

more urban smog, or greater threats to the public health and safety.

CONCLUSION

With these five steps, Mr. President, we will make federal rules and regulations more effective. And we will do something even more important. Americans will be more confident that their tax dollars are being spent wisely, and that we are guaranteeing public health and safety with the absolute minimum of bureaucracy and paperwork.

So I look forward to the debate on this bill, and to working with my colleagues to meet these goals.●

CONGRATULATING THE NEW JERSEY DEVILS FOR WINNING 1995 NHL STANLEY CUP

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 142, a resolution to congratulate the New Jersey Devils for winning the 1995 NHL Stanley Cup, a resolution submitted earlier today by Senators LAUTENBERG and BRADLEY; that the resolution and preamble be agreed to, en bloc, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements appear in the RECORD as if read.

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

So the resolution (S. Res. 142) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 142

Whereas on October 5, 1982, the New Jersey Devils played their first National Hockey League game in New Jersey, embarking on a quest for the Stanley Cup which was satisfied 13 years later;

Whereas the Devils epitomize New Jersey pride with their heart, stamina, and drive and thus have become a part of New Jersey culture;

Whereas the New Jersey Devils won 10 games on the road during the Stanley Cup playoffs, thus demolishing the previous record;

Whereas the Devils have implemented an ingenious system known as the "trap" that was designed by head coach Jacques Lemaire which constantly stifled and frustrated their opponents;

Whereas Conn Smythe trophy winner Claude Lemieux led the league with 13 playoff goals, three of which were game-winners, and goalie Martin Brodeur led the league with a 1.67 goals-against average during the playoffs;

Whereas the New Jersey hockey fans are the best fans in the nation and deserve commendation for helping build the team into championship caliber and for supporting the Devils during their drive for the Stanley Cup;

Whereas the New Jersey Devils during the playoffs beat Boston, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia and in the finals swept the heavily favored Detroit Red Wings in four games giving the state of New Jersey its first-ever championship for a major league team officially bearing the state's name: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate congratulates the New Jersey Devils for their outstanding discipline, determination, emotion, and ingenuity, in winning the 1995 NHL Stanley Cup.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I stand here proud of the New Jersey Devils' accomplishment in winning hockey's most treasured prize, the Stanley Cup. I congratulate the players and their coaches for an inspiring series with four straight victories over the Detroit Red Wings.

This capped an impressive string of playoff victories over Boston, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia—victories that resulted in the Devils bringing the Stanley Cup to my home State for the first time in history. It is the first time in history that a national professional championship was won by a team with "New Jersey" in its name.

Mr. President, it took a great deal of determination, courage, drive, and discipline—and no small amount of prayer on the part of fervent fans—for the Devils to bring this cup home.

And they did this despite the fact that no one thought they could win it. Not when the playoffs started. Not when they reached the finals. No one gave them a chance against the Red Wings.

But, under the guidance of Head Coach Jacques Lemaire and with the great help of Claude Lemieux, the Cup's Most Valuable Player, and Martin Brodeur, the Devils demonstrated everything great about New Jerseyans—we have the heart, the drive, and the stamina to do it when we have to.

I will take a moment to mention other outstanding Devils players—Ken Daneyko, Bruce Driver, and John MacLean who have each been with the Devils since 1983 and have helped start the team's long journey to the top. Also we must commend Jim Dowd, a New Jersey native hailing from the town of Brick, who scored the winning goal in game two.

Mr. President, anyone who has been in New Jersey knows that the Devils—like our shoreline—are an integral part of our culture. And I, along with 8 million other New Jerseyans look forward to seeing them defend their cup title in the Byrne Arena next year and the year after as well.

Once again, I would like to congratulate them on their remarkable accomplishment, and to thank them for the hard fight they fought to bring the Stanley Cup to the great State of New Jersey.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 1995

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 8:40 a.m. on Wednesday, June 28, 1995; that following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then immediately resume consideration of S. 240, the securities litigation bill, under the provisions of the previous agreement.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BENNETT. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will resume consideration of the securities bill tomorrow at 8:40 a.m. All Senators should be aware there will be a rollcall vote beginning at 8:45 a.m. on or in relation to the Specter amendment. Following that vote, there will be a series of votes with a brief period of debate between each vote. The first vote will be 15 minutes in length, and the remaining votes in the series will be only 10 minutes in length. Following the series of votes and 30 minutes of debate, there will be a 15-minute vote on final passage of the securities litigation.

ORDER TO RECESS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of Senator PELL's morning business speech, the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

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

The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

U.S. RATIFICATION OF THE LAW OF THE SEA CONVENTION WILL ENHANCE OUR NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in the past few months, I have taken the floor on several occasions to highlight how the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea would protect the national interests of the United States with regard to our fisheries and our economic activities. Today, I wish to address how U.S. ratification of the convention will enhance our most important interest: national security.

The convention establishes as a matter of international law freedom of navigation rights that are critical to our military forces. This was highlighted by the President in his Message to Congress, transmitting the Convention on the Law of the Sea:

The United States has basic and enduring national interests in the oceans and has consistently taken the view that the full range of these interests is best protected through a widely accepted international framework governing uses of the sea. . . . Each succeeding U.S. Administration has recognized this as the cornerstone of U.S. ocean policy. . . . The Convention advances the interests of the United States as a global maritime power. It preserves the right of the U.S. military to use the world's oceans to meet national security requirements and of commercial vessels to carry sea-going cargoes. . . . Early adherence by the United States to the Convention and the Agreement is important to maintain a stable legal regime for all uses of the sea, which covers more than 70 percent of the surface of the globe. Maintenance of such stability is vital to U.S. national security

and economic strength." (Treaty Doc. 103-39, p.iii-iv)

Secretary of Defense William Perry and Secretary of State Warren Christopher emphasized in a joint letter to the Congress last year that:

As one of the world's major maritime powers, the United States has a manifest national security interest in the ability to navigate and overfly the oceans freely.

A recent Department of Defense Report on National Security and the Convention on the Law of the Sea concluded that the United States

... national security interests in having a stable oceans regime are, if anything, even more important today than in 1982 when the world had a roughly bipolar political dimension and the U.S. had more abundant forces to project power to wherever it was needed." (Hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations on the Current Status of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, S. Hrg. 103-737, pp.61-75)

In his letter to the Senate accompanying that report Secretary Perry declared that:

... the Convention establishes a universal regime for governance of the oceans which is needed to safeguard United States security and economic interests, as well as to defuse those situations in which competing uses of the oceans are likely to result in conflict. ... Historically, this nation's security has depended upon the ability to conduct military operations over, under and on the oceans. ... To send a strong signal that the United States is committed to an ocean regulatory regime that is guided by the rule of law, General Shalikashvili and I urge your support in securing early advice and consent of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and implementing Agreement.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Perry's letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PELL. With the end of the cold war, both our vital interests and our ability to defend them have shifted. In these fiscally difficult times, the convention allows us to concentrate our resources on the most strategic points of our national security. Illustrations of this phenomenon can be found in the provisions of the Law of the Sea Convention that provide for innocent passage, transit passage, and archipelagic passage.

The convention allows a coastal State to claim a territorial sea that shall not exceed 12 nautical miles measured from the baseline. While this provision recognizes the special rights of the coastal state in the area immediately adjacent to its coastline, it also provides specifically for the right of innocent passage for ships, including warships and submarines, to transit through the territorial sea.

Likewise, in some areas, archipelagic states have been allowed to enclose waters located between the various islands of an archipelago, and to claim them as national waters. Unfortu-

nately, some of these instances involve islands located in international straits or along routes used for international navigation and overflight of the highest strategic importance. Here again, the convention strikes the perfect balance by guaranteeing to all ships and aircraft, including warships, submarines, and military aircraft a right of passage on, over and under international straits and archipelagic sea lanes.

The need to protect freedom of navigation is not merely a theoretical issue. There have been recent situations where even U.S. allies denied our Armed Forces transit rights in times of need. Such an instance was the 1973 Yom Kippur war when our ability to resupply Israel was critically dependent on transit rights through the Strait of Gibraltar. Again, in 1986, United States aircraft passed through the Strait to strike Libyan targets in response to that government's acts of terrorism directed against the United States, after some of our allies had denied us the right to transit through their airspace.

In April 1992, Peruvian fighters strafed a United States C-130 aircraft that was 60 nautical miles off the Peruvian coast, well within Peru's claimed 200-nautical-mile territorial sea, but well outside the 12-nautical-mile limit recognized by the Law of the Sea Convention and the United States. This incident resulted in the death of one U.S. service member and the wounding of several others, as well as the loss of the aircraft. Peru continues to challenge United States aircraft flying over its claimed territorial sea.

There are a number of other situations where having the Law of the Sea in effect might have made a difference. I ask unanimous consent that a summary of such instances be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 2.)

Mr. PELL. Another way in which the convention protects our national security interests is by bringing an incredible amount of stability and certainty with regard to multiple and sometimes divergent ocean uses. Most importantly the convention provides the most effective brake on excessive coastal state maritime claims in ocean areas adjacent to their coasts.

If the United States is not a party to the convention, preserving our navigational rights in nonwartime situations becomes increasingly costly. The Law of the Sea provides very clear rules and circumstances according to which these claims need to be recognized. In addition, if the rights of a transiting nation are impeded, the Law of the Sea provides all parties with a very clear set of rules for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Only a few weeks ago, a potential conflict threatened to erupt over Greek territorial claims around its islands in

the Aegean Sea. Turkey has warned against the transformation of this area into a "Greek Lake" and many have warned of the possibility of conflict over this issue. The Law of the Sea specifically calls for peaceful resolution of such disputes and, when the Hamburg Tribunal on the Law of the Sea is convened, it could be seized to address disputes such as this one.

Another potential point of conflict is to be found in the South China Sea, where conflicting claims have been staked over the Spratly Islands. These islands have been claimed by the People's Republic of China, Taiwan, Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Brunei. Recently, some of those claimants have engaged in aggressive activities. The location of the Spratlys is of paramount importance, as the islands lie along strategic sea lanes that connect the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf to the Pacific Ocean. Seventy percent of Japan's oil imports travel through this route and both the United States and its allies would stand to lose if armed conflict erupted as a result of these conflicting claims. The administration recently advised the various claimants that the United States would view with serious concern any maritime claim or restriction on maritime activity in the South China Sea that was not consistent with the Law of the Sea Convention.

In that regard, on June 20, 1995, the Committee on Foreign Relations reported, and on June 22 the Senate agreed to, Senate Resolution 97, introduced by Senator THOMAS and Senator ROBB, which I cosponsored. This resolution calls on the parties involved in this dispute to solve their differences in a manner that is consistent with international law.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an op ed piece that was published on May 26, 1995 in the Washington Times and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. PELL. In it, Keith Eirinberg, a Fellow in the Asian Studies Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, calls the Law of the Sea Convention perhaps the world's greatest diplomatic achievement for having established internationally accepted laws for three fourths of the earth's surface. He also clearly demonstrates that excessive claims have no standing under the Convention and that the U.S. ability to influence a peaceful settlement of the dispute over the Spratly Islands would be enhanced by U.S. ratification of the treaty.

In addition, on June 22, 1995, Rear Adm. Lloyd R. Vasey (Ret.), a senior strategist specializing in Asia-Pacific security, wrote in the Christian Science Monitor that the claims over the Spratly Islands should be resolved through international law and the UN

Convention on the Law of the Sea. He added that for its own credibility the U.S. needs to complete ratification of the Law of the Sea Treaty. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. PELL. There are scores of other instances where maritime boundary disputes were solved in a peaceful manner, precisely because the Law of the Sea establishes such clear rules and limitations. If it does not ratify the Convention, the United States will stand at risk of being left out of the enforcement of this Constitution for the Oceans, and will be subject to the uncertainties of customary international 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 were seen as a violation of their treaty obligations.

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.

The concordant judgment of those charged with responsibility for the national security of our Nation is reflected in the report of the Department of Defense on National Security and the Law of the Sea, which states:

Our principal judgement is that public order of the oceans is best established by a universally accepted Law of the Sea treaty that is in the U.S. national interest. . . . Reliance upon customary international law in the absence of the modified Convention would represent a necessarily imprecise approach to the problem as well as one which requires the United States to put forces in harm's way when principles of law are not universally understood or accepted. A universal Convention is the best guarantee of avoiding situations in which U.S. forces must be used to assert navigational freedoms, as well as the best method of fostering the growth and use of various conflict avoidance schemes which are contained in the Convention.

Mr. President, this is not merely my opinion but that of the professionals whose job it is to protect our Nation's security. We must not ignore their advice: United States ratification of the Law of the Sea Convention will enhance our national security interests.

EXHIBIT 1

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, July 29, 1994.

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In 1982, the United States made a decision that it would not be-

come a party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea because of its concerns about the deep seabed mining provisions, contained in Part XI of the Convention. The Convention is due to enter into force on November 16, 1994, now that the requisite number of other states (60) have ratified it. However, consultations were recently concluded which resulted in an Agreement to correct what the United States has long viewed as the Convention's flawed deep seabed mining provisions. The United States now intends to sign the Agreement at the United Nations on July 29, 1994. Accordingly, the Convention as modified will be transmitted to the Senate for its advice and consent at the end of the 103rd Congress.

The Department of Defense fully supports U.S. signature of the Agreement, and ratification of the Convention as modified by the Agreement. In the Administration's view, the new Agreement satisfactorily resolves the issues that the U.S. Government and ocean mining interests raised in the early 1980's during deliberations over whether the United States should sign the Law of the Sea Convention. The new Agreement meets these objections by correcting the serious institutional and free market deficiencies in the original Convention. We have received indications from other industrialized nations that, with adoption of the new Agreement, they will soon accede to the modified Convention.

The Convention establishes a universal regime for governance of the oceans which is needed to safeguard U.S. security and economic interests, as well as to defuse those situations in which competing uses of the oceans are likely to result in conflict. In addition to strongly supporting our interests in freedom of navigation, the Convention provides an effective framework for serious efforts to address land and sea-based sources of pollution and overfishing. Moreover, the Agreement provides us with an opportunity to participate with other industrialized nations in a widely accepted international order to regulate and safeguard the many diverse activities, interests, and resources in the world's oceans. Historically, this nation's security has depended upon the ability to conduct military operations over, under, and on the oceans. The best guarantee that this free and unfettered access to the high seas will continue in the years ahead is for the U.S. to become a party to the Convention, as modified by the Agreement, at the earliest possible time.

In the coming months, we anticipate heightened public debate of the merits of the Law of the Sea Convention. To put that debate into perspective, you will find enclosed a paper which briefly outlines the history of the original Convention, the steps leading to the formalization of the Part XI Agreement, and the nation's vital national security and other interests in becoming bound by the modified Convention.

To send a strong signal that the United States is committed to an ocean regulatory regime that is guided by the rule of law, General Shalikashvili and I urge your support in securing early advice and consent of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and implementing Agreement.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. PERRY.

EXHIBIT 2

PARTICULAR CASES 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 a 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.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Washington Times, May 26, 1995]

U.N. MARITIME PACT COULD PRODUCE SOUTH CHINA SEA SOLUTION

(By Keith W. Eiringer)

The recent Clinton administration statement on the Spratly Islands dispute, urging negotiations instead of force, is the strongest declaration yet of U.S. interests in the South China Sea.

While critics of the administration argue that the United States should "draw a line in the sand" against Chinese aggression in the Spratlys, U.S. interests are better served by efforts to persuade the contesting parties to follow international law, including the newly effective 1982 U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea, and find a diplomatic solution.

The Republican-controlled Senate can help America's efforts to protect these interests by ratifying the Law of the Sea accord, giving this country greater standing as it encourages a peaceful resolution of the dispute.

The Spratly Islands imbroglio is essentially a maritime controversy centered on the question of sovereignty and jurisdiction over geologic features and adjacent waters in the South China Sea.

Six nations claim part or all of the Spratlys: the People's Republic of China, Taiwan, Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia and Brunei. The dispute has direct implications for U.S. interests: freedom of navigation and overflight and the maintenance of peace and stability in Southeast Asia.

The sovereignty issue appears intractable, so many of the parties have voiced a desire to shelve this point and look to joint development of the area's resources. China, in a "divide and conquer" strategy, insists on negotiating bilaterally and rejects a regional or international approach. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations, which includes some of the claimants, is interested in a regional solution.

The parties to the dispute, except Brunei, claim ownership over islands, reefs, atolls, rocks and cays in the Spratlys. The Spratlys are important because they lie along strategic sea lanes and lines of communication that connect the Indian and Pacific oceans. More than 70 percent of Japan's oil imports and a large volume of global commerce travel along this maritime route. The Spratlys are domestically important to the claimants

because of the politics and patriotism reflected in ownership.

It is the potential of vast hydrocarbon resources beneath the seabed that has caused this dispute to become a flash point in East Asia. The energy needs of the developing claimants have made the exploitation of oil and gas beneath the South China Sea especially attractive.

The U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea—perhaps the world's greatest diplomatic achievement for having established internationally accepted laws for three-fourths of the earth's surface—can provide the framework for a diplomatic solution. For example, it prescribes the methods for determining boundaries. Of the claimants, the Philippines and Vietnam have ratified the convention.

To Beijing, however, ownership is nine-tenths of the law. While advocating a diplomatic solution, it has aggressively placed encampments and markers in contested areas of the Spratlys. This "talk and take" pattern was most recently illustrated in China's occupation of Mischief Reef in Philippine-claimed territory.

China's cavalier attitude to international law is also shown by its 1992 territorial sea law. This declares Chinese jurisdiction over virtually all of the South China Sea—a claim that has no basis in modern international law.

China must play by the rules. Washington encourages Beijing to join the international community in many different areas, from nuclear proliferation to human rights. But Washington finds itself in a poor position to persuade Beijing to ratify the Law of the Sea accord without having done so itself.

U.S. administrations had resisted ratification because of inequities in the deep-seabed-mining provisions. But changes to the convention have addressed U.S. objections.

Last year, with strong Defense Department backing, the White House signed the amended Convention on the Law of the Sea and sent it to the Senate for ratification.

America's ability to influence a peaceful settlement of the Spratly Islands dispute would be enhanced by U.S. ratification of the treaty. In light of the tensions in the South China Sea, this step should be taken soon.

EXHIBIT 4

[From The Christian Science Monitor, June 22, 1995]

COLLISION IN THE CHINA SEA—WORLD OIL AND SHIPPING LANES AT STAKE IN MULTINATION DISPUTE

(By Lloyd R. Vasey)

East Asia's economic momentum may grind to a premature halt unless political

leaders find a way to defuse tensions over territorial disputes in the South China Sea. With several countries on a collision course, a major regional crisis is waiting to happen.

At issue are claims of sovereignty over the Spratly and Paracel Islands—hundreds of islets and reefs and surrounding seas believed to be rich in oil, gas, and other resources. China, which urgently needs new energy sources, is the central disputant; others include Vietnam, Brunei, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Taiwan. China's claims are historically based, going back several centuries when the South China Sea was an area of preeminent Chinese influence and power. Currently they have no basis in international law, and claims of some of the other countries are also questionable.

The prevailing view in Asia is that China is deliberately expanding its geopolitical influence in the region. This perception was dramatically reinforced in 1992 when the Chinese People's Congress declared ownership of the waters around the Spratlys and Paracels and readiness to use military power to defend its interests. The claim would make the South China Sea a virtual Chinese lake straddling shipping lanes carrying huge volumes of global trade, including the oil lifelines of Japan and South Korea.

Indonesia and other countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) have convened unofficial forums seeking to resolve the disputes, but progress on the issues has stalled.

Regional tensions escalated last month when Philippine president Fidel Ramos challenged China's "illegal" occupation of a small atoll in the Spratlys aptly named Mischief Reef.

It lies well within the Philippine's 200 mile Exclusive Economic Zone but also within the area claimed by Beijing.

China hasn't hesitated to use force in asserting territorial claims. In 1974 it seized most of the Paracel islands east of Vietnam. In 1988, the two engaged in bloody clashes over the Spratlys.

Indonesians are deeply suspicious of China's revision of a map that now depicts part of the maritime area around Natuna island, hundreds of miles south of the Spratlys, to be under Chinese jurisdiction. Indonesia's military leaders have announced that they will defend their national interests by force if necessary. What makes the issue particularly irksome to Indonesia is that a \$35 billion deal involving a United States oil company was signed last year to help develop the Natuna gas field, possibly one of the world's largest.

Such colliding claims ought to alert Washington to pay much closer attention to this high-stakes strategic game. The implications for American interests are disturbing: future access to resources, freedom of the seas, the balance of power, and regional stability are all involved.

The US should now revamp its policy of relying on ASEAN even when important American interests are involved. Instead, the US should volunteer to act as honest broker to work out production-sharing agreements for joint development of resources in contested areas, and request disputants to put sovereignty claims on hold. These claims should be resolved through international law and the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. For its own credibility the US needs to complete ratification of the Law of the Sea Treaty, now in the Senate. Leadership won't cost Washington an extra dime, nor will it require any troops. Crisis prevention is what it's all about.

RECESS UNTIL 8:40 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 8:40 tomorrow morning.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:38 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, June 28, 1995, at 8:40 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 27, 1995:

JUDICIARY

TODD J. CAMPBELL, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE THOMAS A. WISEMAN, JR., RETIRED.

JAMES M. MOODY, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS, VICE HENRY WOODS, RETIRED.

EVAN J. WALLACH, OF NEVADA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE U.S. COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE, VICE EDWARD D. RE, RETIRED.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

ALBERTO J. MORA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR A TERM OF 2 YEARS. (NEW POSITION.)