

consumers don't really have a lobby. No one pays people to come up here and speak for them—except one group. You see, the people who sent us here believed and thought that it was our obligation to stand up for them. I think most of them would be surprised to know that sometimes when they don't have a lobbyist, that voice goes unheard.

Madam President, this agreement is wrong. It is wrong because it is anti-competitive. It is wrong because it is a response to the special interests. It is wrong because it is a misallocation of taxpayers' money. And it is wrong because it sets the bad example for what a competitive economy is all about. At a point in our world's history when the rest of the world is waking up to the advantages of free enterprise and competition, it is a shame to see the United States consider and enact this kind of anticompetitive agreement.

Madam President, I yield the floor and retain the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. PELL. Madam President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 8 minutes 47 seconds.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for the third International Natural Rubber Agreement, which was reported favorably by the Foreign Relations Committee 3 months ago. After holding a hearing on this important measure, our committee agreed that it would clearly serve the interests of the United States and ordered it reported favorably on a voice vote.

I believe that the Natural Rubber Agreement is a clear example of the way in which both producing and consuming nations of a major natural resource can work together to ensure adequate supply and stable prices. Its primary purposes are to encourage investment in rubber production in order to assure adequacy of supply, and to set up a mechanism to prevent excessive volatility in prices. These functions are particularly important because the United States is the largest importer of natural rubber, while just three countries—Thailand, Indonesia, and Malaysia—control 75 percent of the world's production. Without a mechanism like the INRA, U.S. tire and rubber manufacturers as well as consumers would be more vulnerable to cartel-like behavior that raises prices and creates uncertainty of supply.

U.S. participation in INRA has been supported by four successive administrations, Democratic and Republican alike, and has received the advice and consent of the Senate on two previous occasions. The original agreement was adopted in 1980 by a vote of 90 to 1, and the first extension in 1988 was approved unanimously, by a vote of 97 to 0. The United Steelworkers of America has called ratification of this treaty "a matter of critical importance to our union, its members and families—and

the consumers who purchase the products we produce." If the United States fails to ratify this treaty by the end of this year, it could mean the end of an agreement which has served to the benefit of the United States and the world for the last 16 years.

Mr. President, during the course of my service in the Senate I have risen many times in support of treaties that have come under attack. There are currently a number of extremely important treaties pending before the Senate that I deeply regret have not been taken up during this session. The Chemical Weapons Convention is only the most recent example, but several other agreements such as the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, should also be taken up at the earliest opportunity. I welcome the chance to consider the International Natural Rubber Agreement today, and I urge that it be followed expeditiously by the other treaties I have mentioned.

In closing, let me say that a failure to approve this treaty now would be a great mistake. The objections that have been raised are not borne out by our experience with this agreement, and I urge my colleagues to join me in giving their advice and consent to its ratification.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, my distinguished friend from Rhode Island has summarized the case well, and, as is always the case, he is a very accurate describer of events and facts. In this case, I find myself coming to an opposite conclusion. But I continue to admire his commitment to a sound presentation.

Madam President, I want to indicate that I think he is right that both Democratic and Republican administrations in the past have supported the agreement. I indicate that he is right. I think both the large corporations and the unions—at least it is my information—support the agreement. But, Madam President, I want to invite the Members' attention to what happens if this agreement is not ratified, the specter that the distinguished Senator has raised. What happens? If the agreement is not ratified, \$78 million goes back in the Treasury that would be used to prop up prices of natural rubber. In other words, the taxpayers of this country get a \$78 million break.

Second, if this agreement is not ratified, we will have lower prices for rubber than we would if the agreement is ratified.

Third, if the agreement is not ratified, we will have greater competition in the marketplace.

Finally, I think if the agreement is not ratified, we will have set an example that this country is serious about competition and its antitrust laws, and we will have renewed a commitment to

our consumers. My sense is that returning money to the Treasury, lower prices for consumers, increased competition in the marketplace are good things, and that saying no to the special interests is appropriate as well. So at least in this Senator's judgment, we have a responsibility to vote against the treaty.

I retain the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. PELL. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 5 minutes 30 seconds.

Mr. PELL. I am happy to yield that back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. I yield back all time as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. PELL. Madam President, I ask for consideration of the resolution before the Senate by a division vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is requested. Senators in favor of the resolution of ratification will rise and stand until counted. (After a pause.) Those opposed will rise and stand until counted.

On a division, two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, is the Senate in executive or legislative session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in executive session.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the approval of the treaty.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

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

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, at the end of this session of Congress, one of the Senate's longest-serving Members will be retiring. Senator CLAIBORNE PELL's sterling 35-year record—actually it is 36 years this year—of dedicated service to the people of Rhode Island and the United States began in 1960, when he was elected to the first of his six terms. He is the third longest-serving Member of today's Senate, after only Senator THURMOND and myself. Yet Senator PELL's service to the United States and to his own strong principles began even earlier.