

and justice. Ed Levi is a profile in courage, and a proud example for all citizens of excellence in the law and justice at its best.

HOMICIDES BY GUNSHOT IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, I rise today to continue my weekly practice of reporting to the Senate on the death toll by gunshot in New York City. Last week, 8 people were killed by firearms in New York City, bringing this year's total to 66.

THE PRESIDENT'S IMMIGRATION INITIATIVE

Mr. SIMON. Madam President, the administration has come under much criticism lately for its alleged failure to provide leadership on issues that are important to the nation. The 1996 Immigration Initiative announced by the administration this week, however, belies these contentions. The administration's policy proposal on this extremely important issue is thoughtful and comprehensive, and I applaud it.

The administration's initiative recognizes, as do the people of this country, the need to formulate an effective response to the problem of illegal immigration, and proposes increased resources not only for border enforcement, but also increased resources to eliminate the job magnet that will continue to draw undocumented aliens into the country regardless of the success of our border policy. The initiative also reflects a desire to improve our ability to deport those aliens that have been identified as deportable, and to assist States that have long borne the burdens of our inability to prevent illegal immigration.

For each of these objectives the administration has proposed the commitment of substantial resources; yet, at the same time, the initiative contains little that unnecessarily feeds the anti-immigrant xenophobia that has characterized the immigration policy debate in recent years. Rather, the administration's proposal takes a measured yet aggressive approach to the problems we must face. In short, while it has taken an undeniably firm stance against illegal immigration, the administration has not succumbed to the belief that immigration in all its shapes and forms is a bad thing. Quite the contrary: the initiative reflects the fact that, as the President has said, an effective immigration policy must combine deterrence of illegal immigration with an encouragement and celebration of legal immigration.

I look forward to working with the administration and my colleagues in the Senate to effect this delicate balance, and to implement an immigration policy that is both tough and fair. The administration's proposal is certainly a great step in this direction.

SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL'S SPEECH BEFORE THE GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER ON THE LAW OF THE SEA CONVENTION

Mr. DODD. Madam President, on Friday, January 27, 1995, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL spoke at the Georgetown University Law Center on the topic of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. During that speech, Senator PELL made a very strong case for United States ratification of the Law of the Sea Treaty.

As many of my colleagues may already know, Senator PELL has been a leading advocate for promoting the peaceful uses of the oceans for more than four decades. I believe he first became interested in the subject as a young man in the service of the U.S. Coast Guard—an interest he has continued to pursue with energy and imagination since he was elected to the Senate in 1960.

While the national security implications associated with the Law of the Sea Convention have been widely discussed over the years, I do not believe that as much attention has been focussed on the economic implications of the treaty. In that regard, Senator PELL's speech on January 27, very clearly spelled out the economic importance of the treaty to the United States. I found his arguments most useful in gaining a fuller appreciation of the treaty's many provisions.

I know that Senator PELL very enthusiastically endorsed President Clinton's decision to sign the Law of the Sea Convention and to seek the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification. And, that he believes it to be of the utmost importance that the United States become a party to this important convention as soon as possible.

I am confident that Senator PELL is willing and eager to play an active role in educating this body on the very important issues associated with the Law of the Sea Convention. I hope that the Senate will have an opportunity to address this subject during the 104th Congress.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Senator PELL's speech at Georgetown University Law Center be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL

It is a great pleasure to join you here this evening at the Georgetown University Law Center to discuss the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. This is a subject that is near to my heart and one that I have been involved with for much of my working career.

With its transmission to the Senate in October and entry into force in November, the Convention has again moved to the fore as an issue for public debate.

These events make today's symposium particularly timely, and I want to thank the organizers, and especially Mr. Eric Fersht, for their outstanding work. The panels you have

heard from provide a truly exceptional array of information about the Law of the Sea Convention.

The initial support for this idea was led by Arvid Pardo, Malta's delegate to the United Nations, with his famous "Common Heritage of Mankind" speech before the United Nations General Assembly in 1967.

The Convention then became the interest of many people. I remember particularly the "Pacem in Maribus"—Peace on the Seas—meetings organized by Elizabeth Mann Borgese.

Her book, *The Ocean Regime*, published in 1968, gave written expression to the ideas that were to gain a wider audience through *Pacem in Maribus*, on their way to being embodied in the negotiated texts of the Law of the Sea Convention.

For me the dream began even earlier. It was during my service in the U.S. Coast Guard during World War II that I wrote my first memorandum on the subject to Admiral Waesche, then Commandant of the Coast Guard. And even before that I had been appointed by President Eisenhower as a Delegate to the first meeting of IMCO (the International Maritime Consultative Organization.)

My service on the staff of the San Francisco Convention that prepared the UN Charter, just fifty years ago this summer, further confirmed me in my belief that ways could be found to create a working ocean peace system.

The Law of the Sea Convention is the product of one of the more protracted negotiations in diplomatic history. When the process began, the Vietnam War was nearing its peak; the Cold War was at its height; it had been only five years since the construction of the Berlin Wall.

I was proud to serve as a delegate and observer to those early Law of the Sea negotiations, one of the few who had also attended a *Pacem in Maribus* meeting. My enthusiasm led me in 1967 to introduce the first Senate Resolution calling on the President to negotiate a Law of the Sea Convention.

That resolution and a draft treaty that I proposed in 1969 led to the Seabed Arms Control treaty, which was ratified by the Senate in 1972. This little-known treaty has permanently removed nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction from the ocean floor, which is seventy percent of the earth's surface.

It has been signed by nearly 100 countries, it works, and it provides a good precedent for the Convention on the Law of the Sea.

With the Seabed Arms Control Treaty as my model, you can appreciate my enthusiasm for the Law of the Sea Convention. In my view there are few actions that the Senate can take in the year or two ahead that can have greater long term benefits for the world as a whole than to ratify this Treaty.

The implications for world peace are enormous; the potential for trade and development is equally far-reaching. I hope this Convention will not be caught up in a spate of politics as usual, but will be seen in the framework of a renewed commitment to bipartisanship in foreign policy.

The old saying was that "politics stops at the water's edge." That would be an apt motto for our consideration of Law of the Sea, since its scope begins precisely at "the water's edge."

Let me outline just a few of the reasons that have come to make me such a strong supporter of the Convention.

Of greatest importance, the Convention will enhance our national security, because it establishes as a matter of international law, freedom of navigation rights that are critical to our military forces.

At the Foreign Relations Committee's hearing on the Convention in August, Admiral William Center—whom you heard this morning—testified, "The Convention underpins strongly the worldwide mobility America's forces need. It provides a stable legal basis for governing the world's oceans. It reduces the need to fall back on a potentially volatile mixture of customary practice and gunboat diplomacy."

The Secretary of Defense, William J. Perry, also supports prompt Senate action "to send a strong signal that the United States is committed to an ocean regulatory regime that is guided by the rule of law."

I have heard arguments that the Convention's provisions on freedom of navigation are not really important because they reflect customary international law. I disagree with that argument.

Customary international law is inherently unstable. Governments can be less scrupulous about flouting the precedents of customary law, than they would be if such actions are seen as violating a treaty.

Moreover, not all governments and scholars agree that all of the critical navigation rights protected by the Convention are also protected by customary law.

They regard many of those rights as *contractual* and, as such, available only to parties to the Convention.

For example, it was not long ago that the United States claimed a territorial sea of only three miles. Now it is twelve. I am certain there are countries that would like to expand their territorial sea even further. Only the Convention establishes limits on countries' claims to territorial seas as a matter of international law.

These navigational rights are of very real importance to our armed forces. There have been recent situations where even U.S. allies denied our forces transit rights in times of need.

For example, during the 1973 Yom Kippur war our ability to resupply Israel was critically dependent on transit rights through the Strait of Gibraltar. In 1986, U.S. aircraft passed through the Strait to strike Libyan targets in response to that government's acts of terrorism directed against the United States.

On February 11, 1992, the USS BATON ROUGE (SSN689) was struck by a Russian Sierra-class attack submarine while on patrol in the Barent Sea, off the major naval port of Murmansk. The USS BATON ROUGE, a Los Angeles-class attack submarine, was submerged at a depth of 59 feet at the time of the collision, in waters claimed by Russia as territorial, but considered by the United States to be high seas.

In addition, the following examples are situations where having the Law of the Sea Convention in effect might have made a difference:

Between 1961 and 1970, Peru seized 74 U.S. fishing vessels over disputed tuna fisheries.

In 1986, Ecuador interfered with the USAF aircraft flight over the high seas 175 miles from the Ecuadorian coast.

Since 1986, Peru has repeatedly challenged U.S. aircraft flying over its claimed 200 nautical mile territorial sea. During several of these challenges, the Peruvian aircraft operated in a manner that unnecessarily and intentionally endangered the safety of the transiting U.S. aircraft and its crew.

This includes an incident where a U.S. C-130 was fired upon and a U.S. service member was killed.

In 1986, two Cuban MIG-21 aircraft intercepted a USCG HU-25A Falcon flying outside of its 12 nautical mile territorial sea, claiming it had entered Cuban Flight Information Region (FIR) without permission.

In 1988, Soviet warships intentionally "bumped" two U.S. warships engaged in innocent passage south of Sevastopol in the Black Sea.

In 1984, Mexican Navy vessels approached U.S. Coast Guard vessels operating outside Mexican territorial waters and interfered with valid USCG law enforcement activities.

Libyan claims to the Gulf of Sidra have resulted in repeated challenges and hostile action against U.S. forces operating in high seas.

During the 1980's, transits of the Northwest Passage by the USCG POLAR SEA and POLAR STAR were challenged by the Canadian government.

I do not doubt that, if necessary, the United States Navy will sail where it needs to to protect U.S. interests. But, if we reject the Convention, preservation of these rights in non-wartime situations will carry an increasingly heavy price for the United States.

By remaining outside of the Convention, the United States will have to challenge excessive claims by other states not only diplomatically, but also through conduct that opposes these claims. A widely ratified Convention would significantly reduce the need for such expensive operations.

It would also afford us a durable platform of principle to ensure support from the American people and our allies when we confront claims we regard as illegal.

The Convention's provisions on freedom of navigation are also vitally important to the U.S. economy and the thousands of U.S. workers whose jobs are dependent on exports and imports. We live in an interdependent world, and 80 percent of trade between nations in this interdependent world is carried by ship.

Oil is one example of this. In 1993, 44 percent of U.S. petroleum products supplied came from imported oil. This oil was carried on tankers that every day pass through straits, territorial waters, and exclusive economic zones of other nations.

The U.S. has a vital interest in the stability of the international legal order that serves as the basis for this commerce. We also have an interest in avoiding higher prices for consumers and job losses that can result from costly coastal state restrictions on navigation.

The benefits of the Convention extend to many other areas. Protection of submarine cables is one example. The new fiber optic cables that connect the United States to other countries are crucial for international communications and our increasingly information-based economy.

These cables are enormously expensive. A new fiber optic cable connecting the United States to Japan can carry up to one million simultaneous telephone calls, and is valued at \$1.3 billion. The total value of existing cables is measured in the many billions of dollars.

When these cables are broken, U.S. companies, and ultimately U.S. consumers, incur huge repair costs. The Convention contains new provisions that strengthen the obligation of all states to take measures to protect the cables, and cable owners.

Past U.S. concerns with the Convention's provisions on deep seabed mining—concerns that had prevented the United States from signing the Convention—were resolved in an agreement signed in July at the United Nations in New York.

Earlier today, you heard about this subject from Wes Scholz, the head of the U.S. delegation to the negotiations on the Part XI Agreement. He and his negotiating team did a truly superb job in adjusting the Convention's provisions on seabed mining to provide a workable framework for the 21st century.

Looking to the future, U.S. interests in the Convention lie not only in what it is today, but in what it may become. Just as form and substance have been given our Constitution by the courts, so too will future uses of the oceans be influenced and shaped by decisions made under the Convention.

With the Convention's entry into force last November 16th, the United States stands on the threshold of a new era in oceans policy. Under the Convention, U.S. national interests in the world's oceans would be protected as a matter of law. This is a success of U.S. foreign policy that will work to our benefit in the decades to come.

The question on many people's minds now is: will the Senate act on the Convention during this, the 104th Congress?

I think that those who support the treaty should help make the case for its approval. The benefits of the Convention are many. We should not be shy in making them known. The consequences of not ratifying the Convention are also many. Those too should be made known.

Over the past 25 years, the Convention and its supporters have overcome many obstacles. The same tenacity and commitment that brought the Convention to where it is today will be needed to take the Convention the next step.

U.S. ratification of the Convention may not come quickly, but I am confident it will come. It is up to us to make that happen sooner rather than later. And when it happens, that for me will be a nearly life-long dream come true.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:24 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill; in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2. An act to give the President item veto authority over appropriation acts and targeted tax benefits in revenue acts.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2. An act to give the President item veto authority over appropriation acts and targeted tax benefits in revenue acts; pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977; referred jointly to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-372. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-370 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-373. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 10-371 adopted by the Council on December 6, 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.