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 Clif 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 underregulated 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,

demonstrates his unwillingness to engage in quiet diplomacy. Humane principles and a commitment to democratic ideals compel us to respond forcefully to the Abachan regime. While the Clinton administration has called on the United Nations to consider an embargo on sales of military equipment to Nigeria, Congress should consider taking the lead in identifying and enacting strong measures that hurt the Abachan regime.

Mr. President, I would like to conclude with reiterating my outrage at General Abacha and his regime's complete disregard for basic human rights and international legal standards. I believe that relations between our two countries cannot be normalized until the appalling abuse of human rights, especially toward the Ogoni people and their leaders, comes to an end.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, thank you.

Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly. And I want to be brief because I know the pages are anxious, and so is the Presiding Officer. But I would like to speak for a moment on the continuing resolution, the debate that was just concluded, and make a few brief comments about it. And then I will file a more expansive statement at a later time.

Mr. President, this is the third day of the Government shutdown, and, quite frankly, this is a disgraceful way to conduct the people's business.

The Government is shut down because, in my opinion, macho posturing, pique, and those things are being substituted—attitudes and old grudges are being substituted—for substantive debate and serious-minded search for compromise.

And we are here also because this Congress has not done its work. Over 6 weeks into this fiscal year, and only four appropriations bills are now law. Most of the bills are stalled here in Congress, not because of disputes over funding levels and philosophical debates, and the like, but frankly because of the efforts by the majority party to attach unrelated riders that are designed, in some instances, to erode women's right for choice, or to deregulate pollution, or to cut away workers' collective bargaining rights.

So we have to resort to a continuing resolution. This continuing resolution that we just passed funds the Government for roughly 5 weeks. It also calls on Congress and the President to balance the budget in 7 years.

Frankly, that provision does not belong in the bill. That issue should be left to negotiations between the President and the Congress on the permanent budget, not on this temporary, partial budget.

That was, however, why I supported the amendment offered by the minority leader. And, frankly, that is why I supported the amendment offered by the majority leader. But, quite frankly, it was the wrong place. Quite frankly, also, Mr. President, there is nothing particularly magic in 7 years. What is important is the objective. What is important is meeting our obligation to leave our children something more than a legacy of debt. And what is important is balancing the budget in a way that helps both individual Americans and our country generally.

Mr. President, I believe we can balance the budget while not undermining health care for the elderly or for the poor, without pushing millions of children into poverty, and without denying access to a college education to additional millions of young Americans.

I think it is possible to balance the budget over 7 years in a way that will make the future brighter for our children and that will help create prosperity for all of us. I hope the parties will seek and find common ground with that in mind.

We have to reduce Federal deficits, but there are other objectives that cannot be forgotten. We cannot just on the one hand transfer costs from the Federal balance sheet to the balance sheets and the budgets of American families. We cannot cut back on essential investments in areas like education on which our competitiveness and, therefore, our economic strength, security, and wealth ultimately depend. We cannot make cuts that close more doors to more Americans who are already anxious about their futures, and who are very hard pressed because, while the cost of achieving the American dream is rising, their incomes are not.

Mr. President, this continuing resolution is not a balanced budget plan. It simply buys Congress and the President a little more time to produce a plan. It is all too clear that we need that time because the budget priorities reflected in the reconciliation bill that we will act on tomorrow are clearly mistaken, in my opinion.

That reconciliation bill contains a foolish $245 billion tax cut. And I think one of my colleagues responded by saying to talk about a tax cut at a time that you are talking about reducing the deficit and balancing the budget is like announcing that you are going on a diet and asking someone to pass the dessert.

Even though the President has cut the deficits in half over the last 3 years, given the scope and the extent of our deficit problem, this is not the time for a tax cut. I add, Mr. President, parenthetically with regard to the specific parts of the tax cut—and I serve on the Finance Committee—there is nothing objectionable—well, there is little objectionable—about the tax cut with the specific ingredients in it. But, quite frankly, the tax cut is very much like a chicken in every pot, the oldest political ploy in town, to give a little bit of substance to the constituents. It could not come at a worse time. The timing and context is wrong. I believe it does not belong as part of reconciliation when we are talking about balancing the budget and cutting protections that are vitally dear, if not vital to Americans.

Mr. President, the reconciliation bill that we are going to take up tomorrow unnecessarily jeopardizes the elderly, the poor, the children, and students by asking them for a hugely disproportionate share of budget savings that the bill requires over the next years 7 years while at the same time protecting tax expenditures, and many other business subsidies and loopholes from the clever.

I believe we need a new plan, one that meets the needs of ordinary, hard-working Americans, and one that embraces opportunities for Americans in the future rather than diminishing them. What we need to do, therefore, in my opinion, is to end this temporary budget crisis, and to put the Government back to work.

What we need to do is to defeat the reconciliation bill tomorrow, and vote against it, because we have to, given the technicalities of it, act on it before we can get to the compromise. Kill the reconciliation bill tomorrow, and go back to work on a more balanced, more fair, and more workable budget plan that does not treat millions of Americans as expendable people.

Most of all, we need to act to meet our obligations to the American people by crafting a budget based on their needs, and that is based on the American priorities of all of our community, a budget built on the proposition that people's futures—and not just abstract accounting numbers—is what is really at stake here.

We have a chance to define ourselves as one community, to recognize that we are all in this together, and to fix our budget problems by sharing the sacrifice and addressing our collective needs as Americans.