

States has discretionary powers for determining the total allowable catch, its harvesting capacity, the allocation of surpluses to other States and the terms and conditions established in its conservation and management measures.

Indeed, the Law of the Sea Convention will play a paramount role in the implementation of the important international agreements to which the United States is already a party. These include: the 1992 Convention for the Conservation of Anadromous Stocks in the North Pacific Ocean, approved by the Senate on August 11, 1992; the U.N. General Assembly Resolution on Large-Scale High Seas Driftnet Fishing, approved by the Senate on November 26, 1991; the Convention on the Conservation and Management of Pollock Resources in the Central Bering Sea, approved by the Senate on October 6, 1994; and the FAO Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas, approved by the Senate on October 6, 1994.

In approving these treaties, the Senate spoke to the importance of these issues to our Nation; however, the long-term benefits of these fishery agreements will only be realized and mutual enforcement ensured if the underlying principles of the Law of the Sea Convention—the new constitution of the oceans—are ratified by the United States.

Mr. President, in 1982, the Reagan administration was prepared to sign the convention on behalf of the United States, but for part XI. Part XI dealt with deep seabed mining and contained a number of provisions that the United States found objectionable. Unfortunately, at the time, the administration was not able to secure the changes it sought in time for the United States to sign the convention. As a result, neither the United States nor the other industrialized countries signed the convention.

During the Bush administration, with the prospect that the convention would actually enter into force, informal consultations were begun at the United Nations with the aim of resolving concerns with part XI. That goal was achieved in an agreement that, in effect, amends part XI of the convention in a manner that meets all of the concerns first articulated under President Reagan and carried forward through to the Clinton Administration. The modification of part XI is a bipartisan foreign policy success and is the culmination of three decades of U.S. oceans policy efforts.

I feel qualified to say this Mr. President, since I have closely followed the Law of the Sea negotiations from their early days to the present. The initial support for this idea was put forth by Arvid Pardo, Malta's delegate to the United Nations, with his famous "Common Heritage of Mankind" speech before the U.N. General Assembly in 1967. The convention then became the prod-

uct of visionaries. I remember particularly the "Pacem in Maribus"—Peace on the Seas—meetings organized by Elizabeth Mann Borgese, the daughter of Germany's great writer, Thomas Mann. 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, during my service in the U.S. Coast Guard during World War II. Why not declare the oceans a zone of peace, open to all peoples and nations, to be free forever from the ravages of warfare? My service on the staff of the San Francisco Convention that prepared the U.N. Charter, just 51 years ago this summer, further confirmed me in my belief that ways could be found to create a working 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 5 years since the construction of the Berlin Wall.

I was proud to serve as a delegate 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 70 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.

Now, Mr. President, we must look to the future and U.S. oceans policy for the 21st century. Our 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, the United States stands on the threshold of a new era of 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.

Mr. President, the United States was a leader in initiating the negotiations of the Law of the Sea Convention because our national security interests

were at stake. We have also played a widely recognized leadership role in the Straddling Stock Agreement negotiations because our fisheries interests were threatened. Indeed, the United States will be among the very first parties to ratify this very important agreement. It is time for the United States to regain its leadership role by ratifying promptly the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and thus protecting the entirety of our oceans interests.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I understand we are working back and forth. If the Senator from Iowa wishes to be recognized for 5 or 10 minutes, I will be happy to yield to him.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Three minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa be recognized for 5 minutes, and the Senator from California for 10 minutes immediately following his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Senator from California for her kindness.

#### THE CASE OF RICARDO CORDERO ONTIVEROS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am disappointed to have just learned that Mexican officials have arrested Ricardo Cordero. Mr. Cordero came to our attention this week with articles in the *Washington Post* and other papers in our country because of charges he made about the degree of narcotics-related corruption in Mexico's counterdrug efforts.

When I read those articles, the thought came to my mind, how come this guy is still in Mexico? He will be assassinated, executed, or something. But anyway, now he is arrested. It has been on charges of corruption and taking bribes himself.

I do not want to comment on the merits of those charges. He could be guilty, of course. But what concerns me, and what needs to concern all of us in this body, Cordero's accusations made this week printed in our own newspapers.

The arrest has the appearance of retaliation and intimidation. It gives the impression that instead of investigating his allegations, that the messenger, in fact, has been punished. If this is the case, then it raises further doubts about the ability of Mexico to take serious steps to end corruption and to deal with the problems posed by drug trafficking.

Even if Mr. Cordero is guilty of the charges brought against him, it is a clear indication of the thorough-going nature of corruption in the counterdrug fight in Mexico. If he is innocent, however—and at least in our

country we would believe that he is innocent at this point—then his arrest is an example of a system that is on the verge of going out of control.

I want to make it clear here that we will be following Mr. Cordero's arrest closely. How his case and his personal safety are handled will be the subject of considerable attention. I know that bureaucracies hate whistle-blowers, here or, I am for sure, they hate them in Mexico as well. The integrity of public institutions, however, can only be maintained if people in those institutions, with regard for documentation, are able to tell their stories without retaliation.

Mr. Cordero's case is very disturbing. And if it should prove to be a case of retaliation, it does not speak well of Mexico's ability to deal seriously with the problems of corruption.

I call on the Mexican Government to resolve this case quickly, and, of course, fairly. I ask our own U.S. administration, even those of us here in the Congress, to monitor this case very closely. And in the case of the administration, please keep Congress informed. I expect Mr. Cordero's rights—most importantly, his personal safety—will receive particular attention. Thank you.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much.

Before the Senator from Iowa leaves the floor, I want to thank him for bringing this issue before the Senate.

Mexico is continually asking for cooperation with this country in the areas of trade. I say to my friend, I am in a little bit of a battle right now over the dolphin-safe fishing of tuna where the Mexicans are really fighting very hard to have us change the rules of the game so they can go out and purse seine on dolphin and sell their tuna here in competition with our dolphin-safe American tuna people.

They want our cooperation, and yet we know the drugs are coming from Mexico, yet we know they are doing, I would say, virtually nothing to stop illegal immigration. I believe it is important to have a warm and good relationship with our neighbor, Mexico. But I think the Senator has raised an issue that really requires the attention of the U.S. Senate. And I will work with him, and I know Senator FEINSTEIN, the senior Senator from California, will as well. Again, I want to thank him for raising this issue.

#### LEGISLATION PASSED BY CONGRESS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I came to the floor because I have been watching a series of dueling press conferences, one held by the Republicans this morning, the Republican leadership, one held by the Democratic leadership, to discuss who deserves credit for the flurry of legislation that has finally passed this Congress, after a do-nothing Congress.

Of course, the American people are going to make the decision about who deserves the credit or the blame, depending on how they view the legislation. The issues are welfare, health care, and minimum wage. We remember back to President Clinton talking about how it was important to reform welfare as we know it, the fact that he granted many waivers to the States to reform welfare, the fact that he presented some excellent welfare reform bills which I consider to be real reform.

I think what the Republican Congress put out is very hurtful to my home State. It is a huge, unfunded mandate, and it also hurts children. As I said yesterday, it amazed me that Senators who earn large paychecks in relation to most of the people in this country did not have the heart to mandate that the little kids who are helpless and hopeless, whose parents cannot find a job, that they are not assured diapers, school supplies, emergency food and other things. So people will decide on that one.

On health care, we know Senator KENNEDY, for years, has worked on that. Senator KASSEBAUM and he got together and passed two provisions of the Clinton health care reform bill, very important provisions. I am very hopeful we will see portability of health insurance, so that when Americans lose their jobs, they can take their health care with them and they will not be punished if they have a pre-existing condition.

Who deserves credit for that? The Republicans say they do; I say look at the record. It was Senator Dole who blocked Senator KASSEBAUM from bringing up the bill time and time again. It is in the RECORD. Finally she said, "I will offer it every day." We finally have a bill.

Minimum wage. I do not have to tell you that DICK ARMEY, the majority leader of the Republicans, said, "I will fight a minimum wage increase with every fiber in my body." Well, it was not good enough, Mr. ARMEY, because the army of people in this country did not agree with you. Now you want to take credit over there for it. The most important thing to this Senator is that people will get a minimum wage increase—I am happy about that—millions of hard-working Americans who do not want a handout, they want to work for a decent wage. Most of them, by the way, are adults, and most of them are women.

So we have an argument going on. As I watched the Republican press conference, it brought to mind a little fable. I want to tell you the little fable. Once upon a time, in 1994, the real Republicans took over the U.S. Congress. They came in like the wolf in Little Red Riding Hood, and this is what they did, on the record: They tried to roll back environmental laws that protect our children. I know, I am on the Environment Committee. I saw it. They tried to sell off our parks. As a matter of fact, Chairman HANSEN said publicly

it was not a question that they would close down the parks, it is just how they would do it.

They tried to give huge tax breaks to millionaires, paid for by the middle class. They put through the largest cuts ever in education in the history of our country. They denied many American women the right to choose. That is on the record. They even shut down the Government because Democrats would not let them destroy Medicare.

That is only part of it. Then the real Republicans read the polls and realized they were about to lose the elections. So before your eyes, the wolf has put on a grandma's disguise just like the wolf in Little Red Riding Hood, a grandma's smile, a grandma's voice, sweet, and it is telling the American people, "Look at the goodies we have done for you."

There are different versions for the end of Little Red Riding Hood. In one she gets eaten alive because she trusts the wolf. In the other she found out that Grandma is really a wolf in disguise, and she is saved.

We say, today we do not think the American people will be fooled by this costume because the real Republicans are on the record. I love the new ones. I have never enjoyed it more than the last few days of being able to get some work done around here, that will make life better for the people.

But I have to say in closing, do not take my word for it. Listen to what House Republican whip DENNIS HASTERT has said, on the record, quoted in the St. Louis Dispatch, June 9, 1996: "After November, it will be a different story."

So, for now, we see different Republicans. I am going to reach out to those different Republicans. Let's do something about pensions. Let's do something about paycheck security. Let's put more police on the beat. Let's do something about terrorism. Let's not back off of this taggant issue. Tag those explosives used in bombs. Let's work together on these issues. Let's go with President Clinton's idea to give our middle-class families a tax break for education. Let's put more investment into research for diseases like Alzheimer's and cancer and AIDS, and wipe these scourges off the face of the Earth.

We can to it. We can do it, I say to my friends in your new outlook, in your new desire to work. But I say to the American people, look out. Watch out for the disguise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

#### A REPORT CARD ON SCHOOL BUS SAFETY

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to communicate some very good news to my colleagues in the Senate. The good news is about an issue that I have previously talked about on two or three occasions on the Senate floor, the issue of schoolbus safety.