe health problems, said Cliff Curtis, an adviser to the international environmental organization Greenpeace. Studies have linked some of the compounds to cancer, neurological damage and defects of the reproductive system and immune system in various animals, including humans. Creatures occupying positions near the top of the food chain—such as fish that eat smaller fish, marine mammals, seabirds and humans—are at greater risk of such effects because more of the toxic substances accumulate in their tissues. Greenpeace advocates a worldwide ban on the production and use of persistent organic pollutants.

The campaign for new restrictions on the chemicals is part of a growing movement to save the oceans, considered by many environmentalists to be the world's last unregulated biological frontier, from further degradation.

"The oceans of the world are interdependent," Vice President Gore told the gathering in a speech this week. "The only way to stop the degradation of marine environment from land-based activities is to share the solutions."

"If we're going to take the cleanup of the oceans seriously, [persistent organic pollutants] must be banned," said Salef Diop, an adviser to the Senegalese environment ministry and delegate to the conference.

While the 1982 Law of the Sea Treaty and other international agreements regulate ocean dumping and other forms of direct pollution, the UNEP conference focused on restricting land-based activities that indirectly contribute to the pollution of oceans—such as the use of organic pesticides that are washed into rivers and end up in the ocean.

The conference pointed out in its recommendations that individual countries can help fight ocean pollution through national policies, such as the reduction of sewage discharges and control of pollution from nonpoint sources like farmland. Land-based activities are responsible for 80 percent of ocean pollution, according to Magnus Johannesson, a senior environmental official from Iceland.

The substances pinpointed by the conference as requiring more stringent controls include the pesticides DDT, toxaphene, chlordane, heptachlor, endrin, aldrin, mirex and dieldrin, as well as byproducts of industrial combustion such as dioxins, furans, hexachlorobenzene and the group of chlorinated substances known as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). Although dozens of other chemicals pose a threat to oceans, these 12 are most widely used and most toxic, according to environmentalists.

After controls are in place, others could be added to the list if scientific consensus indicates that they are harmful to marine life, conference delegates said.

The U.S. has already moved to ban the use or spread of many of the compounds, but at least two—chlordane and heptachlor—are still produced by American companies for export abroad, Clinton administration officials said.

Although banned in the United States in 1972, DDT is still widely used in India and some other developing countries to protect crops against insects. Heptachlor and toxaphene are also used heavily in some countries.

Safer alternatives exist, but some research will be needed to determine whether they can be substituted cost-effectively in those

countries that still rely on chemicals that end up as persistent organic pollutants, conference delegates said.

#### THE EXECUTION OF KEN SARO-WIWA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, last Friday, amid the strong protests of the American and British Governments and countless human rights organizations, the Nigerian Government executed Ken Saro-Wiwa, a noted author, environmentalist and human rights activist, and eight of his colleagues. I must say that these executions represent a flagrant violation of human rights and I am outraged. These executions reflect the refusal of the brutal regime of General Abacha in Nigeria to abide by the most basic international norms. Moreover, such actions deserve a swift and harsh response from the U.S. Government.

Since seizing power in a military coup in June 1993, General Abacha has systematically eliminated any perceived rival by intimidation, lifelong imprisonment and most appallingly, by means of execution. Mr. Saro-Wiwa and his eight colleagues now join the ranks of Nigerians whom the Abacha government has successfully silenced. Despite these brutal deaths, I am confident that the causes for which these leaders died cannot, nor will not, be destroyed.

Ken Saro-Wiwa spent much of his life fighting against the military government and the rampant pollution of the land and water in his home, Ogoniland, caused by unregulated oil production. Threatened by his persistent and popular campaign, the Nigerian Government charged Ken Saro-Wiwa and his colleagues for the murder of four pro-government activists. The State Department and human rights groups report that Mr. Saro-Wiwa was nowhere near the murder scene and was denied a fair chance to defend himself. Further, there is evidence that witnesses were paid to testify against Mr. Saro-Wiwa. Topped with a military tribunal appointed to try the case, Ken Saro-Wiwa never had a chance.

Mr. President, Nigeria is a critically important country for United States interests in Africa. Nigeria has made significant contributions in the course of regional and international affairs, such as its involvement in restoring peace in Liberia, in resolving the regional drug issue, and last year's commutation of the death sentence to life imprisonment for General Obasanjo and other alleged coup plotters.

This latest action, however, undermines international and American confidence in General Abacha's announced transition to democracy. The impact of Nigeria's problems, inflicted primarily by the Abachan regime, threatens to extend throughout West Africa, harming the political and economic prospects of its neighbors. General Abacha's refusal to heed the calls of the international community, including those made from these chambers,