

As both a coastal State and a State whose vessels fish on the high seas, we are keenly aware of the need for a balanced approach in the Agreement, one that recognizes the legitimate concerns of both groups. The United States believes that the Agreement strikes a reasonable balance between conservation and fishing concerns, and between the interests of coastal States and States whose vessels fish on the high seas. We support the Agreement because it establishes new and effective rules to conserve and manage marine fisheries and provides for States to resolve their disputes through compulsory binding dispute settlement procedures. The Agreement, if widely ratified and properly implemented, will both improve the health of our ocean ecosystems and ensure a lasting supply of fish to feed the world's population.

The United States wishes to acknowledge the skill, leadership and energy of Ambassador Satya Nandan for crafting the Agreement. We are truly indebted to you.

This Agreement is particularly noteworthy because it directly contributes to a broader global effort to promote international cooperation, reduce conflict and achieve more effectively the sustainable use of living marine resources. The Agreement is consistent with and builds upon the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea which entered into force last year. It complements the 1993 Agreement to Promote Compliance With International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas, which itself is an integral component of the International Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries which was adopted last month in Rome. Together, these instruments provide a strong basis to move forward in achieving sustainable use of living marine resources in the world's oceans and seas.

Looking to the future, we see many exciting challenges before us. Our first task is to bring this Agreement into force as soon as possible. We hope that all nations that sign the Agreement today will soon deposit their instruments of ratification. We urge those nations which are not able to sign the Agreement today to do so as soon as possible. Also ahead are the challenges of implementing effectively the provisions of the Agreement in various regional and subregional organizations and arrangements throughout the world. The status of the world's fish stocks demands that implementation of the Agreement begin immediately wherever straddling and highly migratory fish stocks are harvested.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, the Fish Stocks Agreement is a laudable accomplishment. The tasks before us are not only possible, but absolutely necessary. At stake are important issues involving biological integrity of marine ecosystems and food security. The United States is confident that we will succeed. Let us hope that our imagination and strength are as vast as the oceans we so cherish.

LIHEAP

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, in some parts of Michigan over 5 feet of snow have already fallen and the wind chill has brought the temperature to 50 below zero. Understanding the importance of helping the poor and elderly pay their heating bills during these cold months, I rise to support the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] and urge members of the Appropriations Committee to continue to support funding for this program.

Under the current continuing resolution, funding for LIHEAP is limited to the proportional annual rate of the duration of the Continuing Resolution. That is, if the Continuing Resolution lasts 32 days, only thirty-two three hundred and sixty sixths of LIHEAP funds can be spent. While this formula may work well for most other programs, for obvious reasons the vast majority of funding for LIHEAP is spent during the winter months. Therefore, the current Continuing Resolution formula leaves States with an extreme shortfall in their efforts to help the poor and elderly through the coldest months of the year.

Since LIHEAP is funded through the Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations bill which has not yet been debated on the Senate floor, the funding for this program necessarily must come through Continuing Resolutions. Should this continue to be the case, I urge those negotiating the Continuing Resolution to abandon the daily average formula they have been using and allow the bulk of LIHEAP funds to be spent during the cold, winter months.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President I rise in opposition to this bill, which I feel represents yet another attack on our Nation's resources and our environmental protection laws.

Our greatest legacy to our children and our grandchildren is the world which we leave to them. Simply put, this bill shortchanges future generations of Americans.

I want to commend my colleagues, particularly Senator GORTON and Senator BYRD, who have made some progress toward improving this bill.

First, and foremost, I want to acknowledge that the outcry from the taxpayers of this country has been heard: After months of wrangling, this bill finally restores the moratorium on the processing of mining claims, contained in last year's bill.

Without this freeze, gigantic, foreign-owned mining companies would be permitted to purchase Federal land, loaded with gold, silver, and other precious metals, for as little as \$2.50, due to an outdated 1872 law still in effect.

Only \$2.50 for an acre of land and all the gold underneath it is an outrageous ripoff for the taxpayers of this country.

Though the bill's language will still permit the processing of hundreds of applications which are now pending, this freeze will prevent even more companies from receiving this golden giveaway.

I also support the funding contained in this bill for the North American wetlands conservation fund.

This valuable public-private partnership, has enabled Federal and State wildlife officials, and conservationists in my home State of Delaware, to develop dozens of wetlands and wildlife habitat protection plans. It is cost-effective, matching funds are required, and it deserves our support.

Despite these few bright spots, much in this bill troubles me.

This legislation cuts our efforts to move away from fossil fuels, toward cleaner, renewable fuels, such as solar energy. Energy efficiency standards are also relaxed. The end result: a continuation of our growing dependence on foreign oil.

This conference report also prohibits listing additional species as threatened or endangered and prohibits designating and protecting critical wildlife habitat.

Delaware has 9 animal species, and 16 plant species, which are candidates for Endangered Species Act listing, and I am concerned that this provision will hasten their extinction.

An unsustainable amount of logging will also be permitted in the Tongass National Forest, a great temperate rainforest in southeastern Alaska.

With Christmas fast approaching I can understand a certain amount of sentiment for expedited logging. But we are not talking about a few Christmas trees here.

Under this bill, up to 418 million board feet of timber will be sold in 1996 and 1997—an allowable logging level which is 44 percent higher than the cutting average over the previous 10 years. This plan is locked in, and no changes are permitted.

The conference report also contains a legislative rider which allows the construction of a telescope on Mt. Graham, near Tucson, AZ, despite the fact that this development will likely harm an endangered species.

Putting the merits of the proposal aside, an appropriations bill is not the right location for reforming the Endangered Species Act.

Lastly, this bill expands the number of recreational activities permitted in the new Mojave preserve in California. If you plan to go hiking in the Mojave this summer, be forewarned, the Park Service may be forced to open this wilderness to motorized vehicles and aircraft.

In sum, Mr. President, this bill falls far short of adequately protecting our natural resources. Under this legislation, our dependency on foreign oil grows, endangered species are threatened, our environmental laws are disregarded, and Americans are left poorer.

President Clinton has announced his intention to veto this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the impression will not go away: The \$4.98 trillion Federal debt stands today as a sort of grotesque parallel to television's energizer bunny that appears and appears and appears in precisely the same way that the Federal debt keeps going up and up and up.

Politicians talk a good game—and talk is the operative word—about reducing the Federal deficit and bringing the Federal debt under control. But watch how they vote.

Mr. President, as of the close of business, Wednesday, December 13, the total Federal debt stood at exactly \$4,988,313,115,981.39 or \$18,935.72 per man, woman, child on a per capita basis. *Res ipsa loquitur*.

THE USE OF TROOPS IN BOSNIA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise to explain why I reluctantly supported last night the resolution written by Majority Leader DOLE and Senator MCCAIN of Arizona, which authorized the use of American troops to implement the Dayton Framework Agreement.

I did so with some apprehension. I have no illusions about how difficult this mission could be. Bosnia is a country deeply divided by 4 years of warfare and centuries of turbulence. The terrain is rough and the weather fierce. Much of the land is sown with mines.

So why do I—with some apprehension—support the DOLE resolution? I do it because I believe implementing the Dayton Agreement is the best option in a very bad situation.

Our decision would be easier if we could roll back the clock. If President Bush had used air power to punish Serbian aggression in 1991, we might not be here today. If President Clinton had persuaded our allies, over the past 2 years, to lift the arms embargo against Bosnia, we might now have the balance of power in Bosnia that the Dayton Agreement seeks to create. That is why I voted to lift the arms embargo so that Bosnia could defend itself.

But we cannot roll back the clock; 4 years of war have passed, and the parties are now exhausted. Our allies opposed lifting the embargo. So President Clinton began a diplomatic campaign this past summer to broker a peace settlement. The President's leadership and American-led NATO air strikes produced the Dayton Agreement. President Clinton deserves congratulations for this historic achievement.

Last night the Senate had to decide whether to authorize the use of troops to implement that agreement. Many North Dakotans have shared their concerns about this mission with me. So I want to take a moment to explain my vote to them by describing the decision that the Senate faced and the Dole resolution.

Let me put my vote in the context of what is happening in Bosnia. Since the war began, 250,000 people have lost their lives. Two million people have become homeless. Innocent civilians have been slaughtered, and no one has been spared—not the young, not the infirm, not the elderly. Ethnic cleansing has raged across the land of Bosnia. Atrocities have been committed, by both sides. And we have reliable reports of horrors that we thought we had banished from Europe 50 years ago, such as concentration camps and mass graves.

I agree with Senator DOLE's assesment that the President has the constitutional authority to commit

these troops for a peacekeeping mission. While I have serious reservations about it, it seems to me we ought to, as the President commits these troops, by resolution, support the troops themselves and create narrow restrictions under which the President can keep them there—that they are going only in a peacekeeping role.

The President argues that other countries are sending more troops per capita than we are to carry out this mission. He points out that England is sending three times as many troops, relative to their population, as we are. I understand why it was difficult for the President to withhold a commitment of American troops to keep a peace that he helped negotiate and to keep a peace that will be monitored by virtually all other countries that belong to NATO.

But that does not eliminate the deep reservations I have about the risks of this mission, and about the dangers of changing the mission once our troops are in place in Bosnia.

It is true, I believe, that America is looked upon as a world leader that is not seeking to gain territory but is helping to promote peace. It is also true that with that leadership comes responsibilities. But our country has, in so many ways, for so many years, had to bear the brunt of that responsibility—to pay for the defense of Western Europe and to provide international leadership when others would not.

I would have much preferred, in this circumstance, that the European Community would have been willing to step forward and broker a peace and keep the peace without having the United States expose our ground troops to the kind of risks we will face in the Balkan region. But the President has committed our country to helping to secure peace. And it seems to me we are in a position now where we must tell the President these are the conditions under which you can meet that commitment, which is what the Dole resolution attempts to do.

I am not, by supporting the Dole resolution, saying that I believe the President made the right commitment for our country. But rather, I am expressing support for the troops, acknowledging that the commitment was made and saying that our country must now proceed to keep its word.

Because I have real concerns about this mission I want the President and my colleagues to know that if a change of mission occurs in Bosnia, if the peace does not hold, and there is a decision our soldiers should become peace-makers instead of peacekeepers then I will be among the first in Congress to call for the immediate withdrawal of the American troops and to vote for a cut-off of funding, if necessary, to accomplish that withdrawal.

Finally, Mr. President, let me highlight a few aspects of the Dole resolution that I think are important to my vote. First, the resolution expresses

the unequivocal support of Congress for the work of our troops. It commends their professionalism, their bravery, and their sacrifice. It expresses the commitment of Congress to give them the tools they will need to do their job.

Second, it states that the United States will lead an international effort to arm and train the Bosnian Moslems. That is important. American troops will be able to leave if the Bosnian Moslems are able to defend themselves.

Third, the Dole resolution recognizes that American troops are going to Bosnia to enforce a peace agreement. They are not there to make the peace. The leaders of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia have decided that peace is their policy, and they have again attested to that decision by signing an agreement today in Paris. If the parties themselves abandon peace, then our troops should depart.

Fourth, the resolution supports a truly multilateral operation. The Dayton Agreement's implementation force will be composed of 60,000 troops from about 30 different countries, including non-NATO nations such as Russia, Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary.

This is my thinking on Bosnia, Mr. President, and these are the reasons why I voted for the Dole resolution last night. I hope and pray that my vote will help our troops fulfill their mission and will help speed them safely home.

UNITED STATES DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES CONCERNING WAR CRIMINALS AND EVIDENCE OF WAR CRIMES IN THE UNITED STATES ZONE IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a matter that has not received much public attention during the course of our discussions of the United States role in the Balkans and specifically in Bosnia. While administration officials have discussed how we would respond if we encountered indicted war criminals in Bosnia, they have been silent on the equally important question of collecting and protecting evidence of violations of international humanitarian law.

This is a very basic point. You can indict and arrest suspects, but for convictions, you need solid, admissible evidence. The International Criminal tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia has been doing excellent work, considering the resource limitations it operates under and its lack of direct access to many crime scenes. It now lies within the power of the United States to advance the tribunal's work and the cause of justice in the former Yugoslavia.

The United States has supported the Tribunal's efforts to acquire more resources. Now, the United States and our NATO allies in the implementation force will have direct access to the scenes of the alleged crimes. The question we face is what do we do with this access?